

From billing@igc.apc.orgWed Feb 12 16:27:51 1997
Date: Tue, 11 Feb 1997 18:29:59 -0800 (PST)
From: IGC Billing Department <billing@igc.apc.org>
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: IGC billing

THIS IS AN AUTOMATIC RESPONSE

This is to acknowledge receipt of your mail to the IGC Billing Department regarding "IGC billing".

If you have written with an address or credit card change, we will update our records. If your message requires a response, we will reply; depending on the volume of mail we receive, a full reply may take a few days. If your request is urgent, please call our office at the number below, or send e-mail again with the word "URGENT" in the subject.

If your request is best handled by another department, your message will be forwarded to the appropriate staff. E-mail addresses for common requests are:

1. <support@igc.org> technical support
2. <outreach@igc.org> extended service; WWW, domain names, etc.
3. <subscription@igc.org> new accounts
4. <getinteract@igc.org> for software purchasing
5. <info@igc.org> information about IGC's projects & services
6. <rates-info@igc.org> for rates information.
7. <www-info@igc.org> for Web site hosting information

=====
==

Institute for Global Communications Presidio Building 1012, First Floor
Phone: (415) 561-6100 Torney Avenue
Fax: (415) 561-6101 P.O. Box 29904
Email: billing@igc.org San Francisco, CA 94129-0904

ConflictNet * EcoNet * HomeoNet * LaborNet * PeaceNet * WomensNet
A division of the Tides Center

From Majordomo@igc.orgWed Feb 12 16:31:44 1997
Date: Tue, 11 Feb 1997 18:31:45 -0800 (PST)
From: Majordomo@igc.org
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: Welcome to abolition-caucus

--

Welcome to the abolition-caucus mailing list!

If you ever want to remove yourself from this mailing list,
you can send mail to "Majordomo@igc.org" with the following command
in the body of your email message:

```
unsubscribe abolition-caucus
```

If you try to unsubscribe from this mailing list, and your
request is rejected, then send mail again to "Majordomo@igc.org"
with the following command in the body of your email message:

```
unsubscribe abolition-caucus "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
```

Here's the general information for the list you've
subscribed to, in case you don't already have it:

[Last updated on: Tue Oct 1 6:58:01 1996]
WELCOME to the Abolition-Caucus list server of Abolition 2000: A
Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons!

The following commands may be used by sending them in the body of a
message addressed to 'Majordomo@igc.apc.org':

```
subscribe abolition-caucus <address>  
unsubscribe abolition-caucus <address>  
who abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
info abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
help
```

This list is 'open' meaning that anyone can subscribe themselves.

A word of caution: as e-mail becomes increasingly popular, many users
are experiencing 'e-mail fatigue' from the amount of mail, list server,
and
conference messages. Also, in some countries, messages are billed by the
number of characters received, which can make e-mail prohibitively
expensive for some. Therefore, please keep messages as short as possible
and avoid duplicating information from other conferences.

For other questions regarding the abolition-caucus list server, contact
the
International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War
126 Rogers St., Cambridge, MA, USA 02142-1096

Phone: (617)868-5050
Fax: (617)868-2560
ippnwbos@igc.apc.org
<http://www.healthnet.org/IPPNW/IPPNW.html>

BACKGROUND:

In April 1995, during the first weeks of the NonProliferation Treaty Review and Extension Conference, activists from around the world recognized that the issue of nuclear abolition was not on the agenda. Activists met together to write the following statement that has become the founding document of the Abolition 2000 Network. Over 600 NGOs on six continents have now signed it and are actively working in ten working groups to accomplish the eleven points listed here. To sign on to this statement please send a fax or email stating the contact name, organization name, address, fax, telephone and email to: Pamela Meidell, Facilitator, Abolition 2000 Global Network Office, P.O. Box 220, Port Hueneme, CA 93044 USA; tel: +1 805/985 5073, fax: +1 805/985 7563, email: pmeidell@igc.apc.org OR if you are in Africa, the Middle East or Europe: Xanthe Hall, IPPNW Germany, Krtestrae 10, Berlin, D-10967, Germany; fax:+49 30 693 8166, email: ippnw@oln.comlink.de

STATEMENT:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

 Abolition 2000 Signup Form (Please feel free to reproduce and

distribute).

Abolition 2000
A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

"Sunflowers instead of missiles in the soil will insure peace for future generations."

--U.S. Secretary of Defense William J. Perry on June 4, 1996, the day Ukraine officially gave up its nuclear weapons. Russian and Ukrainian defense secretaries joined him in a ceremony planting sunflowers on a former missile silo.

The following organization endorses the Abolition 2000 Statement:

Organization: _____

Contact

Person: _____

Address: _____

Telephone: _____ Fax: _____ Email: _____

We enclose _____ (indicate amount here in your national currency) for Network Support. Please make checks or drafts payable to The Atomic Mirror/Abolition 2000 or transfer money directly to account no. 09384 33840 (the Atomic Mirror/Abolition 2000 account) at the Bank of America (bank code 510 000 655).

We would like to participate in/receive more information about the following WorkingGroup/s: _____

From 74734.1621@CompuServe.COMWed Feb 12 16:34:37 1997
Date: 11 Feb 97 21:43:27 EST
From: Lynette Mehall <74734.1621@CompuServe.COM>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Greetings!

Dear Howard and Carlee,

I am just going to send a brief note to see if this goes through correctly.

THANK YOU so much for your hospitality last Saturday evening. The meal was

delicious and it was fun to visit with you a second weekend in a row.

Howard,

you are a terrific tour guide! I really enjoyed our drive around Washington!

Thank you for the service to the airport! My planes were on time, and I was

home by 2:00 p.m.

Please let me know if this arrives!

Love, Lynette

From ngill@emerald.tufts.eduWed Feb 12 16:36:01 1997
Date: Tue, 11 Feb 1997 21:17:06 -0500 (EST)
From: Nick <ngill@emerald.tufts.edu>
To: ALICE SLATER <aslater@igc.apc.org>
Cc: Peace Action - National Office <panukes@igc.apc.org>,
abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: NATO expansion

Alice et al,

I think it's great to have a discussion if people want to. However, I was mostly curious. This is not my number one concern in life, although perhaps it should be. Nonetheless...I feel like I must delegate my responsibility on this decision to more informed parties, in and out of government.

It is clearly a valid concern for Abol 2000. I appreciate being brought up to speed on the nature of the concern. I still have my doubts as to the tactical wisdom of taking on this issue, based on the concerns of the Poles, etc. Their worry over Russia is legitimate over the long run, to my mind, and the OSCE is not a sufficient deterrent should the Russians ever get adventurous.

The OSCE deserves our full support and should be emphasized in all European security arrangements, especially if Abolition ever occurs.

The foregoing notwithstanding, George Kennan may very well be correct. That's why I will sit this one out. Please don't set up this discussion group on my account.

Finally, I would like to thank everyone who participated in the discussion for their respectful, thoughtful comments, which could very well have been highly critical of my inquiry, particularly as some of the respondents may have considered it either naive or hostile to the cause.

Best-
Nicholas Gill
Arlington

]On Tue, 11 Feb 1997, ALICE SLATER wrote:

> On what basis are you setting up an Abolition 2000 discussion group on NATO?
> Can anyone set up an Abolition 2000 discussion group on any subject?
Are
> there any procedures established? Let's discuss.
> Alice Slater
> GRACE

> Global Resource Action Center for the Environment
> 15 East 26 St., Room 915
> New York, NY 10010
> 212-726-9161 (tel)
> 212-726-9160 (fax)
> aslater@igc.apc.org <email>
>
>

From ippnwbos@igc.apc.orgWed Feb 12 16:38:57 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Feb 1997 07:13:48 -0800 (PST)
From: ippnwbos@igc.apc.org
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: NPT Prep Comm- Provisional NGO program

forwarded

>From: LCNP@aol.com
>Date: Tue, 11 Feb 1997 19:06:04 -0500 (EST)
>Message-ID: <970211190306_1079765596@emout16.mail.aol.com>
>To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
>Subject: NPT Prep Comm- Provisional NGO program

>

>April 7-17, NPT Prep Comm. NGO Program

>

>The NGO Committee on Disarmament has secured the following rooms during the

>NPT prepcomm:

>

>1. Dag Hammarskjold Auditorium-

> Morning breifings 9am April 8, 11, 14, 15 and 18 for breifings on the NPT

>Prep Comm including the work and progress in the committees.

>

> Evening programs. 5-7 pm. April 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 17 and 18. On issues of

>relevance to the NPT with the audience consisting of delegations and other

>NGOs.

>

>So far the following are planned for the evening programs:

> April 7: Nuclear Weapons Convention (organised by Abolition 2000 Caucus and

>the NWC working group)

> April 8: Health, environment and security risks of nuclear energy and

>alternatives (organised by Abolition 2000 Caucus and the NGOs attending the

>Commission on Sustainable Development)

> April 10: Nuclear technology safeguards necessary for nuclear weapons

>abolition (organised by the NGO Committee on Disarmament to follow-up an IAEA

>panel which is being held on April 9)

>

>Abolition 2000 has also been requested to organise a panel on European Security, NATO nuclear policy and NATO expansion to be held on one of the

>the

>remaining days.

>

>If you have suggestions for any of the panels Abolition 2000 Caucus is

>organising, please contact Alyn Ware <lcnp@aol.com> or Alice Slater

><aslater@igc.apc.org>.

>

>2. Conference Room.

>

>One conference room will be available for NGOs for the duration of the prep

>comm. Organisations wanting to make presentations to other NGOs will be able

>to do so in this room as long as the presentations are open to everyone and

>other NGOs are still free to come in and out of the room (ie for picking up

>papers etc...). The NGO Committee on Disarmament will manage the timetable

>for meetings in the conference room.

>

>For further information contact NGO Committee on Disarmament (Roger Smith)

><disarmtimes@igc.apc.org>

>

>

From ippnwbos@igc.apc.org Wed Feb 12 16:40:01 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Feb 1997 07:13:40 -0800 (PST)
From: ippnwbos@igc.apc.org
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: show about nukes coming soon to a tv set near you

Forwarded

>Date: Tue, 11 Feb 1997 18:07:35 -0500
>To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, BBanks40@aol.com,
SmithB@acad.ripon.edu,
> FitzwaterC@mac.ripon.edu, cebeling@students.wisc.edu,
> constant@wctc.net, dcortright@igc.apc.org, napf@igc.apc.org,
> Debbie.Hendriksen@CAPNCC02.ssw.abbott.com,
MorrisD@acad.ripon.edu,
> chevrier@utdallas.edu, glsh@pge.com, GHager9519@aol.com,
> lasg@igc.apc.org, jwillens@leland.stanford.edu,
jobrown@adobe.com,
> Kathleen.Bailey@quickmail.llnl.gov, 0002054931@mcimail.com,
> farrellm@acad.ripon.edu, ippnwbos@igc.apc.org,
WittlerM@puck.ripon.edu,
> plenz@csd.uwm.edu, alum-ripon-col@acad.ripon.edu,
> MelvilleR@acad.ripon.edu, Portzlines88@delphi.com,
saflaherty@juno.com,
> sherri@scn.org, five@nworks.com, scox@uwsp.edu,
No1PakrFan@aol.com,
> tracy@akolarch.com
>From: kathryn schultz <kschultz@mail.cdi.org>
>Subject: show about nukes coming soon to a tv set near you
>
>Greetings.
>
>You may want to check your local listings for PBS and cable stations to
see
>if they carry the America's Defense Monitor television program. Well,
the
>episode to which I've devoted serious amounts of overtime is now
finished.
>It's called "Nuclear Power, Nuclear Weapons." It's funded in part by the
>Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.
>
>"Nuclear Power, Nuclear Weapons" examines how civilian nuclear power is
the
>backdoor through which determined nations may go to obtain nuclear
weapons.
>It also looks at how nuclear facilities can be better protected against
>sabotage and military bombardment. The show also includes sections on
the
>theft of nuclear materials, DOE's MOX disposal plan, the shipment of
nuclear
>waste from France to Japan, and the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel.
>Interviewees include former IAEA inspector David Kay (he led the Parking
Lot
>standoff in Iraq that CNN made famous), former nuclear weapons designer
Dr.

>Ted Taylor, Nuclear Control Institute's Paul Leventhal, Scott Portzline,
>and
>Three Mile Island's Mary Wells.

>
>I think you might find the show interesting. Check it out. We air on PBS
>and
>cable stations around the country so check local listings (I know we air
>in
>Milwaukee on PBS and in Madison on cable). If your local station doesn't
>carry ADM, you can always request that they do. It's free and they can
>download it from the PBS satellite or contact our offices to request
>free
>broadcast quality tapes.

>
>Gotta run. I have two speeches to write for the Admiral. Ugh. One on
>NATO
>expansion and the other on nuclear weapons in the 21st century.

>
>Hasta,
>
>Kathryn

>
>
>=====

>Kathryn R. Schultz
>Senior Research Analyst
>Center for Defense Information
>1500 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Suite 24
>Washington, DC 20005
>202-862-0700 (Phone)
>202-862-0708 (Fax)
>kschultz@cdi.org (E-mail)
><http://www.cdi.org> (CDI's home page)
><http://www.cdi.org/kschultz> (personal home page)
>=====

>
>

From banana@split.comWed Feb 12 16:41:18 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Feb 1997 10:01:35 -0700 (MST)
From: Banana Programming <banana@split.com>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: your mail

> I've tried out BananaCom and now would like to purchase it.
>
> You can charge the \$25 to my VISA card:

Your registered version of BananaCom will be sent via US Mail tomorrow morning. It should take less than a week to get to you.

Thanks for your order!

Have a fruitful day!

Paul Wheaton
Banana Programming

From nfznsc@gn.apc.orgWed Feb 12 16:42:23 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Feb 1997 17:11:06 GMT
From: Stewart Kemp <nfznsc@gn.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Launch for UK Local Authorities Ab2000 Resolution

There follows the statement put out today to UK media in support of the Ab2000 local authorities resolution. If list server readers know of journalists who may be interested in the following then please pass it on.

[Part 2: "Attached Text"]

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

Embargoed to 00.01am 13 February 1997

Councils Urged to Back the
International Abolition 2000 Campaign

Nuclear Free Local Authorities today issued a briefing¹ to local government highlighting the progress in 1996 towards the abolition of nuclear weapons and calling for endorsement of the international Abolition 2000 local authorities resolution.²⁼²⁰ Abolition 2000, an international alliance of over 700 organisations, is lobbying the nuclear powers to sign a Convention by the year 2000 setting out a timetable for global nuclear disarmament.

The NFLA briefing summarises progress in 1996 with a nuclear weapon test ban, two new nuclear weapon free zones, international legal opinion declaring against nuclear weapons, and growing international opinion favouring disarmament.

Launching the briefing, NFLA Chair, Leeds City Councillor Martin Hemingway stated:

"Local Government is affected daily by expenditure of between =9C1.5bn and =9C2bn each year on the maintenance of a UK nuclear weapon capability. This drives international nuclear proliferation, insecurity, and the risk of nuclear terrorism.=20 It diverts public money away from where it is most needed - in housing, education and health. It does nothing to make the streets of our towns and cities safe and takes energy and resources away from tackling real international dangers and causes of future conflict - climate change, desertification, resource scarcity, population migration and xenophobia.

We appeal to all local authorities now to support the UK Abolition 2000 campaign which urges immediate international negotiations on the terms of a time bound Convention for a nuclear weapons free future."

Further information: Stewart Kemp (W) 0161 831 9108 (Mobile)
0468 743996=0CABOLITION 2000 LOCAL AUTHORITIES RESOLUTION

The _____ Council noting that:

- nuclear weapons continue to pose the most dangerous threat to the existence of the human species and the planet;

- towns and cities have been targets of nuclear weapons throughout the Nuclear Age and remain vulnerable to the massive destructive effects of nuclear weapons;

- the development and maintenance of nuclear arsenals are a huge burden on public finance, costing billions of pounds each year, when resources ought to be employed in rebuilding the infrastructure of our communities, improving the health and welfare of our citizens, and protecting and enhancing the quality of the environment;

- the five declared nuclear weapons states (China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States) promised at the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review and Extension Conference in May 1995 to make "systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goal of eliminating these weapons";

- the International Court of Justice ruling of July 1996 unanimously declared 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.";

- over sixty former Generals, Admirals and Air Chiefs world-wide (including representatives from all five declared nuclear weapon states) in December 1996 called for urgent efforts to secure a nuclear free world noting: "The dangers of proliferation, terrorism, and a new nuclear arms race render it necessary...There is no alternative"; and

- the end of the Cold War provides an unprecedented opportunity to hand a precious gift to all future generations - end the nuclear weapons era.

RESOLVES:

- to call upon the governments of all nuclear weapons states to begin negotiations immediately on a Nuclear Weapons Convention to prohibit and eliminate all nuclear weapons early in the next century, and to complete these negotiations by the year 2000;

- to call for all nuclear weapons to be immediately taken off of alert status, for all nuclear warheads to be separated from their delivery vehicles, and for the nuclear weapons states to agree to unconditional no first use of these weapons; and

- to declare support for the further development of legally binding national and international Nuclear Weapon Free Zones throughout the world.

Based on a document prepared for the Abolition 2000 Global Campaign. For more information contact The NFLA Secretariat, Town Hall, Manchester M60 2LA Tel: 0161 831 9108 Fax: 0161 235 3645 Email: nfznsc@gn.apc.org or Abolition 2000 UK, Danny Thompson, NPC, 88 Islington High Street, London N1 8EG, Tel: 0171 354 5200 Fax: 0171 354 0033 Email: npc@gn.apc.org

1 Nuclear Weapons' Abolition: Present Opportunities and Future Trends National Steering Committee for Nuclear Free Local Authorities, 13pp, February 1997

2 The Abolition 2000 Local Authorities Resolution follows.

=1A

[Part 3: "Attached Text"]

Stewart Kemp (nfznsc@gn.apc.org)

From billing3@igc.apc.org Wed Feb 12 16:43:31 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Feb 1997 14:55:26 -0800 (PST)
From: IGC Billing Department <billing3@igc.apc.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: IGC billing (fwd)

Hello Howard,

Sorry you've had so much trouble! We will reverse your IGC monthly fees for November, December & January, for a total credit of \$35.42. The credit will be reflected on your February 1997 invoice.

I'm appending our basic documentation on BananaCom below. The section that should help you is "Uploading in BananaCom". If you have further technical questions, please email <support@igc.org>, or phone our technical support department at (415) 561-6100.

If you have any further billing questions or concerns, please let me know.

(Please include a copy of this e-mail with your message.)

Thank you,

Charlie Hancock, Billing Manager

Institute for Global Communications
PO Box 29904, San Francisco, CA 94129-0904 USA
Phone:(415)561-6100 Fax:(415)561-6101 E-mail:<billing3@igc.org>
ConflictNet * EcoNet * HomeoNet * LaborNet * PeaceNet * WomensNet
A division of the Tides Center

> ----- Forwarded message -----
> Date: Tue, 11 Feb 1997 18:21:10 -0800 (PST)
> From: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>
> To: billing@igc.apc.org
> Subject: IGC billing
>
> We joined IGC in November under the assumption that a 386 PC with 4 MB
> RAM and 7MB of hard disk space was sufficient (your communication
> of 10/25/96).
>
> The manual that came with your software indicated greater requirements.
> Although I freed 14 MB of disk space I still got an "insufficient"
message.
>
> A friend tried to help in December and connected with your SF office
> through my modem (I couldn't find the DC number), but this wasn't
helpful
> without communications software. This was my only use in December.
>
> I tried to add another hard drive to my computer, but this cannot be
done.
>

> Finally one of your staff advised me to get BananaCom, which I did. So
I
> have finally become operative in February.
>
> I view of my difficulties, I ask you to waive the December billing,
which
> amounted to 10 minutes of usage.
>
> Also, I request instructions on how to upload a pre-composed letter
> instead of using on-line time.
>
> Howard W. Hallman
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice
> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
>

Subject: BananaCom QRC

** BananaCom

A Quick Reference Guide for use with the IGC Networks

This Quick Reference Guide will help you use BananaCom software to connect you to your IGC account. BananaCom will allow your modem to dial and connect to IGC's text-only interface, which presents IGC's manual resources through a series of text menus.

Please note that BananaCom is shareware software which IGC distributes for our subscribers' convenience. Shareware means the software is freely distributed IGC charges only for disks and shipping but the software manufacturer asks users to pay a fee to register their copies. Shareware fees entitle you to updates of the software and are usually lower than the cost of commercial software.

** Installing BananaCom:

The installation process is very simple. BananaCom does many things on its own, including setting itself up. The most important thing to do is to make sure your modem is plugged into the computer and turned on.

- 1) Insert the BananaCom diskette in your floppy drive.
- 2) If you put the disk in the A drive, type: a:install
If you put the disk in the B drive, type b:install

That's it!

** Finding the Modem:

If there is a problem with your modem, you will most likely get this message from BananaCom: "Wiring problem! Modem Cable? Power?"

This indicates that BananaCom can't talk to the modem.

- 1) Check that the modem is connected to the computer and turned on.
- 2) If it is and BananaCom reports the error, Alt-F will force BananaCom to try to find the modem again.
- 3) Check to make sure that no other programs that use the modem are running (i.e. fax software).
- 4) If it still reports the error, call IGC Support at 415-561-6100.

** Setting Up Your Dialing Directory

Setting up the dialing directory to dial your account is the next important step.

- 1) Press Alt-D to call up the dialing directory. If this is the first time you have entered a number, the only number listed will be for the Montana BBS (BananaCom's makers).
- 2) Using the arrow keys go down to "(add new modem service)" and press <ENTER>.
- 3) For 'Name', type: IGC
- 4) For 'Phone Number', find the closest local access number to you for calling IGC by consulting the booklet, "IGC Connect Information" which you received when you first got your account. Then enter in the phone number.
- 5) For 'Speed', press F3 and then select your modem speed. The common speeds are: 300, 1200, 2400, 14.4 and 28.8. If the speed is not listed, select the nearest number above your modem's actual speed. For example, if your modem is a 14400 modem, select 19200 as your speed.
- 6) When you're done, press F2 to save this new entry.

Now you are ready to connect to IGC.

** Dialing In With BananaCom

- 1) Bring up your dialing directory by pressing ALT-D.
- 2) Using the arrow keys, select the phone number you wish to dial.
- 3) Press ENTER.

BananaCom will start the dial-in process.

- 1) Listen for the dial tone. If there is a problem, BananaCom

may display: NO DIALTONE . This means that either the modem is not plugged into the phone line, or the line is already in use (by another phone, fax machine or software program).

- 2) If the dialtone is found, then the modem will dial the phone number.
- 3) Wait until you hear the connect tone (it sounds like a fax machine).

At this point, follow the login instructions for "How To Connect" listed in the "Connect Information" booklet. The steps you will follow will depend on the Access Method that is best for your city.

** Downloading in BananaCom (Using Zmodem)

Downloading is a method for saving material you find online to your hard drive. Follow the preliminary directions for downloading in the IGC User's Guide. After the basic commands you issue to begin downloading mail, conference posts, or files in IGC's text based interface, you will be given a choice of protocols to use:

Protocol: (a)scii-text (k)ermit (x)modem (y)modem (z)modem (f)tp(? for help):

Zmodem is a download/upload protocol that takes advantage of high speed modems. It is the most efficient and error-safe protocol, and it also has a "memory" of what's already been downloaded. In other words, if you're in the middle of downloading a file and you get cut off, the next time you get back online, Zmodem can download the remaining portion of the file instead of starting at the beginning.

Zmodem downloads are also "automatic" in the sense that if you download a file from IGC Networks, Zmodem will automatically start. You don't need to instruct BananaCom to begin downloading. However, if you ever need to start a Zmodem download manually, first make sure that the IGC system is ready to transmit the file, then:

- 1) Press Alt-M for the BananaCom menu.
- 2) From the menu, choose More...
- 3) From the More options menu, choose Zmodem download.

BananaCom will then display a window on your screen to show you the progress of the file transfer. Wait until the box disappears to continue.

- 4) NOTE: The default directory where files are saved to on your computer is c:\modem.

** Uploading in BananaCom

(Zmodem)

Uploading is the reverse of downloading. You do an "upload" to transfer a file you have created from your computer to an e-mail message, or to an online conference.

You can upload either text or binary files using Zmodem.

If you want the file to be text, and therefore readable on-screen by the recipient, be sure to save it as "text only" or "text only with line breaks" in your word processing program before you attempt to send it. If you want to send a binary file, (a file that preserves the formatting) you should make sure the recipient of your file has the same program you used to create the file. After you have prepared to send the text or binary file, this is how you upload it using BananaCom.

Initiate the upload online by beginning a mail message or a conference post, and selecting "upload" and "Zmodem" when prompted. Consult the IGC User's Guide for complete instructions if you are not sure how to start. When the system prompts you, follow these directions to instruct BananaCom to begin uploading your file.

- 1) Press Alt-M for the BananaCom menu.
- 2) From the menu, choose More...
- 3) From the More menu, choose Zmodem upload.
- 4) Enter the file name and type ENTER. (It might be necessary to type in the path name of your file's location too, i.e.:
c:\wp51\example.txt).

The upload will now proceed!

** Hanging Up with BananaCom

You must be in the main menu of the IGC text based interface to exit.

- 1) Type `bye` on IGC Networks and IGC will hang up for you. If you get stuck, however,
- 2) Press Alt-H to hang up the modem.

** Troubleshooting Problems

BananaCom should run perfectly well out of the box with most modems under most computer systems. However, sometimes in order to correct a problem you might be asked in either your modem documentation or by IGC Support to change your "initialization string". Here is how you do this:

1) Hit Alt-E for the Edit Dialing Commands menu.

2) In the box called Dialing Command Prefix, type your modem's initialization string followed by "DT" For example if you are given the string "AT&FE2" you would type "AT&FE2DT" in that box.

** Other BananaCom Commands

BananaCom Menu	ALT-M
DOS Shell	ALT-S
Toggle text capture	- ALT-T
Finding the Modem	ALT-F
Scroll Backwards	ALT-B
Help	Alt-I
Exiting	ALT-X (make sure you hang up first!)

Need more help? Contact IGC User Support weekdays from 7AM until 5PM Pacific Time at (415) 561-6100 or send e-mail to <support@igc.org>

From panukes@igc.apc.orgWed Feb 12 16:44:27 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Feb 1997 12:06:49 -0800 (PST)
From: Peace Action - National Office <panukes@igc.apc.org>
To: aslater@igc.apc.org, ngill@emerald.tufts.edu
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.org, panukes@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: NATO expansion

To respond to Alice Slater's questions about the anti-NATO expansion/pro-START III action group: at the Abolition 2000 conference in Moorea/Tahiti, a group of US and European activists got together to discuss NATO expansion and how it is negatively affecting our chances for securing nuclear reduction agreements and may well negatively affect the future of nuclear abolition altogether.

We decided to set up a working group/action group on-line so we could plan common strategies exposing the dangers of NATO expansion and promoting a START III treaty. We had a very fruitful discussion, which I have written up into a report and am presently circulating to the other participants to make sure it accurately reflects our discussion. I will post it to the abolition-caucus list server as soon as I can.

I am setting up a discussion conference on these issues to ease the traffic on the abolition-caucus list server, and so people can get into more substantive discussions and practical planning for action. Stimulating as the on-line discussion prompted by Nick Gill's comments has been, the idea of setting up a discussion conference originated at the Abolition 2000 conference, and not as a reaction to his comments -- so no need for worry on that score!

I presumed that within the Abolition 2000 network, the whole idea was that participants set up working groups/action groups around topics of interest and "network" with each other. However, I'm not really bothered whether we call ourselves an "Abolition 2000" working group or not -- just so long as the people who want to plan joint strategies can get together and do it.

I'll post details of the discussion conference as soon as I get it set up.

- Karina Wood
PAEF

From guardian@peg.apc.orgWed Feb 12 16:45:19 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 07:37 AEST
From: Hannah Middleton <guardian@peg.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: request for assistance

TO: abolition-caucus@igc.org
FROM: Dr Hannah Middleton <guardian@peg.apc.org>
DATE: Tues, 11 Feb 1997
SUBJECT: Legal cases citing ICJ ruling

Dear Abolitionists,

We noted and were grateful for the information posted by George Farebrother:

On Dec 23, George Farebrother wrote:

1) BELGIUM

In September two peace activists appeared before a police court in Beringen charged with climbing into the nuclear weapon base at Kleine Brogel. One of them stated in his defence that their action aimed to expose the illegality of nuclear weapons, and quoted the ICJ verdict. The Judge said: This is a point of view which one can indeed defend and adjourned the proceedings.

6) GERMANY

Seven members of the EUCommunity Group who had broken into a nuclear base were acquitted. The judge agreed that since the end of the Cold War no state could genuinely claim its existence to be endangered, thereby eliminating the only possibly justification allowed by the World Court. He even agreed that if states do not agree by their own laws, civil disobedience actions could be justified in a state of law.

7) FRANCE

Serge Levillayer has broken into a nuclear-armed submarine base. During his court hearing, which is due this month, he will invoke the ICJ judgment.

Does anyone have any updates on these or other similar cases and/or more details of the actual judgements?

We are currently preparing defences for some activists and would be grateful for other legal opinions we could use.

We are also about to stage some NVDA protests against the huge US-Australian war games called TANDEM THRUST (such a charmingly evocative name, don't you think) and would like to use a similar defence if possible. (I will attach some information on Tandem Thrust for general interest.)

yours in peace
Hannah Middleton
Australian Anti-Bases Campaign Coalition
PO Box A899

Sydney South NSW 2000
Australia
ph: 61-2-9267 2772 fax: 61-2-9267 4746
email: guardian@peg.apc.org

TANDEM THRUST

What is Tandem Thrust?

* During March 1997 a joint United States-Australian military exercise (war game) called Tandem Thrust will be held at the Shoalwater Bay Training Area near Rockhampton in central Queensland.

* The exercise will involve 17,000 United States military personnel and 5,000 Australian military personnel.

* 17 US Navy vessels will be involved, including a nuclear submarine, as well as elements from the US Airforce, US Marines and US Army.

* Tandem Thrust is described as an "exercise scheduled every two years to provide training in crisis action planning and execution for contingency response operations in the Pacific area"
(Government media release).

Dates

March 1- 9 Deployment
March 12-14 amphibious landing of 4,000 US Marines
March 17-19 firing with live ammunition
March 22-31 redeployment and environmental cleanup

Issues

* Australia is under no military threat from any country in the region but the countries of the Asia-Pacific region are threatened by aggressive US and Australian war games. Rehearsing for US intervention in countries whose policies do not please Washington contributes nothing to Australian or regional security.

* The emphasis being given to the special relationship with the US will lead to the isolation of Australia from Asian countries.

* Tandem Thrust is not simply against the socialist governments of Asian countries but against all the liberation and progressive movements and governments of the region.

* The use of rapid deployment forces removes or restricts the possibilities of resolving conflicts peacefully through diplomacy and negotiations. Force replaces talks.

* The entry of a nuclear submarine into Australian waters, especially close to the irreplaceable Great Barrier Reef, is unacceptable.

Environmental dangers

The Tandem Thrust war games, with many vessels including a nuclear submarine close inshore, large numbers of troops "invading", bush bashing their way inland and using live ammunition, will cause immense damage to the fragile environment and wildlife species. A serious threat is posed to:

- * dugong and green turtles
- * the Great Barrier Reef

Cost to the taxpayers

- * The last major military exercise, Kangaroo 92, cost Australia \$64 million. Tandem Thrust will cost as much if not more. \$64 million is close to the amount the Federal Government is cutting from the ABC.
- * The Federal Government can't pay for the ABC, it can't pay for Medicare or for universities but apparently it can find the money to subsidise the United States war machine.
- * Just a ten per cent cut in current military spending of \$26 million a day could wipe out the \$8 billion "black hole" within cutting education, health, welfare and other social programs.
- * These war games will practice the US Rapid Deployment Force targeting the Middle East. This could well damage Australia's major grain and meat markets in this region.

Background

- * During the July 1996 AUSMIN talks between the Defence and Foreign Ministers of Australia and the United States, US Secretary of Defense William Perry said that Australia is the southern anchor of US strategy in the Middle East, Asia and the Pacific.
- * Defense Secretary Perry also claimed that North Korea and Iraq are two main threats to the interests of the United States and its allies.
- * In September 1993 the Clinton administrations issued its Bottom-Up Review (BUR) of the military. The centrepiece of the BUR is its two-war strategy: "U.S. forces will be structured to achieve a decisive victory in two nearly simultaneous major regional conflicts and to conduct combat operations characterized by rapid response and high probability of success, while minimizing the risk of significant American casualties."
- * Tandem Thrust for two wars -- The Tandem Thrust exercise is centred around a major amphibious landing -- practising the invasion of North Korea and Iraq.
- * Training and exercising with the Americans is so routine that most members of the ADF could not imagine life without it. However, it encourages Australia to develop and maintain a high-tech military structure which is very expensive and which cannot be operated properly without American help, making Australia even more dependent.
- * Exploitation by transnationals, resource depletion, environmental degradation, unemployment and poverty are the root cause of most regional insecurity. Military relationships cannot solve these problems and military preparations steal resources which might help to solve them.
- * The belief that security can be enforced by ever greater numbers of more sophisticated weapons is being increasingly questioned. More and more people understand that real security comes with jobs, steady food supplies, homes, clean water, warmth, education and health care, democracy and human rights.

The campaign

There is support in Rockhampton for a protest against Tandem Thrust but local shop owners and the Chamber of Commerce are eagerly looking forward to the event. The Queensland Government will be hostile to protests by peace and environmental activists. We are also informed that it will be impossible to get into the actual invasion/exercise area. The campaign will therefore include:

- * Publicity
- * Peace Camp to be set up in/near Rockhampton in mid-March
- * Blockade
- * Protest actions in Rockhampton
- * Solidarity actions in major centres between March 12 and 16

Actions

- * Protest letters to the Federal Government, MPs, national and local media.
- * Posters and stickers everywhere
- * Raise finance
- * Delegations to trade unions, churches, community groups, political groups, etc. seeking support (resolutions, delegates to go to the Peace Camp, financial support, etc.)
- * Travel to Rockhampton for the Peace Camp
- * Organise local solidarity demonstrations just before and/or during the Peace Camp and blockade

ENDS

From 74734.1621@CompuServe.COMThu Feb 13 16:18:46 1997
Date: 12 Feb 97 22:42:07 EST
From: Lynette Mehall <74734.1621@CompuServe.COM>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Thanks!

Dear Howard and Carlee,

Thank you so much for sending my make-up kit! I had not idea I had left it there until Monday morning when I got ready for school. Then I thought that perhaps it had fallen out on the airplane. I was so relieved to find it in the mail today. I had had to go to the store on my way to school on Monday to buy enough to get by for a couple of days! Thank you so much ! I owe you the \$3 it required for postage!

Thanks! Love, Lynette

From nukeresister@igc.apc.org Thu Feb 13 16:20:37 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Feb 1997 18:42:42 -0700
From: Jack & Felice Cohen-Joppa <nukeresister@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Prince of Peace Plowshares

Greetings,

This information came too late for issue #107 of the Nuclear Resister (printed Friday, Feb. 7) - we just learned of it today, so wanted to spread the news!

If you are interested in a sample copy of our latest issue, please send us your snail mail address and we'd be happy to send one. If you already had requested one - it's on the way!
Peace,
Felice

>From: Disarmnow@aol.com
>Date: Wed, 12 Feb 1997 11:04:56 -0500 (EST)
>To: klcF92@hamp.hampshire.edu
>cc: nukeresister@igc.apc.org, Lydia.Sargent@lbbs.org, NatCath@aol.com,
> madnaar@vabch.com
>Subject: Prince of Peace Plowshares

>
>Before dawn on Ash Wed., Feb 12, six people calling themselves the Prince of Peace Plowshares boarded the USS Sullivan at Bath Iron Works in Bath, Maine.
>The USS Sullivan is an Aegis destroyer already commissioned to the Navy by the Bath Iron Works. The 6 are in custody at Bath City Jail - expecting transfer to local jails. At present they are charged with criminal trespass (6 months and/or a \$500 fine) and criminal mischief (1 year) - all this is likely to change as authorities assess the "damages" and their options.
An arraignment, scheduled for 9:00 a.m. today was cancelled; arraignment is tentatively scheduled for Friday, February 14.

>
>The Prince of Peace Plowshares were observed by security shortly after boarding the destroyer; as the officer called for reinforcements, the 6 activists spread out to the Pilot house, the Bridge, the Helicopter pad, and the missile hatch covers and hammered and poured their blood in each location. They then gathered on deck and unfurled their banner - "Prince of Peace Plowshares - They shall beat their Swords into Plowshares and their Spears into Pruning Hooks." - and read their statement before BIW and Naval

>security leveled guns (including shotguns) at them and forceably threw them
>to the deck..
>
>The Prince of Peace Plowshares are:
> Susan Crane - 52 - mother of 2 sons, former high school teacher, resident of
>Jonah House, a nonviolent resistance community in Baltimore MD
> Steve Kelly SJ - Jesuit priest, plowshares activist, member of Jubilee West
>Plowshares, resident at the West Side Jesuit Community in NYC
> Philip Berrigan - 72 - WWII vet, plowshares activist, author, member of
>Jonah House, and father of 3
> Mark Colville - 35 - husband and father of 3 young children, urban minister
>and member of Cesar Jerez Catholic Worker, New Haven CT
> Steve Baggarly - 31 - husband and father - lives with and serves poor and
>homeless people in Norfolk VA with the Norfolk CW
> Tom Lewis-Borbely - 56 - artist, painter, printmaker, happily married,
>father of a 5 year old daughter, plowshares activist and 30 years of
>nonviolent resistance history including the Baltimore 4 and Catonsville 9
>
>For further information and/or updates, contact
>Max Obuszewski - 410- 323-7200 or 243-7695
>Sagadahoc Sherriff's Dept. 207-443-9711
>Maria and Andy Holt- local support in Maine 207-443-3588
>Macy Morse in New Hampshire 603-433-4119
>Jonah House 410-669-6265
>
>An outstanding warrant was found for Susan Crane; one is anticipated for
>Steve Kelly!
>
>What follows is the statement the 6 read on board the USS Sullivan -
>
>In the days to come...
>God will judge between the nations
>and impose terms on many peoples.
>They will beat their swords into plowshares
>and their spears into pruning hooks;
>one nation shall not
>raise the sword against another,
>nor shall they train for war again.
>O children of God, come,
>let us walk in the light of the Lord!
>(Isaiah 2:2,4-5)
>
>This Ash Wednesday finds us nearing the close of the bloodiest century
in
>history, during which more than 200 million people have been killed in
wars.
> The state of the world seems no more than madness--wars, nuclear
weapons,

>ethnic hatreds, concentrated wealth and widespread dire poverty,
ecological
>trauma, superpower posturing, corporate global domination, Arleigh Burke
>class Aegis guided missile destroyers like those built at Bath Iron
Works.
> Evidence abounds everywhere that human beings cannot revere God, cannot
live
>as sisters and brothers, cannot care for creation, and cannot do
otherwise.
> The result is widespread numbness and despair.
> Yet amid this reality is the vision of Isaiah and the Judeo-Christian
>tradition--we can obey God and learn nonviolence, we can love our
enemies, we
>can stop our millennial scapegoating and victimizing, we can offer the
poor
>dignity and equality, we can abolish war, we can nurture and heal the
planet.
> We can convert nuclear swords into plowshares.
> The Prince of Peace Plowshares believes in this deeper vision and
attempts
>to live it, risking for it our good name and liberty. On Ash Wednesday,
in
>the spirit of Lent, we come to B.I.W. to symbolically disarm and covert
an
>Aegis destroyer in repentance and atonement. We repent of our
willingness to
>deny the world's children a future, and so we act, full of hope. God's
>authority assures us that Isaiah's vision of humankind disarmed, is both
>"already and yet to come" --"My word shall not return to me void but
shall do
>my will, achieving the end for which I sent it" (Isaiah 55:11)
> The US Navy boasts that Aegis destroyers like those in the water at
Bath
>Iron Works, (The Sullivans, the Mahan and the Decatur) are the most
powerful
>surface ships in history. Their nuclear arsenals can vaporize a
continent.
> Their conventional firepower can and has spread terror, destruction and
>death. This is the first class of warships designed to fight nuclear,
>biological and chemical warfare. We see these ships as blasphemy
against
>God; as byproduct of national weakness, fear and hatred; as robbery
from the
>poor, as technology bent toward pride and lawlessness. In the judgment
of
>God's Word, they should not exist.
> Nonviolently disarming and converting such a destroyer points beyond
our
>hammers and blood. It is an indictment--exposing the national consensus
on
>violence. More importantly, it is both hope and certainty that
repentance
>will happen, that love and justice will prevail, that war will become no
more

>than a barbarous memory.

>
>

the Nuclear Resister
"a chronicle of hope"

P.O. Box 43383

Tucson AZ 85733

Felice & Jack Cohen-Joppa, editors
520-323-8697/nukeresister@igc.apc.org

From grayle@adelaide.DIALix.oz.auThu Feb 13 16:22:03 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 14:54:28 +1030 (CST)
From: Ron Gray <grayle@adelaide.DIALix.oz.au>
To: Stewart Kemp <nfznsc@gn.apc.org>
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Local authorities resolution (typo!)

Dear Stewart Kemp,

We were very pleased to receive in today's mail the letter re the launch of the UK Local Authorities A2000 Resolution.

Just wanted to quickly point out the the typing error which existed in the original document has been carried across into yours. i.e. in the 2nd point after "RESOLVES:" it says "call for all nuclear weapons to be immediately taken off of " instead of just "taken off alert status..."

Can you arrange to remove the "of" from the final document which is distributed, or is it already too late?

Congratulations on your work there.

Yours for Peace, Irene Gale, Sect. Australian Peace Committee (Sth.Aust. branch) Inc. 11 South Terrace, Adelaide SA 5000, Australia. Ph: +(61-8) 8212-7138 Fax: +(61-8) 8364-2291.

From rwilcock@execulink.comThu Feb 13 16:23:26 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 01:31:06 -0500
From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>
To: "Abolition Caucus List (E-mail)" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Russia reserves first use of nuclear arms

Russia reserves first use of nuclear arms.
Army's deterioration makes deterrence vital to defence policy, official says

By Geoffrey York, Moscow Bureau, Globe and Mail, Canada, February 12, 1997

MOSCOW - Russia is prepared to use nuclear weapons if attacked by the conventional forces of any foreign country, and influential Russian security official said yesterday.

The warning by Ivan Rybkin, secretary of Russia's powerful policy making Security Council, was a sign Moscow's increasing dependence on nuclear weapons as the bulwark of its defence forces.

The weakness of the Russian military was graphically exposed by its defeat at the hands of a guerilla army in the final battle of the Chechnya war last summer. The Kremlin realizes that its nuclear arsenal is the only Russian military asset that still commands respect on the international stage.

"If an aggressor starts a war against us using conventional weapons, we may respond with nuclear ones," Mr. Rybkin, who replaced Alexander Lebed as head of the Security Council, told a Russian newspaper yesterday. Everyone must know that in the case of a direct challenge, our response will be full-fledged, and we are to choose the means, including nuclear weapons."

The rapid deterioration of the Russian army could encourage foreign enemies to test Russia's defences, so the existence of a nuclear deterrent is increasingly vital, Mr. Rybkin said.

"We talk about this so that military adventurers do not get tempted by the fact that, at this stage, our armed forces are being reformed and do not have the might they used to have," he said.

In the 1980s, the Soviet Union promised that it would never be the first to use nuclear weapons. This policy, announced by Leonid Brezhnev in 1982, was repeatedly affirmed by Mikhail Gorbachev, the last Soviet leader, who made it an article of faith in his reformist era.

But after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, the Kremlin began to back away from this promise. In a military doctrine drafted by the Russian defence ministry in 1993, Moscow authorized the first use of nuclear weapons under certain limited circumstances.

Since then, the drastic decline of the Russian military has boosted the importance of its military arsenal. "Now it is becoming one of the prime options," military analyst Dmitri Trenin said yesterday. "The trend is very clear - more and more reliance on nuclear weapons. Russian conventional forces have substantially deteriorated since 1993."

Mr. Rybkin's warning is significant because he is not known as a hawk on military matters. Mr. Trenin said.

The Russian defence ministry is drafting a new military doctrine that would spell out its dependence on the nuclear deterrent. One report based on an unpublished draft of the new doctrine, said the Kremlin would authorize a "limited nuclear strike" to de-escalate an armed conflict "before it evolves into a large scale war against Russia and its allies."

Some analysts have criticized this draft saying a nuclear strike could trigger a massive nuclear retaliation by Russia's enemies.

Mr. Rybkin's comments are a reflection of the emerging new military doctrine, but they also signal Russia's anxiety over the planned expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization into the former Soviet-block countries of Eastern Europe, Mr. Trenin said.

Russian leaders are contemplating a tougher military stand in response to the NATO expansion, and this would have to involve nuclear weapons, he said. "They know there is no way they could respond with conventional forces."

Similar warnings have been issued by many other Russian politicians and military leaders. This week, for example, a Russian parliamentary leader said NATO expansion would force Russia to increase its defence budget and produce new medium-range bombers.

Last month, a group of Russian naval officers said the Kremlin should aim its nuclear weapons at key cities and military sites in NATO countries if the expansion goes ahead.

Moscow and Washington said in 1994 that they would stop pointing their nuclear missiles at each other. But it would take less than 45 minutes to retarget the weapons, analysts say.

To ensure potency of its nuclear weapons, Russia has continued testing its cruise and other missiles in recent months. It has also purchased hundreds of cruise missiles and dozens of strategic missiles from Ukraine. The purchase was designed to help Russia "maintain its nuclear potential at an appropriate level," one official said.

Washington has complained that Russia is failing to reduce its stockpile of short-range nuclear missiles, despite reductions in other weapons. There are also reports that Moscow is developing four new types of nuclear arms.

One analyst, from the U.S.-based Brookings Institution said the Russian military is increasing its efforts to disperse mobile missiles to secret hiding places on land.

In total, Russia has about 28,000 nuclear tipped weapons in its arsenal.

From nfzns@gn.apc.org Thu Feb 13 16:24:44 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 12:25:03 GMT
From: Stewart Kemp <nfzns@gn.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Launch for UK Local Authorities Ab2000 Resolution

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

I think the attachment to my last message was missing. A press statement launching the Ab2000 local authorities resolution in the UK follows:

Embargoed to 00.01am 13 February 1997

Councils Urged to Back the
International Abolition 2000 Campaign

Nuclear Free Local Authorities today issued a briefing to local government highlighting the progress in 1996 towards the abolition of nuclear weapons and calling for endorsement of the international Abolition 2000 local authorities resolution. Abolition 2000, an international alliance of over 700 organisations, is lobbying the nuclear powers to sign a Convention by the year 2000 setting out a timetable for global nuclear disarmament.

The NFLA briefing summarises progress in 1996 with a nuclear weapon test ban, two new nuclear weapon free zones, international legal opinion declaring against nuclear weapons, and growing international opinion favouring disarmament.

Launching the briefing, NFLA Chair, Leeds City Councillor Martin Hemingway stated:

"Local Government is affected daily by expenditure of between £1.5bn and £2bn each year on the maintenance of a UK nuclear weapon capability. This drives international nuclear proliferation, insecurity, and the risk of nuclear terrorism. It diverts public money away from where it is most needed - in housing, education and health. It does nothing to make the streets of our towns and cities safe and takes energy and resources away from tackling real international dangers and causes of future conflict - climate change, desertification, resource scarcity, population migration and xenophobia.

We appeal to all local authorities now to support the UK Abolition 2000 campaign which urges immediate international negotiations on the terms of a time bound Convention for a nuclear weapons free future."

Further information: Stewart Kemp (W) 0161 831 9108 (Mobile) 0468
743996

Stewart Kemp (nfznscc@gn.apc.org)

From rwilcock@execulink.comThu Feb 13 16:25:39 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 07:39:08 -0500
From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>
To: "Abolition Caucus List (E-mail)" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>
Subject: FW: RFE/RL: Chechens Say Foreigners Dissuaded From Attending
Inauguration

Ross Wilcock
rwilcock@web.net
<http://web.net.pgs/~pgs/>

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

From: Norbert Strade [SMTP:ccc22002@vip.cybercity.dk]
Sent: Thursday, February 13, 1997 7:48 AM
To: Multiple recipients of list CHECHNYA
Subject: RFE/RL: Chechens Say Foreigners Dissuaded From
AttendingInauguration

Grozny, 12 February 1997 (RFE/RL) - A Chechen official says Russia is trying to dissuade foreign dignitaries from attending tomorrow's presidential inauguration of Aslan Maskhadov. Lema Usmanov, an organizer for the ceremony, told AFP that Moscow had convinced Moroccan officials not to attend the event in Grozny. Usmanov said a Ukrainian delegation made up of parliamentarians had also been prevented from landing in Russia. Our correspondent says Moscow denied the Ukrainians a landing at Grozny's airport because they said the facility could not accommodate large aircraft. Yesterday, a Lithuanian parliamentary delegation was prevented from traveling to Chechnya. The Lithuanians said the Russian embassy in Vilnius said no visa would be given to the delegation. No reason for the denial was given. Russia's foreign ministry has said it would consider the attendance by foreign officials at Maskhadov's inauguration a hostile act.

1997 Radio Free Europe / Radio Liberty, Inc.
All Rights Reserved.

From nfznsc@gn.apc.org Thu Feb 13 16:27:00 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 20:10:07 GMT
From: National Steering Ctte Nuclear Free Local Authorities
<nfznsc@gn.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: UK Press

Dear Friends

I do not want to clog up the list server with useless information, but I get a daily email flagging the nuclear news in the UK press and its easy to copy it to the list server if readers find it useful.

I've posted today's press. The abbreviations are as follows:

FT (Financial Times) Gu (Guardian) T (Times) DT (Daily Telegraph)
Ind (Independent) + NSci (New Scientist). Occasionally there are
postings about Manchester area press. If people find this too
distracting then say so and I'll stop it.

Good wishes

Stewart Kemp

From nukeresister@igc.apc.org Thu Feb 13 16:28:19 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 13:05:39 -0700
From: Jack & Felice Cohen-Joppa <nukeresister@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Missile sites in FL (forwarded query)

>X-Sender: jlydiard@popserver.sfu.ca
>Mime-Version: 1.0
>Date: Sun, 9 Feb 1997 23:23:42 -0800
>To: NanooseNet@mail.island.net
>From: jlydiard@sfu.ca (Joyce Lydiard)
>Subject: NN: Missile sites
>Sender: owner-nanoosenet@mail.island.net
>Precedence: bulk
>Reply-To: NanooseNet@mail.island.net

>
>There is a rumour that the US is installing missile launching sites along
>the Florida coast. Can anyone verify this rumor, or direct me to a reliable
>source that would provide information on this topic? Thank you in advance
>for your assistance.

>
>

>~~~~~

>NANOOSE CONVERSION CAMPAIGN
>Submissions: NanooseNet@mail.island.net
>Subscriptions: NanooseNet-Request@mail.island.net
>World-Wide Web: <http://nanaimo.ark.com/~convert/>
>STOP NUCLEAR SUBMARINE WEAPONS TESTS IN GEORGIA STRAIT

>~~~~~

>

From nfznsc@gn.apc.org Thu Feb 13 16:29:18 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 20:01:53 GMT
From: National Steering Ctte Nuclear Free Local Authorities
<nfznsc@gn.apc.org>
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Daily Press 13 February 1997

>From GMR@MCR1.poptel.org.uk Thu Feb 13 14:08:06 1997
Received: from MCR1.poptel.org.uk by gnew.gn.apc.org (8.8.5/Revision:
2.06 03 December 1996)
id OAA10871; Thu, 13 Feb 1997 14:07:50 GMT
From: GMR@MCR1.poptel.org.uk
Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 14:07:27 GMT
Subject: NPU Bulletin 13 Feb
To: nfznsc@gn.apc.org
Message-Id: <297138789MCR1@MCR1.poptel.org.uk>
Status: R

DAILY INFORMATION BULLETIN - NUCLEAR POLICY

Thurs 13 Feb 1997

- 97-8148 Expert says that Ukraine could meet its peak power demand by improving its many underused coal-burning power stations. NewSc 15 Feb; FT 13
- 97-8149 New Scientist argues that Western gvts are likely to want to build more n/plants in Ukraine, despite arguments of experts. NewSc 15 Feb
- 97-8150 Channel 4 programme (tonight) will say that cuts put RAF in danger of being unable to fulfil its combat role. G,Ind,FT

GM Research, Metropolitan House, Hobson Street, Oldham, OL1 1QD.
Tel: 0161-911 4179. Fax: 0161-627 1736.
Internet: gmr@mcr1.poptel.org.uk

From disarmtimes@igc.apc.orgThu Feb 13 16:30:12 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 12:53:14 -0800 (PST)
From: NGO Committee on Disarmament <disarmtimes@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Chemical - OPCW conference

Dear NGOs,

The following announcement from the Provisional Technical Secretariat of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons may interest NGOs concerned with the Chemical Weapons Convention, which enters into force on April 29 of this year. The First Session of the Conference of States Parties of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons will open at the Netherlands Congress Centre in The Hague on May 6. The Committee making preparations for this conference has proposed that "non-governmental organisations (including chemical industry associations) in a field relevant to the object and purpose of the Convention" should be invited to attend this conference.

The first four days of the conference will include a general debate in plenary session. NGOs may be invited to attend public meetings of plenary sessions, and may place literature for distribution in designated locations outside the conference rooms. NGOs will not have the right to address any meetings of the States Parties. Other guidelines are being drawn up, and final decisions on NGO participation will be taken once the session begins.

The Preparatory Commission for the First Session of the Conference of States Parties invites NGOs to submit applications to attend the public meetings of the session. "Applications should provide, in a concise form, the following information, together with any additional information considered relevant:

- a) description of NGO activities in a field relevant to the object and purpose of the Convention; and
- b) technical, financial and academic activities of the NGO.

The Commission will evaluate applications and make recommendations to the First Session regarding those NGOs that should be invited, taking into account that practical constraints of the Netherlands Congress Centre will limit the number of invitations that can be extended."

Send applications by March 20, to

Mr. Anil Wadhwa
Head of Media and Public Affairs Branch
Provisional Technical Secretariat
Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons
Laan van Meerdervoort 51
2517 AE The Hague, The Netherlands

tel 31.70.376.1768 / 376.1707
fax 31.70.360.0944

Homepage for the OPCW is <http://www.opcw.nl/>

This message relayed by Roger Smith, Network Coordinator,
NGO Committee on Disarmament.

From ippnwbos@igc.apc.org Thu Feb 13 16:31:18 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 14:01:06 -0800 (PST)
From: ippnwbos@igc.apc.org
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Nato newsgroup

forwarded

>Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 07:14:01 +0800 (WST)
>To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
>From: Graham Daniell <gdaniell@wt.com.au>
>Subject: Nato newsgroup

>

>I think this is a good idea as it will enable those who wish to work on
NATO

>expansion to concentrate on that goal, and enable those working directly
on

>the Abolition 2000 to concentrate on that goal. Those who are
interested in

>both can subscribe to both. Like others who have a regular job to hold
>down and family commitments, I certainly already have my time cut out
>following just the Abolition newsgroup, and would like to see any
innovations

>like this that will make it a bit easier to cope with.

>

>Regards,

>Graham Daniell

>

>Replying to Alice Slater's message:

>>On what basis are you setting up an Abolition 2000 discussion group on
NATO?

>>Can anyone set up an Abolition 2000 discussion group on any subject?
Are

>>there any procedures established? Let's discuss.

>>Alice Slater

>Towards a nuclear-free millennium,

>Graham Daniell

>Perth, Western Australia

>gdaniell@wt.com.au

>

>

>

From georg.schoefbaenker@jk.uni-linz.ac.at Sat Feb 15 07:49:43 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Feb 1997 00:04:15 +0100
From: Georg Schoefbaenker <georg.schoefbaenker@jk.uni-linz.ac.at>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: NATO expansion. Austrian Newspaper Comment

dear friends,

I'm since 2 months reader of the abolition-caucus and I'm going here to post my first msg. The institute I work with - the Peace Center Burg Schlaining / Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution - is engaged, with a lot of others movements here in Europe, in forming an European wing of Abolition 2000. Just to give you a short information on how the domestic debate on nuclear weapons and NATO-expansion went on the last 2 1/2 years in Austria:

Austria has never been member of the 2 military blocs, had and still has a constitutional binding neutral status which prohibits in it's core foreign troops and nukes on its soil. But the political elites here are divided whether to join NATO or not. The expansion debate including all questions of a new or changed or modified nuclear strategy of NATO including the American B61-warheads deployed in several NATO-countries and the Russian reactions will be most decisive on public opinion and policy-making. Some Austrian politicians have regarded the formal instrument of creating a NWFZ in central Europe as an interesting concept, but don't ask me how this idea will develop ...

So I want to thank all of you who contributed very helpful, precise documented information on arguments and sources in the last months, especially the declaration of the 60 generals, General Lee Butlers statement and the testimony of Sam Nunn before the House in Oct. 1995. It helped me a lot.

For those of you who do read German language: I was able to publish yesterday (Feb. 12th 97) in the leading Austrian daily newspaper "Der Standard" a comment on NATO expansion and the role of nukes in the European theater.

You may find that on the WEB at <http://derstandard.at>

If there is some interest, I can post the German language text at the abolition-caucus.

For all of you, who do read German and who are interested in central European questions concerning NATO expansion. Beside the WEB-address mentioned before, another Austrian Newspaper "Die Presse" is represented in the WEB under <http://www.diepresse.co.at>

Both newspapers do have searchable WEB-archives where you may browse around the last months on central European topics. Most what you will find, is domestic Austrian policy but a lot is stuff about Austrias close or further neighbours such as Hungary, Poland, Czech Republic, Slovenia, Ukraine and others who discuss NATO expansion. I wanted to mention that, cause I'm sure that the further general role of the legitimization of nukes will be decided within the European theater in the context on NATO-US-Russia relations and on the question of the fate of further US nuclear engagement in Europe.

Best regard

Georg Schoefbaneker

Senior Research Analyst
Peace Center Burg Schlaining / Austria
Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution

email: georg.schoefbaenker@jk.uni-linz.ac.at

private
phone and fax: +43 (0)732 77 01 49

private mail:
Schneckenpost/
snail address: Untere Donaulaende 18/8, 4020 Linz, AUSTRIA

From aslater@igc.apc.org Sat Feb 15 07:50:47 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 16:33:42 -0800 (PST)
From: ALICE SLATER <aslater@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, rdtandempn+@igc.org
Subject: NPT PrepComm

Dear Friends,

Minutes are available upon request of our Thursday morning Abolition
Caucus
for the NPT PrepComm.

Many of you have asked when would be the best time to come to the
PrepComm.
Now that things are shaping up, we think the beginning of the meeting,
during the first week would be the best time. We are organizing panels
on
April 7th to launch the Nuclear Weapons Convention; April 8th jointly
with
the Energy Caucus of the Commission on Sustainable Development (which is
meeting concurrently with the PrepComm) on Nuclear Energy and Sustainable
Alternatives; April 12th on NATO expansion with plans for a strategy
session
after the formal meeting. We will do a health panel which is not yet
scheduled. ALL THESE ITEMS ARE MORE FULLY DESCRIBED IN THE MINUTES.

The last day of the Prep Comm has been changed to April 18th to
accomodate
the Muslim holiday of Id Al-Adha which takes place on April 17th at which
time no meetings are scheduled.

The shape of the PrepComm is being determined in Geneva. At this time we
are informed by the UN Center for Disarmament Affairs that the Agenda for
the PrepComm will be determined after the meeting commences and that
there
will not be three main committees. We need more information about
planning.
Any suggestions from our Geneva friends, etc.?

Regards,
Alice Slater
GRACE
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment
15 East 26 St., Room 915
New York, NY 10010
212-726-9161 (tel)
212-726-9160 (fax)
aslater@igc.apc.org <email>

From A.Malten@net.HCC.nl Sat Feb 15 07:51:38 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Feb 1997 01:55:45 +0100 (MET)
From: Ak Malten <A.Malten@net.HCC.nl>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: NATO discussion

Dear Abolition 2000 Friends,

It is my believe, that duscussing NATO, NATO expansion in Europe should be part of the dicussions on the Abolition-caucus, because it involves Nuclear Forces, Nuclear Weapons, Nuclear Weapon States. The have been lots of posting about NATO and OSCE on Abolition-caucus in the last year, so I cannot understand why we suddenly have to stop discussing this issue.
What is more the workinggroup Euro-Bomb was with us right from the start of the Abolition 2000 network in November 1995.

By the way peacemovements in Europe are fighting for Nuclear Free Zones in Europe and are trying to convince their government that the do not like to live under a Nuclear Umbrella formed by a combination of Nuclear Weapons from the US, the UK, France or the Russian Federation.
This Nuclear Umbrella's are and will be part of NATO and/or part of WEU defence politics and/or part of the defence politics of the Russian Federation.

There is however an other option for a defence structure in Europe within the framework of the OSCE, which could be a better alternative for NATO and WEU, while "promoting the creation of Zones Free of Nuclear Weapons in the OSCE region as a necessary and important component of a new all-European security system".

This OSCE structure of defence in Europe will bring us closer to our European dream of a Nuclear Free Europe and by that closer to our Abolition 2000 dream of a Nuclear Free 21th Century for ALL of us.

Peace,
or saved by
the pigeons,

Ak Malten,

Global Anti-Nuclear Alliance.

=====
Name of Organisation: Global Anti-Nuclear Alliance (GANA)
Which is a member of: The Abolition 2000 Network,
A Global Network to Eliminate
Nuclear Weapons

Address: c/o Ak Malten
Irisstraat 134 Tel:+31.70.3608905
2565TP The Hague Fax:+31.70.3608905
The Netherlands E-Mail: A.Malten@net.HCC.nl

GANAs Website: <http://www.inter.nl.net/hcc/A.Malten>

An introduction to the Abolition 2000 Network Website of GANA,
which gives you a glimpse of what you might expect there,
you can find at:

<http://web.inter.nl.net/hcc/A.Malten/welcome.html>

=====

From billing@igc.org Sat Feb 15 07:53:42 1997
 Date: Fri, 14 Feb 1997 03:17:55 -0800 (PST)
 From: IGC Billing Department <billing@igc.org>
 To: mupj@igc.org
 Subject: January use, acct: mupj

** Are your friends tired of corporate online services? Refer them to IGC, **
 ** the nation's only unionized, nonprofit Internet service provider.
 **

** If they signup with IGC, we will credit your account \$12.50, **
 ** after they've been with us for three months. IGC membership
 applications **
 ** are available via email at <igc-info@igc.org>, or on our World Wide
 Web **

** page at <http://www.igc.org/igc/join/> **
 * * * * *

***** I N V O I C E *****

Howard W. Hallman
 Methodists United for Peace with Justice
 1500 16th St., NW
 Washington, DC 20036

January 1997 activity for your PeaceNet account
 IGC Account: mupj Invoice date: 01/31/97
 Invoice number: 9701-10062

Date	Time	Description	Qty	Cost
Taxable				
01/31/97		Storage fee	6KC	0.00
01/31/97		Feb 1997 monthly service fee		12.50
		Total Current Charges		12.50
12/31/96		Previous Balance		10.42
		Grand Total Due		22.92

Summary for this period:	Minutes	Hourly rate	Charge
Storage fee			0.00
Subscription fee			12.50
Totals:	0		\$ 12.50

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 your account is paid by check, please include your IGC account name (login) with all payments. We can accept payments in U.S. dollars only, either with checks drawn on U.S. banks or with international money orders.

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

From weavepaz@wco.comSat Feb 15 07:52:35 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Feb 1997 22:06:05 -0700
From: Eszter Freeman <weavepaz@wco.com>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Prince of Peace Plowshares

>From: Disarmnow@aol.com
>Date: Wed, 12 Feb 1997 14:31:16 -0500 (EST)
>To: weavepaz@wco.com
>Subject: Prince of Peace Plowshares

>
>Before dawn on Ash Wed., Feb 12, six people calling themselves the Prince of Peace Plowshares boarded the USS Sullivan at Bath Iron Works in Bath, Maine.
>The USS Sullivan is an Aegis destroyer already commissioned to the Navy by the Bath Iron Works. The 6 are in custody at Bath City Jail - expecting transfer to local jails. At present they are charged with criminal trespass (6 months and/or a \$500 fine) and criminal mischief (1 year) - all this is likely to change as authorities assess the "damages" and their options. An arraignment, scheduled for 9:00 a.m. today was cancelled; arraignment is tentatively scheduled for Friday, February 14.

>
>The Prince of Peace Plowshares were observed by security shortly after boarding the destroyer; as the officer called for reinforcements, the 6 activists spread out to the Pilot house, the Bridge, the Helicopter pad, and the missile hatch covers and hammered and poured their blood in each location. They then gathered on deck and unfurled their banner - "Prince of Peace Plowshares - They shall beat their Swords into Plowshares and their Spears into Pruning Hooks." - and read their statement before BIW and Naval security leveled guns (including shotguns) at them and forceably threw them to the deck..

>
>The Prince of Peace Plowshares are:
> Susan Crane - 52 - mother of 2 sons, former high school teacher, resident of Jonah House, a nonviolent resistance community in Baltimore MD
> Steve Kelly SJ - Jesuit priest, plowshares activist, member of Jubilee West Plowshares, resident at the West Side Jesuit Community in NYC
> Philip Berrigan - 72 - WWII vet, plowshares activist, author, member of Jonah House, and father of 3
> Mark Colville - 35 - husband and father of 3 young children, urban minister

>and member of Cesar Jerez Catholic Worker, New Haven CT
> Steve Baggarly - 31 - husband and father - lives with and serves poor
and
>homeless people in Norfolk VA with the Norfolk CW
> Tom Lewis-Borbely - 56 - artist, painter, printmaker, happily married,
>father of a 5 year old daughter, plowshares activist and 30 years of
>nonviolent resistance history including the Baltimore 4 and Catonsville
9
>
>For further information and/or updates, contact
>Max Obuszewski - 410- 323-7200 or 243-7695
>Sagadahoc Sherriff's Dept. 207-443-9711
>Maria and Andy Holt- local support in Maine 207-443-3588
>Macy Morse in New Hampshire 603-433-4119
>Jonah House 410-669-6265
>
>An outstanding warrant was found for Susan Crane; one is anticipated for
>Steve Kelly!
>
>What follows is the statement the 6 read on board the USS Sullivan -
>
>In the days to come...
>God will judge between the nations
>and impose terms on many peoples.
>They will beat their swords into plowshares
>and their spears into pruning hooks;
>one nation shall not
>raise the sword against another,
>nor shall they train for war again.
>O children of God, come,
>let us walk in the light of the Lord!
>(Isaiah 2:2,4-5)
>
>This Ash Wednesday finds us nearing the close of the bloodiest century
in
>history, during which more than 200 million people have been killed in
wars.
> The state of the world seems no more than madness--wars, nuclear
weapons,
>ethnic hatreds, concentrated wealth and widespread dire poverty,
ecological
>trauma, superpower posturing, corporate global domination, Arleigh Burke
>class Aegis guided missile destroyers like those built at Bath Iron
Works.
> Evidence abounds everywhere that human beings cannot revere God, cannot
live
>as sisters and brothers, cannot care for creation, and cannot do
otherwise.
> The result is widespread numbness and despair.
> Yet amid this reality is the vision of Isaiah and the Judeo-Christian
>tradition--we can obey God and learn nonviolence, we can love our
enemies, we
>can stop our millennial scapegoating and victimizing, we can offer the
poor

>dignity and equality, we can abolish war, we can nurture and heal the planet.
> We can convert nuclear swords into plowshares.
> The Prince of Peace Plowshares believes in this deeper vision and attempts
>to live it, risking for it our good name and liberty. On Ash Wednesday, in
>the spirit of Lent, we come to B.I.W. to symbolically disarm and covert an
>Aegis destroyer in repentance and atonement. We repent of our willingness to
>deny the world's children a future, and so we act, full of hope. God's
>authority assures us that Isaiah's vision of humankind disarmed, is both
>"already and yet to come" --"My word shall not return to me void but shall do
>my will, achieving the end for which I sent it" (Isaiah 55:11)
> The US Navy boasts that Aegis destroyers like those in the water at Bath
>Iron Works, (The Sullivans, the Mahan and the Decatur) are the most powerful
>surface ships in history. Their nuclear arsenals can vaporize a continent.
> Their conventional firepower can and has spread terror, destruction and
>death. This is the first class of warships designed to fight nuclear,
>biological and chemical warfare. We see these ships as blasphemy against
>God; as byproduct of national weakness, fear and hatred; as robbery from the
>poor, as technology bent toward pride and lawlessness. In the judgment of
>God's Word, they should not exist.
> Nonviolently disarming and converting such a destroyer points beyond our
>hammers and blood. It is an indictment--exposing the national consensus on
>violence. More importantly, it is both hope and certainty that repentance
>will happen, that love and justice will prevail, that war will become no more
>than a barbarous memory.
>
>

From lforrow@igc.apc.org Sat Feb 15 07:54:18 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Feb 1997 07:24:48 -0800 (PST)
From: Lachlan Forrow <lforrow@igc.apc.org>
To: National Steering Ctte Nuclear Free Local Authorities
<nfznsc@gn.apc.org>,
abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: UK Press

I would very much like to receive UK news relevant to
Abolition 2000, whether or not people conclude that
the postings should be on the Abolition 2000 list serve.

I personally find the concrete local strategies and
news very applicable to our thinking about how to
develop grassroots Abolition 2000 work within the
US.

Lachlan Forrow
PSR/IPPNW and
Albert Schweitzer Fellowship, USA

From aslater@igc.apc.org Sat Feb 15 07:55:08 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Feb 1997 08:04:19 -0800 (PST)
From: ALICE SLATER <aslater@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: NPT Strategy

Dear Friends,

For those of you planning to come to NY for the NPT PrepComm please get your housing requests to me with the dates of your stay as soon as possible. (Between APR.7th-18th).

This is a reminder that we should all be as creative as possible to get to our governments and ask them to instruct their delegates to require the nuclear powers to begin negotiating a convention in 1997 for the elimination of nuclear weapons, to be completed by 2000, and to implement the quick steps in the Canberra Report and in the UN Step by Step Resolution, ie: take weapons off alert, separate bombs from delivery system, new cuts between US and Russia, no first use pledges.

Keep in mind that the Nuclear Weapons Convention Working Group will have a draft convention available. If you need to know more about it, contact Alyn Ware <lcnp@aol.com>

We all must do whatever we can to stop the expansion of NATO or nuclear disarmament will be thrown so far off track that we might as well call ourselves Abolition 3000.

I think it would be useful if we let each other know what progress we are making in speaking to government leaders around the world and keep each other informed through this network about what commitments we have received from governments to press for talks leading to a convention to begin in 1997.

Fact sheets are available if we need good information to use in our lobbying efforts. We need an accessible bulletin board to post our documents for easy referral. (such as abolition statement, Moorea declaration, resolutions, fact sheets, etc.) ANY SUGGESTIONS?

Peace,
Alice Slater
GRACE
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment
15 East 26 St., Room 915
New York, NY 10010

212-726-9161 (tel)
212-726-9160 (fax)
aslater@igc.apc.org <email>

From ipb@gn.apc.org Sat Feb 15 07:56:04 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Feb 1997 16:54:59 -0100
From: International Peace Bureau <ipb@gn.apc.org>
To: 'ALICE SLATER' <aslater@IGC.APC.ORG>
Cc: 'ABOLITION-CAUCUS' <ABOLITION-CAUCUS@IGC.APC.ORG>,
 '"Johnson, Rebecca"' <acronym@gn.apc.org>,
 '"Atwood, David"' <atwood@pop.unicc.org>,
 'ISMUN' <jlonn@nywork2.undp.org>, 'WILPF' <womensleague@gn.apc.org>
Subject: RE: NPT PrepComm

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

From: ALICE SLATER[SMTP:aslater@igc.apc.org]
Sent: jeudi, 13. février 1997 17:33
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org; rdtandempn+@igc.apc.org
Subject: NPT PrepComm

Dear Friends,

Minutes are available upon request of our Thursday morning Abolition
Caucus
for the NPT PrepComm.

Yes please!

. . . .The shape of the PrepComm is being determined in Geneva. At this
time we
are informed by the UN Center for Disarmament Affairs that the Agenda for
the PrepComm will be determined after the meeting commences and that
there
will not be three main committees. We need more information about
planning.
Any suggestions from our Geneva friends, etc.?

I find this curious, since the meeting will be held in New York, and the
Center for Disarmament Affairs has its headquarters in New York also.
However, it may be that the Conf. on Disarmament ambassadors want to have
a hand in finessing the agenda, since they will be coming over for the
NPT anyway, in most cases as heads of delegation. Since they are meeting
on a daily basis here, they may have persuaded the CDA staff that "Geneva
will fix the agenda". We'll ask around and see what we can pick up.

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 a member of Abolition 2000 - a Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear
Weapons, and many other international bodies

Regards,
Alice Slater
GRACE
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment
15 East 26 St., Room 915
New York, NY 10010
212-726-9161 (tel)
212-726-9160 (fax)
aslater@igc.apc.org <email>

From ipb@gn.apc.orgSat Feb 15 07:56:53 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Feb 1997 19:27:58 -0100
From: International Peace Bureau <ipb@gn.apc.org>
To: "'Heffermehl, Fredrik'" <fredpax@sn.no>,
 "'Weiss, Cora'" <srfnyusa@IGC.APC.ORG>
Subject: Public Forum on NATO, NYC 12 April

Dear all, this is an advance note to inform you that the IPB will be co-hosting a public forum on NATO and nuclear weapons on Sat 12 April, at the Church Centre New York City (10.00am - 1.00pm).

Full details will be posted very soon.

See you there!

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 a member of Abolition 2000 - a Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons, and many other international bodies

From ipb@gn.apc.org Sat Feb 15 07:57:41 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Feb 1997 19:24:04 -0100
From: International Peace Bureau <ipb@gn.apc.org>
To: 'ABOLITION-CAUCUS' <ABOLITION-CAUCUS@IGC.APC.ORG>
Cc: "'Weiss, Cora'" <srfnyusa@IGC.APC.ORG>
Subject: FW: Bishop Antonino Nepomuceno, OMI

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

From: NFPC[SMTP:NFPC@phil.gn.apc.org]
Sent: jeudi, 13. février 1997 06:23
To: afscamb@igc.apc.org
Cc: antiatom@twics.com; apcjp@igc.apc.org; fbp@igc.apc.org;
grassroots@igc.apc.org; ipb@gn.apc.org; jemmanuel@igc.apc.org;
lvernich@pmb.med.utoronto.ca; nmorgan@igc.apc.org; ontoy@aol.com;
pacificnews@peg.apc.org; pbloom@soils.umn.edu; pcdrsres@island.net;
pcrc@pactok.peg.apc.org; pparks@igc.apc.org; prcsandiego@igc.apc.org;
sanjuan@bgnnet.bgsu.edu; tmcgloin.hpdabc@mhs.unc.edu;
tschettler@igc.apc.org; twc@afsc.org; 100130.3366@compuserve.com;
103062.1200@compuserve.com; gensuikin@igc.apc.org
Subject: Bishop Antonino Nepomuceno, OMI

14 February 1997

Dear Friends,

With a deep sense of loss and sadness, we wish to inform you of the untimely demise of the National Co-Chairperson of the Nuclear Free Philippines Coalition, the Most Reverend Bishop ANTONINO NEPOMUCENO, OMI, at around noon today, February 14, 1997.

He died in a plane crash at Jolo, Sulu, Philippines, after attending the burial of a fellow Bishop, the late Bishop Benjamin dela Cruz, OMI, who was assassinated in Jolo, Sulu.

No detail is yet available on the cause and circumstances of the accident.

Jolo is the capital town of the island province of Sulu located on the Southwestern tip of the Philippines.

Bishop Nepomuceno belongs to the Oblates of Mary Immaculate (OMI) and was formerly a Bishop of Kidapawan in Cotabato, Philippines. He was the President of Soljuspax, an NGO actively advocating the use of solar energy as an alternative energy source; a Board Director of the Center for Trade Union and Human Rights; a Board Director of the Philippine News and Features and many other organizations that he supported.

"Bishop Nep", as many fondly called him, is an extraordinarily active

person who despite his retirement as Bishop actually intensified his involvement in the nationalist and democratic struggle of the Filipino people. He was a consistent and steadfast anti-nuclear and anti-bases campaigner who helped broaden and strengthen the movement for a nuclear-free and bases-free Philippines.

We will let you know of the schedule and details of a tribute for our beloved friend.

(Sgd.)
Corazon Valdez-Fabros
Secretary General

(Sgd.)
Prof. Roland G. Simbulan
National Chairperson

Messages can be sent through the NFPC Office:

FAX: (63-2) 716-1084

e-mail: nfpc@phil.gn.apc.org

Tel: (63-2) 716-1084

Address: Suite 511 J & T Building
3894 R. Magsaysay Blvd.
Sta. Mesa, Manila

From disarmtimes@igc.apc.org Sat Feb 15 07:58:33 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Feb 1997 11:25:16 -0800 (PST)
From: NGO Committee on Disarmament <disarmtimes@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Cc: ptasso@pipeline.com
Subject: NPT calendar - 1st draft

NPT PREP COM, AT THE UNITED NATIONS,
APRIL 7-18, 1997

This Preparatory Committee meeting of the States Parties to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty will differ from those preceding previous Review Conferences for the treaty, due to the resolution on strengthening the review process approved at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference. Decisions about the logistical and substantive work of the Preparatory Committee, and about the modalities of attendance and possible participation by observer States and Non-Governmental Organizations, will not be made until the meeting opens on the 7th of April. NGOs seeking accreditation to attend open sessions of the PrepCom should inform the NGO Committee on Disarmament no later than March 24th. The NGO Committee on Disarmament will turn its list of registrants over to the Secretariat of the PrepCom.

SCHEDULE OF NGO EVENTS (as of Feb. 14)

SUNDAY, APRIL 6

- * A meditation and public vigil is tentatively planned to mark 1000 days to the year 2000
- * A training and orientation session is tentatively planned for NGOs attending the PrepCom.

MONDAY, APRIL 7

- * PrepCom begins - plenary session expected to be open to NGOs
- * 9:15-10am briefing in conference room to be named later
- * 5-7pm: Launch of the model Nuclear Weapons Convention, Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium (organised by Abolition 2000 Caucus and Nuclear Weapons Convention working group)

TUESDAY, APRIL 8

- * 9:15-10 am briefing in Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium
- * 5-7pm: Presentation - "Nuclear Energy and Environmentally Sustainable Alternatives," Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium (organised by Abolition 2000 Caucus and NGOs attending the Commission on Sustainable Development)

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9

- * 9:15-10am briefing in conference room to be named later
- * All day presentations organized by the International Atomic Energy Agency, location TBA. The morning panel is on security and verification; the afternoon will focus on nuclear safety and technology transfer. There will be a question-and-answer period. NGOs welcome.

THURSDAY, APRIL 10

- * 9:15-10am briefing in conference room to be named later
- * 10:30am-12:30pm: weekly NGO briefing in Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium, on the subject of the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons. Sponsored by the NGO Committee on Disarmament, the U.N. Centre for Disarmament Affairs and the U.N. Department of Public Information.
- * 5-7pm: Presentation on Expanding Nuclear Technology Safeguards, Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium (organized by the NGO Committee on Disarmament)

FRIDAY, APRIL 11

- * 9:15-10 am briefing in Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium
- * Meeting of the International Peace Bureau steering committee, 777 U.N. Plaza (Church Center)
- * 5-7pm: Presentation/reception in Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium

SATURDAY, APRIL 12

- * 10am-1pm: Public Forum on NATO and Nuclear Weapons, 777 U.N. Plaza (Church Center), 2nd floor (organized by International Peace Bureau and the Abolition 2000 Caucus)

MONDAY, APRIL 14

- * 9:15-10 am briefing in Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium
- * 5-7pm: Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium reserved for NGO presentation

TUESDAY, APRIL 15

- * 9:15-10 am briefing in Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16

- * 9:15-10am briefing in conference room to be named later

THURSDAY, APRIL 17

- * NO OFFICIAL MEETINGS (due to the holiday of Id Al-Adha)
- * 5-7pm: Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium reserved for NGO presentation

FRIDAY, APRIL 18

- * Final day of PrepCom
- * 9:15-10 am briefing in Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium
- * 5-7pm: Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium reserved for NGO presentation

* * *

NGOs wishing to make presentations in the U.N. during the PrepCom, either during an evening hour (in the Library Auditorium) or another time (in the small conference room that will be reserved), are requested to contact Roger Smith or Ann Lakhdhir of the NGO Committee on Disarmament.

* * *

THE UNITED NATIONS DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

(UNDC) will hold its 1997 session from Monday, April 21 until Tuesday, May 13. This year's UNDC session will discuss three substantive issues: nuclear weapon free zones; guidelines on conventional arms control/limitation and disarmament, with a special emphasis on peacekeeping; and the Fourth U.N. Special Session on Disarmament. The NGO Committee on Disarmament will be sponsoring panel discussions on each of these three topics in the Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium from 5-7pm on April 22-24. Contact the NGO Committee for more information or if you wish to attend the sessions of the UNDC.

(February 14, 1997)

NGO Committee on Disarmament
777 U.N. Plaza #3B, New York NY 10017
tel 1.212.687.5340 / fax 1.212.687.1643
e-mail disarmtimes@igc.apc.org
Web: <http://www.peacenet.org/disarm/>
Roger Smith, Network Coordinator

From info@peacewire.org Sat Feb 15 07:59:32 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Feb 1997 16:14:24 -0800
From: End the Arms Race <info@peacewire.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Perspectives on Abolition

Perspectives on Abolition

During the General Assembly of Abolition 2000 in Tahiti, January 1997, The following question was posed by the author to several delegates:

What needs to be done to achieve the abolition of nuclear weapons?

Ian Prior, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, New Zealand.

I think that one of the most major things that has to be done is to somehow develop the political will amongst a large proportion of ordinary people of the United States to recognize that nuclear weapons are not necessary for their security. And also to recognize that they've been deluded, and are now being deluded by those saying , "But we must have deterrence to exert out strength and to hold our place in the world as the world's superpower."

Corbin Harney, Spiritual Leader of the Western Shoshone Nations, Nevada USA.

Let's not have two heads, lets have one head. Lets think about the nuclear waste we're going to be dealing with. The United States government today, in my part of the world, is pushing the issue of getting it our of their part of the country and pushing it onto somebody else. I'm afraid it's going to happen throughout the world.

Lopeti Senituli, Pacific Concerns Resource Centre, the secretariat of the Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific Movement, Fiji.

At the moment it is quite clear that we should focus our energies on China. And on top of that, to try to ensure that those states that are suspected of accumulating not only nuclear weapons, but accumulating weapons-grade material, are prevented from succeeding. And here I would not only refer to the states of the Middle East or those in South Asia like India and Pakistan, but also to countries like Japan.

Even though the Soviet Union's Pacific presence has diminished, the slack has been taken up by China.

Peter Weiss, Chair of the Lawyer's Committee on Nuclear Policy in New York,
the U.S Affiliate of International Lawyers Against Nuclear Weapons.

We need to overcome what can only be called the depraved indifference of those who make nuclear policy, who are now trying to lull the world into a totally false sense of security that there no longer is a danger - accidental or otherwise - from the still enormous nuclear stockpiles.

We need a lot of imagination and a lot of action to get through to the psyches of these people who ultimately will have to make a decision to get rid of nuclear weapons.

Myrla Baldonado, Nuclear Free Philippines, Manila.

I believe that what needs to be done to achieve the abolition of nuclear weapons in the Philippines is first and foremost, for the United States to withdraw from the Asia-Pacific region. Second, for the nuclear industry to stop dumping their nuclear power plants in Asia.

Tadashi Funada, Nuclear Free Pacific Centre, Tokyo.

Theoretically we don't have any nuclear weapons, but it may be that the U.S. military brings into Japan some nuclear weapons. So I think it is very important to struggle against the U.S. military bases in Japan. To abolish nuclear weapons around Asia, it must be a struggle against U.S. bases in the region.

Gro Bagn Robinson, Psychotherapist, New York

We now have the means of knowing what makes a a human being, and what the needs are - I could say the divine plan - for a human being to be up to his or her full, glorious capacity. We have neglected that for so long.

Fredrik Heffermehl, Vice President of the International Peace Bureau, Norway.

I see a very close date now which is extremely important for Abolition 2000, and that is the Preparatory Committee for the Nonproliferation Treaty Review in April in New York.

The most important help which the International Court of Justice in The Hague gave the abolition movement was this statement, which was unanimous, that there is a legally binding obligation on the part of the nuclear weapons states to enter into negotiations - and not only to start negotiations but to reach a successful result.

Danny Thompson, National Peace Council, London.

In a British context we need to reclaim the majority opinion which

is that Britain should not have nuclear weapons. And then, moving onto the rest of the world, I think we've simply got to galvanize the public will into political will at the United Nations. I think that we're seeing governments slowly beginning to turn around and hopefully work together and achieve a nuclear weapons convention.

I think now we know it's achievable. Before I think we were dreaming (although there's nothing wrong with that). Now we know we can achieve it.

Istva'n Farkas, Alba Circle Non-Violent Movement for Peace, Hungary.

We would like a treaty between the superpowers and states in Central Europe on a nuclear weapons-free zone. We also want to block NATO expansion and show Hungarians that it is not to their advantage to have this expansion.

Bill Davidon, Federation of American Scientists, Philadelphia.

One thing that needs to be done is to get more people focused on the problem, aware of the dangers of those states who currently have them as well as the danger of nuclear weapons spreading into more places on Earth.

How one alerts the public to that danger? I don't know. One can grasp at the health issues raised by the production of weapons, one can grasp at the problems associated with transporting radioactive wastes to raise the general level of consciousness, but that has to be constantly coupled to the need not just to solve those particular problems but to focus on the overall abolition of nuclear weapons through a treaty signed by all the countries capable of making nuclear weapons.

Interviews by

Steven Staples
End the Arms Race
Vancouver, CANADA

PEACEWIRE

www.peacewire.org/pw

A project of END the ARMS RACE and the Public Education for Peace Society
405-825 Granville Street, Vancouver, B.C. V6Z 1K9 CANADA
ph:(604) 687-3223 fax:(604) 687-3277

From info@peacewire.org Sat Feb 15 08:00:21 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Feb 1997 16:14:29 -0800
From: End the Arms Race <info@peacewire.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Tahiti Report (CANADA)

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

One Thousand Days to Nuclear Abolition:
Report on the General Assembly of Abolition 2000
January 20th to 28th, 1997, Tahiti

by Steven Staples
Coordinator, End the Arms Race
(a founding member of the Canadian Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons)

Introduction:

Abolition 2000 is a dynamic international network of peace and disarmament organizations working together to achieve the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. Activists working in the movement correctly identify themselves as abolitionists, which is a fitting term given its reference to the movement to end slavery in the United States - a struggle whose success proves that entire economic and social systems can be changed when people are committed to a vision.

Since the last General Assembly meeting in 1995, the campaign has witnessed a series of powerful victories and encouraging events, including:

- The World Court's ruling that nuclear weapons are generally illegal under international law and in particular humanitarian law, and the Court's unanimous ruling that there exists an obligation to conclude negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament;
- The Canberra Commission's report calling for nuclear abolition and outlining concrete steps that can be taken to eliminate nuclear weapons;
- The creation of Nuclear Weapons Free Zones which encompass the entire Southern Hemisphere;
- The successful negotiation of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty which ensures the end of nuclear explosions for testing;
- The joint statement by sixty generals world-wide calling for an end to nuclear arms.

However, more than 30,000 nuclear bombs remain in the world. It is clear that the nuclear weapons states are unwilling to commit themselves to nuclear abolition, and in many areas of the world nuclear weapons are still wrongly regarded as a legitimate means to ensure a nation's security. With only a little more than 1000 days remaining before the year 2000, the

deadline of Abolition 2000's goal of attaining an international agreement for the elimination of nuclear weapons, there is much work to be done.

Conference Organization:

The conference was jointly organized by three organizations: Abolition 2000 through the Interim Management Group, American Friends Service Committee, and Hiti Tau, a Tahitian non-governmental organization concerned with working towards independence and on anti-nuclear issues.

Approximately eighty delegates representing approximately sixty organizations attended the conference. Many regions of the world were represented, with the exception of South America, Australia, Africa and South Asia. I was the only delegate from Canada.

The conference was held on the beautiful island of Moorea, a short distance by ferry from Tahiti. It was hosted by Hiti Tau and the Evangelical Church of the Town of Maharepa.

Background of Abolition 2000

In April of 1995, during the first weeks of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review and Extension Conference, activists from around the world recognized the absence of nuclear abolition on the nations' agenda. About fifty organizations, later known as the Abolition Caucus, drafted and endorsed an eleven-point statement which has become the founding document of the network. The statement has since been endorsed by nearly 700 organizations world-wide.

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

It goes on to call on states to take steps toward the abolition of nuclear weapons, with the first step being to initiate immediately and conclude by the year 2000 negotiations on a nuclear weapons abolition convention that requires the phased elimination of all nuclear weapons within a timebound framework, with provisions for effective verification and enforcement.

A subsequent meeting of seventy organizations was held in The Hague in November 1995 during World Court hearings on the legality of nuclear weapons. At that meeting, the group adopted the name Abolition 2000: A Global Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, and created a network of regional and working groups. While not a membership-based body, it is a network of

organizations whose aim is to facilitate an exchange of information and the development of joint initiatives.

In March of 1996, Abolition 2000 held a meeting in Edinburgh. The Interim Management Group was formed at this meeting. The I.M.G. largely consists of representatives from the United States and Western Europe representing organizations such as International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, the International Peace Bureau, and the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament.

Working groups established were: Nuclear Weapons Convention; Non-nuclear Security Model for Europe; Chernobyl and Nuclear Power; Media, Communication and Outreach; C.T.B.T. and Beyond; Fissile Materials; Nuclear Threats/Legal Issues; Lobbying, Dialogue and Campaigning; N.P.T. Prep Comms; and Newsletter. Subsequently, a Global Network Office was established with Pamela Meidell of the Atomic Mirror-Earth Trust as facilitator.

It was decided at the Edinburgh meeting to hold the next meeting of the General Assembly in the Pacific region.

Pacific Issues

Behind Tahiti's facade of beaches and tourist resorts is a vibrant and well-organized anti-colonial and anti-nuclear movement. Delegates assembled in the Pacific in order to recognize this movement and the first anniversary of the end of French nuclear testing on the nearby islands of Moruroa and Fangatafu.

Colonialism never receded from French Polynesia as it did from most parts of the world this century, and the French government maintains its authority over the islands. In 1956 de Gaulle chose French Polynesia as the next site for weapons development after Algeria had gained its independence. The use of this colony for the development of nuclear weapons - including nearly 200 test explosions - and its terrible effects of contamination, economic dependence, and authoritarian rule have devastated the region. The combination of these factors has become known as "nuclear colonialism."

The Campaign for a Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific is an umbrella group for 150 organizations from islands across the South Pacific. In this context, nuclear abolitionism is dependent upon independence,

self-determination and an end to colonialism. For non-French colonies, independence struggles can take the form of creating nuclear weapons-free zones by removing U.S. military bases which allow visits by nuclear-powered and potentially nuclear-armed warships.

Although the French Government has announced an end to testing in the region, the facilities remain in place. Activists are working to ensure a complete and definitive end to nuclear testing.

Despite the end of nuclear testing, its legacy remains. The delegates heard a woman from the Marshall Islands, a former U.S. nuclear test site, who had lost four pregnancies due to radiation exposure. As well, a former test site worker on Moruroa recounted the deaths of many co-workers, and described his own mysterious illness which he attributes to radiation poisoning from eating contaminated fish. (He also gave an eye-witness account of fifty cm-wide fissures on Moruroa and gas escaping from underground).

Test site workers, in particular, have not had a voice in the anti-nuclear struggle. Hiti Tau and the Evangelical Church are about to release the preliminary results of the first independent health survey of former test site workers. It is hoped that all victims of exposure to radiation will receive proper medical treatment and financial compensation.

Efforts to convert the economy from military dependence have resulted in several initiatives. On the island of Moorea, delegates toured a women-controlled monoi oil operation, a cooperative pineapple beverage plant, and a vanilla plantation operated by young people.

In recognition of the Pacific issues related to nuclear abolition, the conference adopted the Moorea Declaration: Supplement to the Abolition 2000 Founding Statement. It states in part: "The inalienable right to self determination, sovereignty and independence is crucial in allowing all peoples of the world to join in the common struggle to rid the planet forever of nuclear weapons."

Regional Reports

Canada (as part of North American Region):

News of Abolition 2000 work in Canada was very well received by delegates.

In fact, many delegations came to the meeting with intentions of learning more about recent activities of the Canadian Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons and recent announcements by the Canadian Government.

In particular, delegations from the U.K. and some groups in the United States expressed a desire to hold roundtables of their own to promote

support for the goals of Abolition 2000. The Japanese delegation intended to invite Doug Roche himself to hold roundtables in their country.

The report included a summary of Canadian policy on nuclear weapons, and Canada's support of its allies' nuclear umbrella through delivery system testing, communication sites, nuclear warship visits, low-level flight training, and votes at the U.N. against the elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework.

The conference was provided with a description of the Canadian Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons and a synopsis of its member's work since its establishment in Ottawa in April 1996:

- Creation of a Contact Group to coordinate joint efforts of the network;
- Establishment of a communication network of an e-mail list and websites;
- Printing of educational pamphlets and other materials;
- Distribution of petitions calling for the Canadian Government's support for nuclear abolition;
- A cross Canada tour by Douglas Roche holding roundtables on nuclear abolition in seventeen cities;
- Public forums, including a tour by Rob Green to be held in May;
- A seminar on implications of the World Court's decision on the legality of nuclear weapons to be held in March.

Delegates were very encouraged by the way in which the Canadian government responded to our activities by holding a review of its nuclear policy. This review is the first of its kind, and peace groups in other countries have already used the announcement to further their government-lobbying efforts. The Canadian Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons' work was frequently cited as a model for abolition work in other regions.

United States:

There are a plethora of issues to be dealt with in the United States, and delegates created a substantial "shopping list" of areas which need attention.

However, the most urgent issue was the recently announced plan to conduct sub-critical weapons tests at the Nevada test site. These explosive tests involve detonating up to 500 lbs of conventional explosives in close proximity to weapons-grade plutonium to test new designs and to maintain the potency of existing stockpiles.

The subcritical tests are part of the \$40 billion Nuclear Stockpile Stewardship Program which will, in effect, allow U.S. weapons labs to further develop nuclear weapons.

U.S. groups plan to develop their own network through improved communication, outreach to other social movements and young people, and coordinated media and government/U.N. lobbying.

Activists intend to affix "injunctions" to nuclear weapons installations in light of the World Court's decision. The ruling that nuclear weapons are illegal convinced a jury in September '96 to find two activists not guilty of criminal intent when the two felled a tower at a Navy communication centre in Wisconsin.

Asia:

Asia is perhaps the most volatile region in the world with regard to nuclear proliferation, arms races, and insecurity, with several non-aligned countries each possessing nuclear arsenals.

Shipments of highly radioactive waste, nuclear waste dumping, and the proliferation of nuclear power plants throughout the region are important issues.

Peace groups have proposed the establishment of a Northeast Asia Nuclear Weapons Free Zone between North and South Korea and Japan, which would decrease the need for the presence of U.S. nuclear weapons and bases (e.g. Okinawa). In the southern region, ten states have cooperated to create a Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapons Free Zone, but it has not been recognized by the nuclear powers.

Europe:

NATO expansion is a dangerous destabilizing policy for European security. NATO has recently reaffirmed its reliance upon nuclear weapons, in spite of the World Court's ruling that nuclear weapons are illegal.

While the alliance has stated that nuclear weapons will not be placed on new member states' soil, the planned expansion has had the effect of practically eliminating any chance of Russian ratification of START II. As well, conventional weapons in Hungary, Poland, or the Czech Republic would be capable of destroying Russian ICBMs.

Neither Britain nor France has shown any sign of policy changes toward its reliance upon its nuclear arsenal, and in fact both are deploying new delivery systems and nuclear weapons. Activists see NATO expansion as part of a larger remilitarization of Europe.

European peace activists are working to define a non-nuclear alternative to

European Security. They point to the Organization for Cooperation and Security in Europe as one possible alternative to NATO. As well, there are efforts to build support for a European Nuclear Weapons Free Zone.

Middle East:

The delegate from Israel reported on the continuing campaign to free Mordechai Vanunu. Vanunu is a former nuclear technician who is currently in his 11th year of solitary confinement in an Israeli prison for revealing to the world the existence of Israel's nuclear weapons program.

Abolition work is difficult in Israel as the majority of the public support Israel's secret nuclear arsenal (and Vanunu's imprisonment). As well, efforts are being made to persuade the Israeli peace movement to confront the nuclear issue.

Internationally, an effort is needed to push governments to act consistently against weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East in a campaign to make it a nuclear weapons-free region.

Pacific:

Having achieved the creation of a South Pacific Nuclear Weapons-Free Zone, activists in the region will continue to work for independence and an end to the militarization of indigenous lands.

As well, they hope to hold the nuclear powers accountable for nuclear clean-up and compensation of radiation victims. The release of the first independent health study of test-site workers is an important part of this process.

Health Caucus and Nuclear Waste Transportation working group:

Two new working groups were added to Abolition 2000's work at the meeting: the Health Caucus and the Nuclear Waste Transportation Working Group.

The Health Caucus is devoted to addressing issues faced by those people who are suffering ill health as a result of the development and testing of nuclear weapons. It has the specific goal of organizing a global health study to document the health effects of nuclear development. It also seeks compensation for victims of radiation poisoning.

The Nuclear Waste Transportation working group is, as its name would suggest, concerned with waste transportation, and the international trade in

nuclear waste.

Countdown to the Year 2000

N.P.T. Review Prep Comm:

There is an excellent opportunity to advance Abolition 2000's goal when the nations of the world gather at the United Nations for the Preparatory Committee for the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review (N.P.T. Prep Comm). The Prep Comm will be held in New York from April 7th to 17th, 1997.

At the 1995 N.P.T. Review and Extension Conference, the nuclear weapons states successfully applied tremendous pressure to the non-nuclear weapons states to agree to an indefinite extension.

However, the final document committed signatory states, including the nuclear weapons states, to achieving a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty before the end of the following year. The successful conclusion of the C.T.B.T. negotiation within the deadline could be used as a model and precedent for a Nuclear Weapons Convention outlining the elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework.

Nuclear Weapons Convention:

The Nuclear Weapons Convention working group of Abolition 2000 has completed a draft of a convention. Weighing in at over 110 pages, the convention is the result of study and consultation coordinated by Alyn Ware of International Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms and Jurgen Scheffran of the International Network of Engineers and Scientists.

The draft is now being reviewed by specialists, and is not yet available. It is a comprehensive document, and includes measures for dismantling weapons and verification. Interestingly, the draft convention includes a role for citizens' groups in the ongoing verification process. The working group plans to have a final draft ready for the N.P.T. Prep Comm meeting in April of this year.

Structure of the Abolition 2000 network:

One goal of the conference which was not successfully achieved was answering the question of structure for the network. At present, the network's work is facilitated by the Interim Management Group; a loose grouping of individuals from largely U.S. and European organizations.

Members of the I.M.G. wanted to create a new body, and a proposal based on a

system of regional representation was put forward by the German delegation. However, there was no consensus, and the issue of creating a better defined administrative body was left to be resolved at a later time, perhaps in April when Abolition 2000 groups will gather in New York for the N.P.T. Prep. Comm.

As well, the issue of finances for the network will also need to be discussed, as the coordinator of Abolition 2000 is owed back wages and it is unlikely that all of the costs of the conference will be met through current revenues.

Achieving Abolition:

The setting of the meeting was a remote location very far from the centres of power, yet at the same time one directly affected by the horror of nuclear weapons. The farther one moves from where the decisions are made, the closer one comes to the worst effects of those decisions.

Meeting survivors of nuclear testing and learning of the tremendous struggle of those who bear the brunt of nuclearism imposed by a colonial power forces one to redouble efforts to work for abolition. It is very much a "reality check" for a movement which is always in danger of becoming too caught up in hypothetical arguments and diplomatic accommodation.

The Tahiti conference will be remembered for many reasons, but perhaps the longest lasting result will be an increased understanding that the movement to abolish nuclear weapons is strengthened through a diversity of organization and strategies, and that every action for peace, whether it be at the U.N. or on a South Pacific Island, contributes to the ultimate goal.

One need only look at General George Lee Butler, a former U.S. General who once chose which cities would be the targets of nuclear weapons and now speaks for their elimination, who said recently that it was the display of the world's condemnation of France's resumed nuclear testing that showed him that the people are far ahead of their political leaders (NY Times 1/8/97).

The sum of the work of organizations around the world, working each in its

own way, will intersect and in doing so will achieve the conditions to make the abolition of nuclear weapons possible.

Steven Staples
Coordinator,
End the Arms Race

I would like to thank all of those people who generously contributed to ensure that a Canadian delegate could attend the meeting. It was a privilege to represent Canada.

PEACEWIRE

www.peacewire.org/pw

A project of END the ARMS RACE and the Public Education for Peace Society
405-825 Granville Street, Vancouver, B.C. V6Z 1K9 CANADA
ph:(604) 687-3223 fax:(604) 687-3277

From shundahai@saltmine.radix.netSat Feb 15 08:01:22 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Feb 1997 22:07:24 -0500 (EST)
From: The Shundahai Network <shundahai@saltmine.radix.net>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: From Corbin Harney to Tahiti participants

Dear Friends,

It was good to be with you in Tahiti at the Abolition 2000 Conference. It is important for us to meet like that and talk about the things we are doing all over the world. It is important for us to find out how to support each other. To help each other and learn from each other. It is important for us to continue to meet and talk together. To continue to pray and take action together.

My people, the Western Shoshone, have been affected by nuclear weapons testing and waste dumping since 1951 when they opened the Nevada Test Site with in the boundaries of my country Newe Segobia. I have seen what has happened to my people with increased leukemia and cancer rates throughout my country. I have seen how this nuclear contamination has affected the water that we drink and the air that we breathe. It has effected the plant life, the animal life and the bird life. I have seen this through out the world as I travel. No one can escape from this mess that the governments have created. I think that we all see this.

The people that made this mess just want to sweep it under the rug and pretend that it is not there. For us the rug is Yucca Mountain and the Nevada Test Site in my country. The US government and nuclear industry just want to sweep the nuclear mess under yucca mountain and go on producing more nuclear waste. We can not let that happen.

We have to make the U.S. governments and corporations realize that they can not produce any more nuclear waste or nuclear weapons. The two go hand in hand. In my country they bring in more then 960 shipments of nuclear waste every year and dump it in a big hole in the ground above our water supply. This nuclear waste comes from the nuclear weapons plants around the country. They call this "low level" nuclear waste. Nuclear waste is nuclear waste. I don't care if they call it low level or high level. It will be dangerous to

all living things for thousands of years.

Many of you heard about the work that the Shundahai Network and Healing Global Wounds are doing to prepare for our spring gathering at the Nevada Test Site this year. I want to personally invite each and every one of you to participate in what ever way you can. You can come and join us in my country of Newe Sogobia, or you can do solidarity gatherings in your own home.

It is going to take strong action from us to make them stop these things. They will not only listen to our words. We have to show them that we are serious about what we say.

The people that I work with are preparing to stand in the road and stop these nuclear waste shipments from coming into the test site with their own bodies.

We are asking people to come from all over the world to join us in this. We need to see people standing in the roads all over the world and stopping these nuclear shipments. That is what it takes for these governments to understand that they can not make any more of this nuclear waste.

Our actions will always be based on nonviolence and prayer. We must continue to pray and do ceremonies to heal and protect our mother.

The most important thing is that we must come together as one people. We must continue to work together to provide for our future generations, to protect Mother Earth.

By ourselves we are not so strong, but together, as one people, nothing can stop us. Our Mother Earth is relying on us. Please join us with your thoughts, prayers and actions.

Corbin Harney,

SHUNDAHAI NETWORK
"Peace and Harmony with all Creation"
Breaking the Nuclear Chain

5007 Elmhurst St., Las Vegas, NV 89108 ph(702)647-3095
Fax: (702)647-9385 Email: shundahai@radix.net

ACTION FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION!
5007 Elmhurst, Las Vegas, NV 89108 Phone: (702) 647-3095
Fax: (702)647-9385 Email: shundahi@intermind.net

SHUT THE TEST SITE DOWN!
NONVIOLENT DIRECT ACTION CAMP
March 31 - April 4, 1997

<http://www.macronet.org/macronet/shundahai/shutdown.html>

"It's in our backyard...its in our front yard.
This nuclear contamination is shortening all life.
Were going to have to unite as a people and say no more!
We, the people, are going to have to put our thoughts
together to save our planet here.
We only have One Water...One Air...One Mother Earth."
Corbin Harney, Newe (Western Shoshone) Spiritual Leader;
Founder and Executive Director, Shundahai Network

From shundahai@saltmine.radix.netSat Feb 15 08:02:09 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Feb 1997 22:08:04 -0500 (EST)
From: The Shundahai Network <shundahai@saltmine.radix.net>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Draft Media Advisory

Dear Friends,

Here is a draft copy of a media advisory which we would like to put out on the Spring Gatherings and Nonviolent Actions at the Nevada Test Site. We will have the final copy done by the end of next week. Does anyone have any suggestions or comments on media strategy around these events and another call in day to the White Whouse on April 1.

Thanks for your efforts.

Peace,
Reinard

DRAFT DRAFT

MEDIA ADVISORY

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
FEBRUARY , 1997

CONTACT:
Reinard Knutsen (702) 647-3095

DIVERSE GROUPS FROM AROUND THE WORLD TO GATHER AT THE NEVADA TEST SITE TO DEMAND NUCLEAR ABOLITION, AN END TO NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTING AND WASTE DUMPING. WE WILL CELEBRATE UNITY, JOIN TOGETHER IN PRAYER, WORKSHOPS AND NONVIOLENT DIRECT ACTION!

MARCH 23 - 30, LENTEN DESERT EXPERIENCE

The Lenten Desert Experience and Holy Week Walk are organized and hosted by Nevada Desert Experience. Through prayer, reflection, sharing and action, participants will explore nonviolent approaches to the violence of nuclear proliferation.

Please Call NDE: (702) 646-4814 for more information or
nde@igc.apc.org

MARCH 26 - 27, A COUNCIL OF WOMEN TO END THE NUCLEAR AGE

The meeting will include presentations on current struggles in this nation and elsewhere related to all kinds of nuclear facilities and transport, and focus on strategies and techniques for organizing women to end the nuclear

age. Please Call Susan Lee Solar (512)-447-6222 or
nukemuse@igc.org,

MARCH 27 - 31, HEALING GLOBAL WOUNDS

All Peoples' gathering to break the nuclear chain. To be effective human beings, we need to develop our 4 aspects: body, spirit, heart and mind. The

HGW four day program includes: Indigenous panel on key nuclear issues, Multicultural Alliance Building Training, International delegations, daily spiritual ceremony, and nonviolent action. Network with key leaders and groups in the anti-nuclear movement.

Please call Jennifer Viereck (408) 338-0147 or hgw@scruznet.com

MARCH 31 - APRIL 4, ACTION FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION!

Five days of creative nonviolent direct action including blockades, parades, and actions to SHUT THE TEST SITE DOWN!

March 31: Critical Mass Action at Nevada Test Site. Day of Unity to Shut the Test Site Down.

April 1: Nuclear Fools Day of Action. We are calling for a National Call

in Day to the White House to cancel the "subcritical" nuclear weapons tests currently planned to begin this spring. In Las Vegas we will organize a Nuclear Fools Day Parade down Las Vegas Blvd., (The Strip) the tourist area of town to the local Department of Energy Headquarters.

April 2-4: Blockades, parades and actions to Shut the Test Site Down! We will attempt to block the main entrances to NTS to stop the preparations for Sub Critical nuclear weapons testing and nuclear waste transportation and dumping

Please call Reinard Knutsen (702) 647-3095 shundahi@intermind.net

SPONSORING ORGANIZATIONS: Action for Nuclear Abolition!, Alliance of Atomic

Veterans, American Friends Service Committee, Center for Energy, Common Ground Magazine, Eco-Services, Inc., Foundation for a Compassionate Society,

Healing Global Wounds Alliance, Macrocosm USA, Shamans Drum, Shundahai Network, P.A.R.A.N.O.I.D.S. ENDORSING ORGANIZATIONS: Research, European Peace Pilgrimage, For Mother Earth, , Global Anti-Nuclear Alliance, Global

Resource Action Center for the Environment, Greenpeace USA, International Peace Bureau, Lawyers committee on Nuclear Policy, Mouvement De La Paix, Nuclear Resister, Nuke Watch, Oregon Peace Works, Proposition One Committee,

Peace Action, Peace Action Education Fund, Peace House, Peace Farm, Save Ward Valley, Seeds of Peace, S.M.A.R.T., Student Nonviolent Action Coalition, Tri-Valley Cares, War Resisters League, Women Strike for Peace

Page 2

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: SPRING GATHERINGS AT NEVADA TEST SITE

"Global opposition has stopped nuclear testing temporarily, but deadly

nuclear wastes continue to accumulate, and nuclear weapons development proceeds unchecked," warns a coalition of nuclear abolition activists who are sponsoring a series of anti-nuclear events this spring at the infamous

Nevada Test Site (NTS), near Las Vegas, Nevada. The purpose of the gatherings--being organized by Shundahai Network, Healing Global Wounds, Nevada Desert Experience, and others--is to convince the Department of Energy (DOE) and the nuclear industry to start cleaning up their messes and stop making more of them.

The coalition selected the NTS as the focus of the spring gatherings for several reasons. The site is located on land illegally appropriated from the Western Shoshone Nation by the U.S. government in the early 1950s; it is the most frequently bombed place in the U.S. (more than a thousand nuclear bombs have been exploded there above and below ground); and it is being turned into world's largest nuclear waste dump.

Although there is a moratorium on nuclear testing at the NTS, the site is being kept in full readiness for future testing under the DOE's new Stockpile Stewardship and Management (SS&M) program. In fact, the U.S. recently announced that despite having signed a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)--which must still be ratified by forty-four weapons-capable nations--it intends to continue nuclear weapons development at the NTS this Spring, and to keep the facility ready to resume full-scale nuclear testing with six months notice.

The SS&M program will involve using computer technology to design and test new developments in nuclear weaponry. As part of this program, "subcritical" nuclear weapons tests are already being planned for the spring of 1997. These "test" detonations are expected to explode before "critical mass" is reached, and therefore, are not supposed to set off a nuclear chain reaction. Nevertheless, the devices to be tested will contain plutonium--and there is no guarantee that critical mass will not be reached. Even if a chain reaction doesn't occur, these tests would undermine efforts to implement the CTBT. If the U.S. continues developing its nuclear weapons program, other nuclear-weapons-capable nations may refrain from ratifying the treaty.

The NTS already has the dubious distinction of being the largest nuclear waste site in the U.S--a nation that generates six tons of nuclear waste a day. In 1995 alone, more than 960 shipments of nuclear waste--averaging nearly three loads per day--were dumped into shallow, unlined trenches

located above southern Nevada's largest underground aquifer. By 1998, the DOE intends to transport more than 15,600 more shipments of nuclear waste through forty-three states to the NTS.

The DOE has itself admitted that anywhere from seventy to three hundred accidents could occur during shipping, and that a single accident could contaminate as much as forty-two square miles. Nuclear abolitionists believe it is sheer madness to continue transporting tons of extremely toxic wastes in unsafe containers, along unsafe railways and highways, through populated communities and beautiful natural settings, to unsafe dumpsites.

The organizers of the spring events believe it is imperative that people speak out and convince the nuclear industry to realistically address the monumental problem of what to do with its waste products--not just assign those wastes to government-controlled sites which operate as if they were exempt from normal environmental regulations. People must also pressure the nuclear industry to stop generating more wastes--and the government to cease its nuclear development programs.

Organizers of the spring events are optimistic that--by using a combination of prayer and ceremony, trainings, workshops, and nonviolent direct action--"activists and organizations working together can generate significant groundswells of public opinion and political pressure." The coalition and Corbin Harney, spiritual leader of the Newe (Western Shoshone) Nation and founder of Shundahai Network, invite all peoples to join them, physically or in spirit.

SHUNDAHAI NETWORK
"Peace and Harmony with all Creation"
Breaking the Nuclear Chain

5007 Elmhurst St., Las Vegas, NV 89108 ph(702)647-3095
Fax: (702)647-9385 Email: shundahai@radix.net

ACTION FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION!
5007 Elmhurst, Las Vegas, NV 89108 Phone: (702) 647-3095
Fax: (702)647-9385 Email: shundahi@intermind.net

SHUT THE TEST SITE DOWN!
NONVIOLENT DIRECT ACTION CAMP
March 31 - April 4, 1997

<http://www.macronet.org/macronet/shundahai/shutdown.html>

"It's in our backyard...its in our front yard.
This nuclear contamination is shortening all life.
Were going to have to unite as a people and say no more!
We, the people, are going to have to put our thoughts
together to save our planet here.

We only have One Water...One Air...One Mother Earth."
Corbin Harney, Newe (Western Shoshone) Spiritual Leader;
Founder and Executive Director, Shundahai Network

From shundahai@saltmine.radix.net Sat Feb 15 08:03:08 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Feb 1997 22:07:29 -0500 (EST)
From: The Shundahai Network <shundahai@saltmine.radix.net>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Action for Nuclear Abolition! and Healing Gloabl Wounds

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

ACTION FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION! and HEALING GLOBAL WOUNDS
March 23 - April 4, 1997

SPONSORING ORGANIZATIONS:

Action for Nuclear Abolition!, Alliance of Atomic Veterans, American Friends Service Committee, Center for Energy, Common Ground Magazine, Eco-Services, Inc., Foundation for a Compassionate Society, Healing Global Wounds Alliance, Macrocosm USA, Nuke Watch, Shamans Drum, Shundahai Network, P.A.R.A.N.O.I.D.S.

ENDORISING ORGANIZATIONS:

Research, European Peace Pilgrimage, For Mother Earth, , Foundation for Peace, Global Anti-Nuclear Alliance, Global Resource Action Center for the Environment, Greenpeace USA, International Peace Bureau, Lawyers committee on Nuclear Policy, Mouvmnt De La Paix, Nuclear Resister, , Oregon Peace Works, Proposition One Committee, Peace Action, Peace Action Education Fund, Peace House, Peace Farm, Save Ward Valley, Seeds of Peace, S.M.A.R.T., Student Nonviolent Action Coalition, Tri-Valley Cares, War Resisters League, Women Strike for Peace, Womens International League for Peace and Freedom

Dear Nuclear Abolitionists

Congratualtions and thank you to all the organizers and activists who worked so hard to make the Abolition 2000 Conference in Tahaiti a big success. We look forward to hearing the reports and discussions and feeling the momentum of this meeting. The Shundahai Network is committed to the work of Abolition 2000 and are very happy to see that a campaign for the closure of all nuclear test sites is a main component in this years priorities.

Action for Nuclear Abolition!, is a major project of the Shundahai Network. Our focus is to bring the communities working respectively on nuclear weapons, nuclear energy and nuclear waste together and bridge the gaps

between other environmental and Native Sovereignty groups. While working as part of a national network promoting nuclear free zones and stopping the transportation of all nuclear materials, we are currently primarily concentrating on shutting down the Nevada Test Site (NTS) to all nuclear weapons testing and development and nuclear waste dumping, and beginning immediate clean up and repatriation to the Western Shoshone Nation, who's land was taken to form NTS.

We are already hard at work with Healing Global Wounds and a growing alliance to prepare for a 13-day series of diverse events at NTS, March 23 - April 4 to: SHUT THE TEST SITE DOWN!

- Halt transportation and dumping of nuclear waste!!
- Stop the "sub-critical" nuclear weapons tests!!
- Stop all nuclear weapons research and development!!
- Begin clean up of 45 years of nuclear contamination!!
- Honor Newe (Western Shoshone) Sovereignty rights!!
- Allow independent study and public monitoring!!

We hope that you have received the latest information package on the 1997 Spring Action for Nuclear Abolition campaign that the Shundahai Network and Healing Global Wounds has begun working on. You can get all of the latest information on the web at <http://www.macronet.org/macronet/shundahai/shutdown.html>, or email us back and we will send you the full packet.

We would like to specifically ask if you could:

Participate: Join us in Nevada or organize local actions or events, especially the Nuclear Fools Day of Action and National Call in Day, April 1st. Advance registration is key so that we can plan our logistical requirements. Please reply using the registration form at the end of this message.

Sponsor: Participate in pre-event organizing or with a tax-deductible donation of \$75 or more and allowing your name to be included with our sponsoring list on future outreach and media materials.

Endorse: allow your organization to be represented on our future outreach materials.

We are in the final stages of putting together our participants packet and would love to include your organization as a sponsor or endorser.

Thank you for your time and consideration, we look forward to hearing from you and hope to see you in Nevada this spring.

Peace,

Reinard Knutsen

PRE ACTION TRAINING CAMP, March 23-26: On the land of the Alliance of Atomic Veterans, overlooking the NTS. Extensive nonviolence, media and organizer's trainings. Join affinity groups and prepare for nonviolent direct action. Learn how nonviolent direct action can be an effective part

of raising public awareness and building local grassroots coalitions.

Developing schedule:

Sunday, 3/23, Afternoon: Opening Circle and Orientation

Monday, 3/24: Direct Action Nonviolence Training

Nonviolent Action strategy and tactics

Legal Defense

Spirituality and other motivations for Direct

Action

Tuesday, 3/25: Action Planning and Logistics

Peacekeeper Training

Legal Observation Training

Media Training

Direct Action First Aid Training

Networking

Wednesday, 3/26: Guerrilla Camp Logistics

Direct Action props and equipment

Action for Nuclear Abolition is held in conjunction with:

HEALING GLOBAL WOUNDS SPRING GATHERING March 27-31, 1997

All Peoples' gathering to break the nuclear chain. To be effective human beings, we need to develop our 4 aspects: body, spirit, heart and mind. The

HGW four day program includes: Indigenous panel on key nuclear issues, Multicultural Alliance Building Training, International delegations, daily

spiritual ceremony, and nonviolent action. Network with key leaders and groups in the anti-nuclear movement.

Activities include:

Thursday, 3/27: Nonviolence and Peacekeeper Trainings.

Updates from conferences and actions, Hibakusha

delegation

Friday, 3/28: All-day Training: 'Alliance Building in a Multi-Cultural World', with Margo Adair, Bill Aal and Dallas Gudgell

Good Friday 'Stations of the Nuclear Cross' Service

Saturday, 3/29: Nuclear Waste: Generation, Transport & Storage with:

Lea Fouchee, Prairie Island Coalition, Indigenous Women's

Network; Dallas Gudgell, Snake River Alliance, Military

Production Network; Virginia Sanchez, Citizen Alert

Native

American Program Indigenous Delegation from Taiwan &

Mongolia

Sunday, 3/30: 'Circle of Rebirth' Ceremony and NV Action with Corbin

Harney & Starhawk
Monday, 3/ 31: Critical Mass Action. All participants join for a Day of
Unity to

SHUT THE TEST SITE DOWN!

Daily Sunrise Ceremony, Sweatlodges, Pre-Meal Circles, Community
Campfire.

This year's camp will be laid out as a village, with specialized areas
for Healing Global Wounds (includes Native ceremonial area), Action for
Nuclear Abolition! (includes Action Tent for trainings and prop
construction) and Nevada Desert Experience. Shared features include the
Kitchen, large-group Meeting Tent, Registration, First Aid Tent, and (new
this year) the Community Cafe with informal meeting space, video and book
library, coffee and tea.

Contact: HGW, P.O. Box 13, Boulder Creek, CA 95006, (408) 338-0147.
hgw@scruznet.com.

ACTION FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION!
NON-VIOLENT DIRECT ACTION CAMP
MARCH 31 - APRIL 4, 1997

Join activists from around the world to defend Mother Earth.
Celebrate our commitment to NUCLEAR ABOLITION 2000

Train in community organizing and learn nonviolent tactics while
participating in five days of creative nonviolent direct action to:

SHUT THE TEST SITE DOWN!

March 31: CRITICAL MASS ACTION. A special Day of Unity to
SHUT THE TEST SITE DOWN!

April 1: NUCLEAR FOOLS DAY OF ACTION. We are calling for a National
Call

in Day to the White house to cancel the "subcritical"
nuclear

weapons tests currently planned to begin this spring. In
Las

Vegas we will organize a Nuclear Fools Day Parade through
the

tourist area of town to the local Department of Energy
Headquarters. If you are unable to make it to Nevada, we
hope that you will join in local solidarity actions to:
SHUT THE TEST SITE DOWN!

April 2-4: Blockades, parades and actions to Shut the Test Site Down! We
will attempt to block the three main entrances to NTS to

stop
the preparations for Sub Critical nuclear weapons testing

and
nuclear waste transportation and dumping

The goals of this Nonviolent Direct Action Camp and Nuclear Fools Day of
Actions are:

1) To bring the activist communities working respectively on nuclear weapons, nuclear energy and nuclear waste together and help bridge the gaps between other environmental and Native Sovereignty groups.

2) To stop preparations for resuming "sub-critical" nuclear weapons testing scheduled to begin this Spring at NTS.

3) To stop the ongoing transportation and dumping of nuclear waste at NTS from the DOE's nuclear weapons facilities around the country.

4) To educate the public and politicians about the immediate dangers to the health and safety of people and the environment due to the continued development of the nuclear weapons industry and transportation and dumping of nuclear waste.

5) To generate international grassroots pressure to permanently shut down the Nevada Test Site (NTS) and begin immediate containment, clean up and repatriation to the Western Shoshone nation, who's land was taken to form NTS

6) To help organize and empower local communities to declare themselves nuclear free zones and train activists in nonviolent direct action to publicize these zones and stop the mining, testing, production, transportation and dumping of nuclear materials in them.

REGISTRATION AND KEY CONTACT, SPONSOR AND ENDORSE FORM

Please mail to: Healing Global Wounds /Action for Nuclear Abolition
P.O. Box 13, Boulder Creek, CA 95006

or email to: hgw@lol.shareworld.com and shundahi@intermind.net

Please mail to: Healing Global Wounds /Action for Nuclear Abolition •
P.O.
Box 13 • Boulder Creek • CA 95006

Name:

Organization:

Address:

Phone: _____ Fax: _____

Email: _____ Website: _____

Our organization would like to endorse: HGW ANA (Please check one or both boxes)

Our organization would like to send _____ representatives to: HGW ANA (Please check one or both boxes)

I am / We are enclosing \$ _____ to help with logistical costs.

Enclosed is \$ _____ to pre register for HGW, March 27 - 30 (suggested donation \$20, \$25 on site)

Enclosed is \$ _____ to pre register for ANA, March 31 - April 4 (suggested donation \$25-\$30)

For Both HGW and ANA registration please make a single check out to Healing Global Wounds.

Donations of \$50 or more are tax deductible and should be made out to Center

for Energy Research: memo HGW

(No one will be turned away from HGW or ANA for lack of registration donations.)

I / We would like to help with: Parking, Recycling, Peacekeeping, First Aid, Kitchen, Media, Fundraising.

We can bring _____ bulk food donation from our area.

I am / We are not able to register at this moment but please send me a participants package. check for yes

I / We would like more information about the regional outreach, organizational development and nonviolence training tours in February.

check for yes

I / We would like more information about the April 1st local Nuclear Fools

Day of Actions and National Call-in Day to the White House. check for yes

I / We plan on attending the ANA Pre Action Training Camp, March 23 - 26. check for yes

(Please note that this will require camping high in the mountains and the weather could be extreme)

KEY CONTACT INFORMATION

Please include me/us on your regional key contact list. check for yes

I / We would like to do local outreach for the NTS Spring Gathering.

I / We would like to help arrange regional speaking, outreach, organizational development and nonviolence training tours in my/our area.

check for yes

I am / We are currently involved in these nuclear abolition efforts:

I / We can offer these skills (ie..nonviolence or peacekeeping training, outreach, fundraising, media)

Tell us what you might like to see happen or accomplished during the Spring actions.

To contact Healing Global Wounds call: (408) 338-0147
Email: hgw@lol.shareworld.com

Or Action for Nuclear Abolition call: (702) 796-3835
Email: shundahi@intermind.net

Please return this registration form to:
HGW / ANA • P.O. Box 13 • Boulder Creek • CA 95006

SHUNDAHAI NETWORK
"Peace and Harmony with all Creation"
Breaking the Nuclear Chain

5007 Elmhurst St., Las Vegas, NV 89108 ph(702)647-3095
Fax: (702)647-9385 Email: shundahai@radix.net

ACTION FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION!
5007 Elmhurst, Las Vegas, NV 89108 Phone: (702) 647-3095
Fax: (702)647-9385 Email: shundahi@intermind.net

SHUT THE TEST SITE DOWN!
NONVIOLENT DIRECT ACTION CAMP
March 31 - April 4, 1997

<http://www.macronet.org/macronet/shundahai/shutdown.html>

"It's in our backyard...its in our front yard.
This nuclear contamination is shortening all life.
Were going to have to unite as a people and say no more!
We, the people, are going to have to put our thoughts
together to save our planet here.

We only have One Water...One Air...One Mother Earth."
Corbin Harney, Newe (Western Shoshone) Spiritual Leader;
Founder and Executive Director, Shundahai Network

From rcowan@lesley.edu Mon Feb 17 16:57:51 1997
Date: Sat, 15 Feb 1997 14:31:00 -0500
From: Rich Cowan <rcowan@lesley.edu>
To: vision@igc.apc.org, adaction@ix.netcom.com, basicusa@igc.apc.org,
CEP@echonyc.com, cnp@igc.apc.org, 102375.413@compuserve.com,
pdd@clark.net, funcongov@aol.com, idds@world.std.com,
natprior@crocker.com, ncc_washington.parti@ecunet.org,
ncecd@igc.apc.org, pda@comw.org, paecon@igc.apc.org,
ploughshares@igc.apc.org, spusa@spusa.org, wand@world.std.com,
wandwill@clark.net, wfp@aed.org, wilpfnatl@igc.apc.org,
joseph@stimson.org, pogodef@mnsinc.com, dculp@nrdc.org,
cdavis@clw.org,
dege@taxpayer.net, 71263.401@compuserve.com, mfonte@clw.org,
hn5236@handsnet.org, kvanderh@mail.clark.net, hultgren@taxpayer.net,
jdi@clw.org, wjnsns@aol.com, CLEVAN@HR.HOUSE.GOV, skerr@clw.org,
bridget@fcnl.org, bmsil@psr.org, 73744.3675@compuserve.com,
mpage@MACArthu.macfdn.org, jparachini@stimson.org, tperry@ucsusa.org,
johnpike@mail.clark.net, mrietman@HR.HOUSE.GOV,
kschultz@mail.cdi.org,
aslater@igc.apc.org, msommer@igc.apc.org, cspinney@erols.com,
MTREISMA@HR.HOUSE.GOV, tsipis@mit.edu, ptyler@HR.HOUSE.GOV,
hn0079@handsnet.org, johnpike@fas.org, chellman@cdi.org,
mw0771a@american.edu, washofc@aol.com,
cwu_washington.parti@ecunet.org,
disarmament@igc.apc.org, tom.clements@green2.greenpeace.org,
laws@earthlink.net, dellsberg@igc.apc.org, mccwash@igc.apc.org,
mupj@igc.apc.org, meldredge@igc.apc.org, cpaine@nrdc.org,
hamilton@rtk.net, barbara_green@pcusa.org, uuawo@aol.com,
unsc@gramercy.ios.com, mary@vi.org, wfa@igc.apc.org
Subject: Challenge the Lie\$ Budget Update: Bad CLINTON BUDGET

**** CHALLENGE THE LIE\$ BUDGET UPDATE **** 2/15/97 ****

When President Clinton released his budget proposal just one week ago, it was attacked by Republicans as "soft on defense" and way out of line in terms of social spending increases.

Exactly what did Clinton propose?

Well, he has proposed to increase military spending by \$27.5 billion from 1997-2002, while planning to increase environmental spending by only \$0.5 billion over the same period. The EPA increase is less than the rate of inflation, while the military increase is greater than the inflation rate!

Below is a summary of the President's Budget, extracted from the budget tables produced by the White House Office of Management and Budget.

Even though Clinton has proposed significant increases in the budget for Education and for Housing and Urban Development, these increases, \$5.3 billion and \$13.7 billion, even combined with small increases for EPA,

Health and Human Services, etc. still do not add up to the whopping \$27.5 billion increase for MILITARY spending.

And if you think the Clinton proposal is bad, just wait until the Republican Congress presents its budget!

For information on a petition drive to protest these priorities, contact CCO or see the website <http://envirolink.org/orgs/cco/ctl>

Thanks!

-Rich Cowan
Center for Campus Organizing, Box 748, Cambridge, MA 02142
(617) 354-9363
rcowan@lesley.edu

P.S. numbers below may or may not include secret government spending of \$30B for spy agencies like the CIA and NSA -- anyone know?

Here's the summary of the proposal for all agencies in the Clinton Budget:

SECTION 323 -- SUMMARIES BY AGENCY

Table S-10. DISCRETIONARY BUDGET AUTHORITY BY AGENCY (In billions of dollars)

Agency	Actual					
	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
2002						
Legislative Branch	2.2	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.5
2.5						
The Judiciary	2.8	3.0	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.7
3.8						
Executive Office Of the President ..	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
0.2						
Funds Appropriated to the Pres....	10.8	10.8	15.6	11.9	11.8	11.4
11.3						
Agriculture	15.3	15.3	15.1	15.2	15.4	15.5
15.8						
Commerce	3.7	3.8	4.2	4.9	6.1	4.0
4.0						
Defense-Military	253.6	250.9	251.6	257.2	263.5	270.3
278.4						
Defense-Civil	3.4	3.5	3.8	3.4	3.4	3.4
3.4						
Education	21.4	26.2	29.1	29.8	30.5	31.1
31.5						
Energy	16.4	16.5	19.2	17.6	16.7	16.3
15.8						
Health and Human Services	33.2	34.1	36.3	36.6	36.8	37.1
37.4						

Housing and Urban Development	21.7	19.3	24.8	28.4	30.3	31.7
33.0						
Interior	7.1	6.9	7.4	7.4	7.6	7.5
7.5						
Justice	14.6	16.3	17.1	17.8	16.8	17.0
17.5						
Labor	9.4	10.2	10.8	10.6	10.6	10.7
10.9						
State	4.7	4.8	5.1	5.8	4.9	5.0
5.0						
Transportation	12.7	12.8	12.5	13.7	13.9	14.1
14.3						
Treasury	10.4	10.6	11.8	11.8	11.4	11.6
11.8						
Veterans Affairs	18.3	18.9	18.7	18.7	18.7	18.7
18.7						
Environmental Protection Agency	6.5	6.8	7.6	7.7	7.1	7.2
7.3						
General Services Administration	0.2	0.6	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
0.1						
National Aeronautics & Space Adm...	13.9	13.7	13.5	13.4	13.2	13.2
13.2						
Office of Personnel Management	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
0.2						
Small Business Administration	0.8	0.9	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
0.7						
Social Security Administration	5.0	5.6	5.6	5.5	5.5	5.5
5.5						
Other Independent Agencies	14.0	11.7	13.6	10.8	10.9	10.7
10.7						
Total	502.5	505.8	530.5	535.4	542.5	549.4
560.6						

From gdaniell@wt.com.au Mon Feb 17 16:58:54 1997
Date: Sun, 16 Feb 1997 08:18:04 +0800 (WST)
From: Graham Daniell <gdaniell@wt.com.au>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

A recent message included the following:

>the issue of finances for the network will also need to be
>discussed, as the coordinator of Abolition 2000 is owed back wages and
it is
>unlikely that all of the costs of the conference will be met through
current
>revenues.

Where can donations to help with this be forwarded? In particular, is
there
a mechanism to allow donations via credit card? This last point is
particularly relevant as bank charges tend to eat up most of any donation
which is being remitted overseas (from Australia at least). Credit card
transactions allow donations "on the spur of the moment", which is how
the
world works these days - people can't be bothered going to all the hassle
of
getting a bank cheque and then posting it. If a credit card facility
could
be set up I am sure it would be profitable and increase your donations.

Hoping this helps,
Towards a nuclear-free millennium,
Graham Daniell
Perth, Western Australia
gdaniell@wt.com.au

From ipb@gn.apc.org Mon Feb 17 16:59:45 1997
Date: Mon, 17 Feb 1997 15:07:22 -0100
From: International Peace Bureau <ipb@gn.apc.org>
To: 'ABOLITION-CAUCUS' <ABOLITION-CAUCUS@IGC.APC.ORG>
Subject: Details of NATO forum April 12

Announcing. . . . a special open forum on Saturday April 12, on NATO expansion, nuclear weapons and alternatives. The co-sponsors are the International Peace Bureau and the Abolition 2000 caucus. There will also be brief presentations of the IPB and Abolition, and an opportunity to ask questions, pick up literature etc.

The speakers so far are:

Admiral Eugene Carroll (Ret. US Navy, Centre for Defense Information)
David Cortright (Fourth Freedom Foundation)
Solange Fernex (IPB Vice-President, France)
Sharon Riggle (Centre for European Security and Disarmament, Brussels)
We hope for a speaker from Eastern Europe.

Time: from 10.00 - 1.00 p.m. One hour of presentations and 2 hours of discussion.

Location: 777 UN Plaza (Church Center), corner of 44th St and 1st Ave, NYC.

Lunch will not be provided. Language: English only. All are welcome.

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 a member of Abolition 2000 - a Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons, and many other international bodies

From aslater@igc.apc.org Mon Feb 17 17:00:27 1997
Date: Mon, 17 Feb 1997 06:32:27 -0800 (PST)
From: ALICE SLATER <aslater@igc.apc.org>
To: International Peace Bureau <ipb@gn.apc.org>
Cc: 'ABOLITION-CAUCUS' <ABOLITION-CAUCUS@IGC.APC.ORG>,
 '"Johnson, Rebecca'" <acronym@gn.apc.org>,
 '"Atwood, David'" <atwood@pop.unicc.org>,
 'ISMUN' <jlonn@nywork2.undp.org>, 'WILPF' <womensleague@gn.apc.org>
Subject: RE: NPT PrepComm

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

Thanks Colin for any help you can give in tracking down the story.
Regards,
Alice

ABOLITION 2000 CAUCUS

MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 13, 1997 9AM-10.30AM

ATTENDING REPRESENTATIVES: Selma Brackman (War & Peace Foundation),
Pauline
Cantwell, Kate Gunning (GRACE), Gail Karlsson (Metropolitan Solar
Energy),
Peggy Kerry (WAND), John Klotz, Babette Linfield (PNSR), Doris Miller
(PNSR), Betty Obal (Peace Action), Alice Slater (GRACE), Roger Smith (NGO
Committee on Disarmament), Alyn Ware (LCNP), Cora Weiss (Peace
Action/IPB).

AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:

1. MEDIA - FOLLOWUP

Alyn Ware presented a draft of a Press Alert he has written about
Abolition
2000 to be distributed to the media before the NPT. He sent it to the
media
working group chair, Janet Bloomfield. Her comments were reproduced on
the
back of the draft Press Alert. People were invited to make comments and
give
feed back about the draft to Alyn.

Alice Slater informed the group that GRACE has offered to help the
Abolition
Caucus hire a PR firm to publicize Abolition 2000 and the NPT. Alice has
been contacting various PR firms and exploring possible strategies with
them. Alice wants the publicity to be done on behalf of the group (i.e.
not
just GRACE) and asked for people to join her to make decisions about the
PR

representative chosen and what publicity should take place. John Klotz and Alyn volunteered to do this. Robert Pollard (Peace Caucus) was suggested as a good person to work on this as he does a lot of Internet work.

Alice informed the group that she sent George Kennan's NY Times op-ed to Barbara Gorn who will do some pro-bono publicity work by sending the article all over the country to get it published in other papers.

It was thought that the group needs to schedule a media event to announce the NPT and the existence of Abolition 2000. The PR firm hired could help to do this.

2. PANELS AND PROGRAMS DURING THE NPT

Roger Smith handed out a Schedule of NGO events for the NPT. The NGO Committee on Disarmament has reserved the Dag Hammarskjold Library auditorium in the UN Secretariat Building for the evenings of 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 17 & 18 April. So far there is only one panel discussion booked, which is for 10 April (organized by the NGO Committee on Disarmament). The library use will have to be paid for and it was suggested that all organizations using the room help to pay for it.

PANELS BEING ORGANIZED:

We decided to have panels on April 7 and 8: one on the 'Nuclear Weapons Convention' and the other on 'Nuclear Energy and Environmentally Sustainable Alternatives'.

A. NUCLEAR WEAPONS CONVENTION PANEL - April 7 (5-7pm)

This is a 'preemptive response' to the IAEA panel on April 9. The IAEA (an official agency of the UN) has taken a full day at the UN to promote nuclear power. It appears that it is too late to organize panel speakers for the IAEA meeting. However, it was suggested that the best way to react/respond to this panel is to be in the audience and to actively taken part in the Q&A session. Literature could also be distributed inside and outside the UN. Betty Obal and Roger Smith will try to contact the Youth Caucus and get them involved in this.

B. NUCLEAR ENERGY & ENVIRONMENTALLY SUSTAINABLE ALTERNATIVES - April 8 (5-7pm)

We agreed to cooperate with the Commission of Sustainable Development NGOs

and organize a joint panel on nuclear and alternative energy. It was agreed that health issues will have to be dealt with in a separate panel. Alyn submitted a list of suggestions for speakers for both of these panels. The group was asked to respond to these suggestions at the next meeting. Cora thought that the list needed to be more international.

C. NATO PANEL - April 12 (10am-1pm)

The third panel suggested was an information session/debate on NATO. It was agreed to have the panel in the Church Center Building. It will be a public-open forum discussion providing information on the NATO issue and aimed at people coming to the NPT conference as NGOs and UN delegates. It was agreed that it will be listed as an 'IPB-Abolition Caucus' information session with the title to be decided upon. There will be a one hour presentation, followed by a 2 hour discussion (from 10am to 1pm). A room has been booked in the Church Center from 9-4 on that day so people attending can network and develop a strategy to oppose NATO after the session formally ends.

Speakers will need to be arranged. So far, David Cortwright, Admiral Carroll and William Sloane Coffin have expressed interest. It is necessary to arrange women speakers as well. Helen Caldicott was suggested as a good speaker for the group. It was thought that it was important to also use the session to focus on alternatives to NATO and highlight the different options available for creating European security. Thus, it would be important to have people who could discuss the OSCE, regional security and the possibility of a UN Security Force.

OTHER PANELS SUGGESTED:

A. HEALTH PANEL

It was thought that because we will have the NATO discussion at the Church Center on Saturday, April 12, the NATO 'slot' reserved at the UN could be used for a health panel. The Abolition 2000 health working group should be involved in any such panel.

B. US NUCLEAR POLICY

Alice has had a request for a panel on US Nuclear Policy and issues such as stockpile stewardship and subcritical tests etc. Abolition 2000 may not be able to use any more of the slots reserved by the NGO Committee on Disarmament, so it was suggested that the groups interested in holding such a panel should reserve space in their own names.

3. SPEAKER

The idea of a speaker who could brief the group on what will go on at the NPT was raised. Roger Smith reported that he spoke with Laura Hope (UN Center for Disarmament Affairs) about the NPT agenda. She said that the NPT agenda will not be set until the commencement of the NPT meeting, but that there will not be 3 main committees. There is currently a meeting going on about the NPT in Geneva which the Finnish ambassador, who will chair the NPT meeting, is attending. It was thought that Abolition 2000 people in Geneva could try to meet with him to get more information about the NPT.

Roger Smith will contact Paula Tasso to see if she has been able to arrange someone from the Finnish mission to speak to us as it would be worth trying to get someone from that mission to speak to the group as well as getting someone from a proactive mission to speak. Alyn will try to get Mr. Hasny (the acting Malaysian Ambassador) to speak to us.

4. HOUSING

Dave Robinson of Pax Christi International is putting out a big announcement to try and get more housing offers. To date we have 16 offers and 12 requests.

5. OTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS

- The last day of the PrepComm is April 18. No official meetings are scheduled for April 17 as it is an Islamic holiday (Id Al-Adha).

- The DPI is having an NGO briefing on Women and Peace on March 6.

- The NGO Committee on Disarmament is having a panel on March 11 (the time has not yet been set, although it will be in the morning), for NGOs to come together, share ideas and make suggestions for the PrepComm.

- MPN '1997 DC Days' - Alyn suggested that we should go down on lobbying days, urge them to put the nuclear issue on their agenda and offer to brief the groups on the nuclear issues. We could also prepare a congressional letter for their use.

- We need to get more NGOs to sign on to the Abolition 2000 statement to reach a goal of 1000 by April 1997.

6. CAUCUS PARTICIPATION

Alice asked that everyone in the group contact all people who have attended the Abolition 2000 Caucus meetings to let them know what is happening and to try and increase the participation in the weekly meetings.

7. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will take place at 9am on February 20, 1997 at the Church Center, 777 UN Plaza. Roger Smith will facilitate the meeting.

Alice Slater

GRACE

Global Resource Action Center for the Environment

15 East 26 St., Room 915

New York, NY 10010

212-726-9161 (tel)

212-726-9160 (fax)

aslater@igc.apc.org <email>

From aslater@igc.apc.org Tue Feb 18 14:20:24 1997
Date: Mon, 17 Feb 1997 15:23:23 -0800 (PST)
From: ALICE SLATER <aslater@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Influencing the UK

Dear Friends,

While some of you may have received this message from BASIC, many of you have not and I thought you may have something to contribute. Regards.
Alice Slater

Subject: Foreign Affairs Committee on Arms Control

Foreign Affairs Committee Session on Arms Control

The House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee has scheduled an Oral Evidence Session with David Davis, Minister of State, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, for Tuesday 4 March at 10:30am in Committee Room 15. The meeting is open to the public (access via St Stephen's entrance, 10-15 minutes in advance).

I spoke to the Committee Clerks this morning, who told me that this hearing is intended to be an update on the Committee's 1994/95 inquiry entitled "UK Policy on Weapons Proliferation and Arms Control in the Post-Cold War Era", during which Patricia Lewis of VERTIC and CND gave oral evidence, and a number of other NGOs submitted written evidence. (The Report was published on 30 March 1995 as HC 34-I and HC 34-II of 1994/95.)

This hearing is one of a series of hearings intended to "wrap up" on the issues which the Committee has worked on since the last election. The hearing will be cancelled if Major calls the General Election for March. Evidence will be taken from the Minister and the Committee will also accept letters and submissions from NGOs and the public. No report will be produced, however the hearing provides a major opportunity for MPs to question the Minister on the record.

I am considering making a written submission from BASIC and I know that CND hopes to submit one also. It would be good to talk (via email) and coordinate efforts with anyone else who is thinking of submitting something or of briefing MPs on the Committee.

I think that it would be useful if people contacted the Committee clerks asking for a number of topics (which have arisen since March 1995) to be raised at the hearing. These are my suggestions:

1. The 1995 NPT Agreements: what Britain is doing to implement Principles and Objectives and what is its approach to

the NPT PrepCom.

2. The Canberra Commission recommendations: what Britain is doing to make progress on them. The Generals' Statement should also be brought to the Committee's attention.

3. The CD Agenda: Why Britain is promoting the idea of the CD tackling landmines, rather than seeking further progress on nuclear disarmament.

I have also spoken to Nigel Chamberlain at Cumbria and North Lancs Peace Groups about sending the Committee something on MOX (in view of the fact that their last report on this subject read like a BNFL brochure).

It could also be useful if people who are more knowledgeable about the ICJ ruling than I am, wrote to the Committee clerks about implications of the ICJ opinion.

Letters and submissions should be kept short, polite and to the point. The most effective approach is to write to the Committee asking it to address a particular issue. The Committee cannot change Government policy, but it can scrutinise it and make comments and recommendations and this is important in itself. If the Committee receives a mailbag on a particular issue, that indicates "public interest" and makes its members more likely to address the issue.

Usually the Committee clerks will start working on suggestions for questions to the Minister about a week in advance of the hearing, so if you have time to write a quick letter or send an email to the Committee on this subject, it would be best to do it in the next week.

Letters and/or submissions should be sent to: Dr Christopher Ward, Foreign Affairs Committee, Committee Office, House of Commons, London, SW1A 0AA; tel 0171-219 6106; fax 0171-219 6864; email: foraffcom@parliament.uk.

Best wishes

Nicola Butler

Alice Slater
GRACE
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment
15 East 26 St., Room 915
New York, NY 10010
212-726-9161 (tel)
212-726-9160 (fax)
aslater@igc.apc.org <email>

From wslf@igc.apc.org Tue Feb 18 14:21:21 1997
Date: Mon, 17 Feb 1997 18:35:48 -0800 (PST)
From: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@igc.apc.org>
To: tomatompn+@igc.org
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: News you can use!

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: February 17, 1997
CONTACT: Jackie Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation (510) 839-5877
Marylia Kelley, Tri-Valley CAREs (510) 443-7148
Tom Cochran, Natural Resources Defense Council (202) 289-6868
Howard Crystal, Meyer & Glitzenstein (202) 588-5206

ADVISORY PANEL BIAS ASSAILED BY PUBLIC INTEREST GROUPS
IN FIRST LEGAL CHALLENGE TO NATIONAL IGNITION FACILITY

In a move that could delay construction of the National Ignition Facility (NIF) megalaser, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), Western States Legal Foundation (WSLF), and Tri-Valley CAREs (TVC) have filed suit in federal court against the Department of Energy (DOE) and the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), challenging the operation and recommendations of the Committee for the Review of the DOE Inertial Confinement Fusion (ICF) Program. The ICF Committee, operated under the auspices of the NAS by the National Research Council (NRC), is currently preparing a report for DOE, expected in March, concerning the scientific and technical readiness of the NIF. DOE has announced that a positive recommendation by the Committee (anticipated) will be taken as a "green light" to begin construction of the NIF at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL).

In their complaint, filed Friday, February 14, the three public interest groups charge that the NRC ICF Committee has been established and is being utilized by DOE as an advisory committee within the meaning of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), and has not operated in compliance with any of FACA's requirements:

- no charter has been filed;
- no public notice or access has been provided for meetings or Committee documents;
- the Committee is not fairly balanced; and
- the Committee includes members with inappropriate special interests.

The groups seek to enjoin DOE from relying on any deliberations, reports or recommendations from the ICF Committee and to terminate the Committee's operation.

The NIF, a stadium-sized laser facility, is a "cornerstone" of the \$40 billion (over ten years) "Stockpile Stewardship and Management" program to preserve U.S. capabilities, under the recently-signed Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, to maintain, test, modify, design, and produce nuclear weapons well into the next century. Funded entirely as a defense program, with a projected construction cost of well over \$1 billion, the NIF would use 192 powerful lasers to supply the energy to compress and heat up fuel pellets of radioactive hydrogen (tritium) and deuterium using a technique called Inertial Confinement Fusion (ICF). If the NIF works and "ignition" is achieved, tiny thermonuclear explosions will result. The NIF's principal mission is to increase understanding of nuclear weapons physics and to provide an above-ground simulation technology for testing nuclear weapon effects. Project proponents also hope that the facility will aid in the development of a commercial fusion energy source.

An earlier ICF Committee, chartered by DOE under FACA in 1992 and abolished in early 1996 by Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary, was uncertain whether the NIF could reach its goal of achieving ignition.

According to NRDC's Dr. Thomas Cochran, a named plaintiff in the suit: "Without question the current membership of the NRC's ICF Committee is not balanced. Ten members of the Committee have ties to DOE's fusion program or to LLNL, or have already voiced very positive views regarding NIF. The current ICF Committee should be abolished and reconstituted with a membership that is balanced and unbiased. This action is essential in order to maintain the integrity of both the NRC and the U.S. Government's public policy review process."

Oakland's WSLF and Livermore's TVC, both long-time LLNL watchdog groups and leading NIF opponents, sought and were denied access to ICF Committee documents and to meetings of the Committee held in Livermore in September 1996. WSLF was further excluded from participation in a NGO (non-governmental organization) session of the Committee meeting held at Sandia National Laboratory in Albuquerque in November 1996 and (despite a subsequent written request) from the Committee's December meeting in Washington, DC.

WSLF Executive Director, Jackie Cabasso, summed up her group's concerns about the NIF: "The NIF and the rest of the Stockpile Stewardship Program are clear indicators that the U.S. is unwilling to give up its nuclear weapons any time soon. The continuing commitment to nuclear weapons as core instruments of national policy legitimizes the weapons, which affects other countries' assessment of their desirability and undermines efforts to stop their global spread. This is a very serious situation, which will have implications for generations to come."

Cabasso continued: "Since 1994, we have been assured by DOE and LLNL officials that public interest groups like ours would be

included in NIF policy discussions and oversight activities, but this simply has not happened. Instead, the project has been propelled by a series of promotional reports prepared with our tax dollars by people with serious conflicts of interest. Once again, a hand-picked advisory panel, paid for by DOE, has excluded meaningful public participation. This is another example of DOE's failure to live up to its pledge of 'openness' and another instance of bad faith on the part of the Livermore Lab."

TVC President Marylia Kelley concluded: "DOE is poised to make irrevocable decisions involving billions of dollars while ignoring significant scientific uncertainty and public opinion. To date, the NIF has moved ahead on the basis of biased reports prepared and promoted by individuals who will benefit from the project. This ICF Committee cannot be allowed to stand. We have to put our foot down."

Plaintiffs are represented by the Washington, DC law firm of Meyer & Glitzenstein.

Copies of the complaint and supporting documents, including Dr. Cochran's analysis of the lack of balance in the selection of ICF Committee members, are available upon request.

#

*** Jackie Cabasso * Western States Legal Foundation ***
1440 Broadway, Suite 500 Oakland, California USA 94612
Telephone: +(510)839-5877 / Fax: +(510)839-5397
***** E-mail: WSLF@igc.apc.org *****
Western States Legal Foundation is part of Abolition 2000,
A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

From A.Malten@net.HCC.nlTue Feb 18 14:22:15 1997
Date: Tue, 18 Feb 1997 05:29:44 +0100 (MET)
From: Ak Malten <A.Malten@net.HCC.nl>
To: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@igc.apc.org>
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: News you can use!

Dear Jackie:

You wrote amongst other things:

>FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: February 17, 1997
>CONTACT: Jackie Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation (510)
>839-5877
>Marylia Kelley, Tri-Valley CAREs (510) 443-7148
>Tom Cochran, Natural Resources Defense Council (202) 289-6868
>Howard Crystal, Meyer & Glitzenstein (202) 588-5206
>
> ADVISORY PANEL BIAS ASSAILED BY PUBLIC INTEREST GROUPS
> IN FIRST LEGAL CHALLENGE TO NATIONAL IGNITION FACILITY
>

If you need any support just let me know. GOOD SHOW !!!!

Peace,
or saved by
the pigeon,

Ak Malten,

GANNA.

=====
The Global Anti-Nuclear Alliance (GANNA) -- is a member of
The Abolition 2000 Network, A Global Network to Eliminate
Nuclear Weapons

Address: c/o Ak Malten
Irisstraat 134 Tel:+31.70.3608905
2565TP The Hague Fax:+31.70.3608905
The Netherlands E-Mail: A.Malten@net.HCC.nl

GANNA's website: <http://www.inter.nl.net/hcc/A.Malten>

The ICJ Advisory Opinion on Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons,
including ALL the Separate Opinions of ALL the Judges,
the Canberra Report and the CTBT Text and Protocol can be
found at:

<http://www.inter.nl.net/hcc/A.Malten/docs.html>
=====

From DavidMcR@aol.comTue Feb 18 14:23:11 1997
Date: Tue, 18 Feb 1997 00:17:30 -0500 (EST)
From: DavidMcR@aol.com
To: LEFT-L@cmsa.berkeley.edu
Cc: SPNO@aol.com, cofc@igc.apc.org, tglick@igc.apc.org,
Solidarity@igc.apc.org, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org,
SocNet@home.ease.lsoft.com, Davidhart@igc.org, COC-
L@cmsa.berkeley.edu,
lnp3@columbia.edu, DEMSOC-L@listserv.aol.com,
treysmith <sporegon@igc.apc.org>, Left-L@cmsa.berkeley.edu
Subject: Re: NATIONAL PRIORITIES PETITION DRIVE ON CAMPUSES (2 of 2)

Rich,
Looks good. Can I get a clean copy which we can use in the next WRL Key
List
(goes out last week of March). I've forwarded your text to some of our
own
people but am putting addresses in the CC box - if you haven't contacted
them, you may want to, and if they want to contact you, they can.

Fraternally,
David McReynolds
War Resisters League (and Socialist Party)

From guardian@peg.apc.orgTue Feb 18 14:25:45 1997
Date: Tue, 18 Feb 1997 21:03 AEST
From: Hannah Middleton <guardian@peg.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: repeated request for assistance

TO: Abolition 2000 <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>
FROM: Dr. Hannah Middleton <guardian@peg.apc.org>
DATE: Tues, 18 Feb 1997
SUBJECT: Legal cases citing ICJ ruling

Dear Abolitionists,

We have received two replies for our request for details of any legal cases citing the International Court of Justice ruling on the illegality of nuclear weapons in defending peace activists.

We are most grateful for these but would like to repeat our request - we would still like DETAILS of defences offered and any sympathetic court comments and decisions if anyone has these available and could post them.

yours in peace
Hannah Middleton
Australian Anti-Bases Campaign Coalition
PO Box A899
Sydney South NSW 2000
Australia
ph: 61-2-9267 2772 fax: 61-2-9267 4746
email: guardian@peg.apc.org

From rcowan@lesley.edu Tue Feb 18 14:26:58 1997
Date: Tue, 18 Feb 1997 10:17:24 -0500
From: Rich Cowan <rcowan@lesley.edu>
To: can-peace@pencil.math.missouri.edu
Subject: Challenge the Lie\$ Budget Update: Bad CLINTON BUDGET

This is slightly corrected, using 1998-2002 for comparison, which is more relevant and more accurate regarding the claim of the military budget growing faster than inflation. FYI, inflation rate used is 2.5%.

**** CHALLENGE THE LIE\$ BUDGET UPDATE **** 2/20/97 ****

When President Clinton released his budget proposal just two weeks ago, it was attacked by Republicans as "soft on defense" and way out of line in terms of social spending increases.

Exactly what did Clinton propose?

Well, he has proposed to increase military spending by \$26.8 billion from 1998-2002, while planning to decrease environmental spending by \$0.3 billion over the same period. The EPA would shrink by 13% after factoring in inflation, while the military would grow FASTER than inflation!

Below is a summary of the President's Budget, extracted from the budget tables produced by the White House Office of Management and Budget.

Even though Clinton has proposed significant increases in the budget for Education and for Housing and Urban Development, these increases, \$5.3 billion and \$13.7 billion, even combined with small increases for EPA, Health and Human Services, etc. still do not add up to the whopping \$27.5 billion increase for MILITARY spending.

And if you think the Clinton proposal is bad, just wait until the Republican Congress presents its budget!

Over 50 campuses and eight national organizations are now participating in a petition drive to protest these priorities. For more information, please contact me or see the website <http://envirolink.org/orgs/cco/ctl>

Thanks!

-Rich Cowan
Center for Campus Organizing, Box 748, Cambridge, MA 02142
(617) 354-9363
rcowan@lesley.edu

P.S. numbers below may or may not include secret government spending of \$30B for spy agencies like the CIA and NSA -- anyone know?

Here's the summary of the proposal for all agencies in the Clinton Budget:

SECTION 323 -- SUMMARIES BY AGENCY

Table S-10. DISCRETIONARY BUDGET AUTHORITY BY AGENCY (In billions of dollars)

Agency	Actual					
	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
2002						
Legislative Branch	2.2	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.5
2.5						
The Judiciary	2.8	3.0	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.7
3.8						
Executive Office Of the President ..	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
0.2						
Funds Appropriated to the Pres....	10.8	10.8	15.6	11.9	11.8	11.4
11.3						
Agriculture	15.3	15.3	15.1	15.2	15.4	15.5
15.8						
Commerce	3.7	3.8	4.2	4.9	6.1	4.0
4.0						
Defense-Military	253.6	250.9	251.6	257.2	263.5	270.3
278.4						
Defense-Civil	3.4	3.5	3.8	3.4	3.4	3.4
3.4						
Education	21.4	26.2	29.1	29.8	30.5	31.1
31.5						
Energy	16.4	16.5	19.2	17.6	16.7	16.3
15.8						
Health and Human Services	33.2	34.1	36.3	36.6	36.8	37.1
37.4						
Housing and Urban Development	21.7	19.3	24.8	28.4	30.3	31.7
33.0						
Interior	7.1	6.9	7.4	7.4	7.6	7.5
7.5						
Justice	14.6	16.3	17.1	17.8	16.8	17.0
17.5						
Labor	9.4	10.2	10.8	10.6	10.6	10.7
10.9						
State	4.7	4.8	5.1	5.8	4.9	5.0
5.0						
Transportation	12.7	12.8	12.5	13.7	13.9	14.1
14.3						
Treasury	10.4	10.6	11.8	11.8	11.4	11.6
11.8						
Veterans Affairs	18.3	18.9	18.7	18.7	18.7	18.7
18.7						
Environmental Protection Agency	6.5	6.8	7.6	7.7	7.1	7.2
7.3						
General Services Administration	0.2	0.6	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
0.1						

National Aeronautics & Space Adm...	13.9	13.7	13.5	13.4	13.2	13.2
13.2						
Office of Personnel Management	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
0.2						
Small Business Administration	0.8	0.9	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
0.7						
Social Security Administration	5.0	5.6	5.6	5.5	5.5	5.5
5.5						
Other Independent Agencies	14.0	11.7	13.6	10.8	10.9	10.7
10.7						
Total	502.5	505.8	530.5	535.4	542.5	549.4
560.6						

From rcowan@lesley.edu Tue Feb 18 14:28:17 1997
Date: Tue, 18 Feb 1997 10:15:34 -0500
From: Rich Cowan <rcowan@lesley.edu>
To: vision@igc.apc.org, adaction@ix.netcom.com, basicusa@igc.apc.org,
CEP@echonyc.com, cnp@igc.apc.org, 102375.413@compuserve.com,
pdd@clark.net, funcongov@aol.com, idds@world.std.com,
natprior@crocker.com, ncc_washington.parti@ecunet.org,
ncecd@igc.apc.org, pda@comw.org, paecon@igc.apc.org,
ploughshares@igc.apc.org, spusa@spusa.org, wand@world.std.com,
wandwill@clark.net, wfp@aed.org, wilpfnatl@igc.apc.org,
joseph@stimson.org, pogodef@mnsinc.com, dculp@nrdc.org,
cdavis@clw.org,
dege@taxpayer.net, 71263.401@compuserve.com, mfonte@clw.org,
hn5236@handsnet.org, kvanderh@mail.clark.net, hultgren@taxpayer.net,
jdi@clw.org, wjnsns@aol.com, CLEVAN@HR.HOUSE.GOV, skerr@clw.org,
bridget@fcnl.org, bmusil@psr.org, 73744.3675@compuserve.com,
mpage@MACArthu.macfdn.org, jparachini@stimson.org, tperry@ucsusa.org,
johnpike@mail.clark.net, mrietman@HR.HOUSE.GOV,
kschultz@mail.cdi.org,
aslater@igc.apc.org, msommer@igc.apc.org, cspinney@erols.com,
MTREISMA@HR.HOUSE.GOV, tsipis@mit.edu, ptyler@HR.HOUSE.GOV,
hn0079@handsnet.org, johnpike@fas.org, chellman@cdi.org,
mw0771a@american.edu, washofc@aol.com,
cwu_washington.parti@ecunet.org,
disarmament@igc.apc.org, tom.clements@green2.greenpeace.org,
laws@earthlink.net, dellsberg@igc.apc.org, mccwash@igc.apc.org,
mupj@igc.apc.org, meldredge@igc.apc.org, cpaine@nrdc.org,
hamilton@rtk.net, barbara_green@pcusa.org, uuawo@aol.com,
unsc@gramercy.ios.com, mary@vi.org, wfa@igc.apc.org
Subject: Update on Petition Drive Progress, Leg. Strategy

Dear MSWG folks:

The petition drive for New Priorities has spread to about 50 campuses!
In two days, fifteen campuses have requested petition packets.

Some of you have asked, "what is our legislative strategy"? First,
please note that this is not simply a critique of the president's 1998
budget. In fact, if the president were to propose the same trend for
1999-2002 that he proposes for 1997-8, there would be a net gain in
social spending relative to military spending.

But that's not what the president's long-term proposal does. It
gives the military most of the increase. As a result, without
grassroots pressure, the likely outcome of budget negotiations with
the Republicans is a compromise that will have no significant social
spending increases, and large projected increases in military spending.

If any of you have ideas about ways to spread this around, or link it
with other efforts that focus on the budget, we're open to them. I will
prepare an update flyer for circulation at the next MSWG meeting.

Thanks

-rich

rcowan@lesley.edu

=====
Center for Campus Organizing * Box 748, Cambridge, MA 02142
(617) 354-9363 cco@igc.org * <http://envirolink.org/orgs/cco>

From lforrow@igc.apc.org Tue Feb 18 14:29:16 1997
Date: Tue, 18 Feb 1997 07:46:17 -0800 (PST)
From: Lachlan Forrow <lforrow@igc.apc.org>
To: ALICE SLATER <aslater@igc.apc.org>,
International Peace Bureau <ipb@gn.apc.org>
Cc: 'ABOLITION-CAUCUS' <ABOLITION-CAUCUS@IGC.APC.ORG>,
"Johnson, Rebecca" <acronym@gn.apc.org>,
"Atwood, David" <atwood@pop.unicc.org>,
'ISMUN' <jlonn@nywork2.undp.org>, 'WILPF' <womensleague@gn.apc.org>
Subject: RE: NPT PrepComm

For the goal of reaching 1000 sponsoring NGO's: Is there a current list of sponsors? If that's posted on a web site somewhere, then each of us could check from time to time to help us think of new sponsors we might recruit.

Also, what does it take to be a supporter? (both in terms of the content of an endorsement, and the kind of organization that 'counts')

For example, the American College of Physicians, the American Public Health Association, and the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association (!) have all recently specifically endorsed the "signed global agreement by the year 2000..." nuclear abolition language, but not the 11-point statement.

Finally, should new sponsors respond directly to Pamela?

Lachlan Forrow
PSR/IPPNW and
Albert Schweitzer Fellowship

From jbbloomfield@gn.apc.orgTue Feb 18 14:30:30 1997
Date: Tue, 18 Feb 1997 16:40:28 GMT
From: Janet Bloomfield <jbbloomfield@gn.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Cc: jbbloomfield@gn.apc.org
Subject: Useful media contact

Dear Abolition Friends, I have recently made contact with a media service that is well worth knowing about. Future Events News Service (FENS) is based in London and provides the media worldwide with information about forthcoming events and potential news stories. Their clients include all the major news agencies - UPI, Reuters, AP etc, TV networks including the BBC, CBS, CNN and NHK and major newspapers such as The Times, Asahi Shimbun, New York Times and Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung. To get your forthcoming event or advance news item into them simply send a fax to FENS World Desk on +44 181 672 2282. They have a web site at <http://www.hubcom.com/fens>. which gives further information about the services they offer. FENS full address is Future Events News Service Ltd, FENS House, 8-10 Wiseton Road, London, SW17 7EE. Tel: +44 1818 672 3191/Fax: +44 181 672 2282. Hope this information is useful to you all. Yours in peace, Janet Bloomfield. Convenor - Media Working Group.

From rwilcock@execulink.com Tue Feb 18 14:31:31 1997
Date: Tue, 18 Feb 1997 12:08:23 -0500
From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>
To: 'Lachlan Forrow' <lforrow@IGC.APC.ORG>,
ALICE SLATER <aslater@IGC.APC.ORG>,
International Peace Bureau <ipb@gn.apc.org>
Cc: 'ABOLITION-CAUCUS' <ABOLITION-CAUCUS@IGC.APC.ORG>,
"Johnson, Rebecca" <acronym@gn.apc.org>,
"Atwood, David" <atwood@pop.unicc.org>,
'ISMUN' <jlonn@nywork2.undp.org>, 'WILPF' <womensleague@gn.apc.org>
Subject: RE: NPT PrepComm

Dear Lachlan, Re The Abolition 2000 Endorsers List

There is a WWW list of all Abolition 2000 Endorsers which can be written to online by using an online form. There are currently 690 endorsing organizations and people continue to sign on. There were several signing on in the last few days.

When somebody signs on two things happen:

1. Their organization name is automatically added to the List.
2. Their complete endorsing data is emailed to Xanthe Hall and Pamela Meidell for their convenience and reference.

Endorsements are still received by means other than WWW so the database needs to be periodically updated. This exists but it is not online, as people may not wish their addresses, phone and fax numbers etc to be published. There are several famous individuals listed in the database who may represent "organizations" - but who do not appear on the WWW list. Pamela may wish to respond to this point.

The complete A2000 database is in fact searchable via WWW browser. In a few cases, the data received appears insufficient for verification. When using WWW Endorsement, essential demographic information is required or it will not complete the procedure.

In addition to the Organizational Endorsers there is also an A2000 Petition for individuals to sign. This has been available for a year now and it still has less than one hundred A2000 petitioners!

Both of these are being used globally, but it would be helpful if we could find ways to bring them to attention in people in the deficit areas. These are most notably - China - no endorsers, Russia 90% less than expected and Israel - only by Mordechai Vanunu supporters.

These three nuclear armed countries demonstrate a relatively low index of popular support for getting rid of nuclear weapons. Russia - having more nuclear weapons than anyone has only 10% evidence of popular "A2000 Will" to get rid of them compared with the USA.

These kind of observable facts may have several possible explanations - but they do point up serious issues that need to be taken into account by A2000 strategists.

The tools discussed here are in the A2000 section of Physicians for Global Survival, Canada WWW - at the address below.

Ross Wilcock
rwilcock@web.net
<http://web.net.pgsg/~pgs/>

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

From: Lachlan Forrow [SMTP:lforrow@IGC.APC.ORG]
Sent: 18 February, 1997 10:46
To: ALICE SLATER; International Peace Bureau
Cc: 'ABOLITION-CAUCUS'; 'Johnson, Rebecca'; 'Atwood, David'; 'ISMUN'; 'WILPF'
Subject: RE: NPT PrepComm

For the goal of reaching 1000 sponsoring NGO's: Is there a current list of sponsors? If that's posted on a web site somewhere, then each of us could check from time to time to help us think of new sponsors we might recruit.

Also, what does it take to be a supporter? (both in terms of the content of an endorsement, and the kind of organization that 'counts').

For example, the American College of Physicians, the American Public Health Association, and the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association (!) have all recently specifically endorsed the "signed global agreement by the year 2000..." nuclear abolition language, but not the 11-point statement.

Finally, should new sponsors respond directly to Pamela?

Lachlan Forrow
PSR/IPPNW and
Albert Schweitzer Fellowship

From rwilcock@execulink.com Tue Feb 18 14:32:33 1997
Date: Tue, 18 Feb 1997 12:08:23 -0500
From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>
To: 'Lachlan Forrow' <lforrow@IGC.APC.ORG>,
ALICE SLATER <aslater@IGC.APC.ORG>,
International Peace Bureau <ipb@gn.apc.org>
Cc: 'ABOLITION-CAUCUS' <ABOLITION-CAUCUS@IGC.APC.ORG>,
"Johnson, Rebecca" <acronym@gn.apc.org>,
"Atwood, David" <atwood@pop.unicc.org>,
'ISMUN' <jlonn@nywork2.undp.org>, 'WILPF' <womensleague@gn.apc.org>
Subject: RE: NPT PrepComm

Dear Lachlan, Re The Abolition 2000 Endorsers List

There is a WWW list of all Abolition 2000 Endorsers which can be written to online by using an online form. There are currently 690 endorsing organizations and people continue to sign on. There were several signing on in the last few days.

When somebody signs on two things happen:

1. Their organization name is automatically added to the List.
2. Their complete endorsing data is emailed to Xanthe Hall and Pamela Meidell for their convenience and reference.

Endorsements are still received by means other than WWW so the database needs to be periodically updated. This exists but it is not online, as people may not wish their addresses, phone and fax numbers etc to be published. There are several famous individuals listed in the database who may represent "organizations" - but who do not appear on the WWW list. Pamela may wish to respond to this point.

The complete A2000 database is in fact searchable via WWW browser. In a few cases, the data received appears insufficient for verification. When using WWW Endorsement, essential demographic information is required or it will not complete the procedure.

In addition to the Organizational Endorsers there is also an A2000 Petition for individuals to sign. This has been available for a year now and it still has less than one hundred A2000 petitioners!

Both of these are being used globally, but it would be helpful if we could find ways to bring them to attention in people in the deficit areas. These are most notably - China - no endorsers, Russia 90% less than expected and Israel - only by Mordechai Vanunu supporters.

These three nuclear armed countries demonstrate a relatively low index of popular support for getting rid of nuclear weapons. Russia - having more nuclear weapons than anyone has only 10% evidence of popular "A2000 Will" to get rid of them compared with the USA.

These kind of observable facts may have several possible explanations - but they do point up serious issues that need to be taken into account by A2000 strategists.

The tools discussed here are in the A2000 section of Physicians for Global Survival, Canada WWW - at the address below.

Ross Wilcock
rwilcock@web.net
<http://web.net.pgsg/~pgs/>

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

From: Lachlan Forrow [SMTP:lforrow@IGC.APC.ORG]
Sent: 18 February, 1997 10:46
To: ALICE SLATER; International Peace Bureau
Cc: 'ABOLITION-CAUCUS'; 'Johnson, Rebecca'; 'Atwood, David'; 'ISMUN'; 'WILPF'
Subject: RE: NPT PrepComm

For the goal of reaching 1000 sponsoring NGO's: Is there a current list of sponsors? If that's posted on a web site somewhere, then each of us could check from time to time to help us think of new sponsors we might recruit.

Also, what does it take to be a supporter? (both in terms of the content of an endorsement, and the kind of organization that 'counts').

For example, the American College of Physicians, the American Public Health Association, and the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association (!) have all recently specifically endorsed the "signed global agreement by the year 2000..." nuclear abolition language, but not the 11-point statement.

Finally, should new sponsors respond directly to Pamela?

Lachlan Forrow
PSR/IPPNW and
Albert Schweitzer Fellowship

From rwilcock@execulink.com Tue Feb 18 14:34:42 1997
Date: Tue, 18 Feb 1997 12:08:23 -0500
From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>
To: 'Lachlan Forrow' <lforrow@IGC.APC.ORG>,
ALICE SLATER <aslater@IGC.APC.ORG>,
International Peace Bureau <ipb@gn.apc.org>
Cc: 'ABOLITION-CAUCUS' <ABOLITION-CAUCUS@IGC.APC.ORG>,
"Johnson, Rebecca" <acronym@gn.apc.org>,
"Atwood, David" <atwood@pop.unicc.org>,
'ISMUN' <jlonn@nywork2.undp.org>, 'WILPF' <womensleague@gn.apc.org>
Subject: RE: NPT PrepComm

Dear Lachlan, Re The Abolition 2000 Endorsers List

There is a WWW list of all Abolition 2000 Endorsers which can be written to online by using an online form. There are currently 690 endorsing organizations and people continue to sign on. There were several signing on in the last few days.

When somebody signs on two things happen:

1. Their organization name is automatically added to the List.
2. Their complete endorsing data is emailed to Xanthe Hall and Pamela Meidell for their convenience and reference.

Endorsements are still received by means other than WWW so the database needs to be periodically updated. This exists but it is not online, as people may not wish their addresses, phone and fax numbers etc to be published. There are several famous individuals listed in the database who may represent "organizations" - but who do not appear on the WWW list. Pamela may wish to respond to this point.

The complete A2000 database is in fact searchable via WWW browser. In a few cases, the data received appears insufficient for verification. When using WWW Endorsement, essential demographic information is required or it will not complete the procedure.

In addition to the Organizational Endorsers there is also an A2000 Petition for individuals to sign. This has been available for a year now and it still has less than one hundred A2000 petitioners!

Both of these are being used globally, but it would be helpful if we could find ways to bring them to attention in people in the deficit areas. These are most notably - China - no endorsers, Russia 90% less than expected and Israel - only by Mordechai Vanunu supporters.

These three nuclear armed countries demonstrate a relatively low index of popular support for getting rid of nuclear weapons. Russia - having more nuclear weapons than anyone has only 10% evidence of popular "A2000 Will" to get rid of them compared with the USA.

These kind of observable facts may have several possible explanations - but they do point up serious issues that need to be taken into account by A2000 strategists.

The tools discussed here are in the A2000 section of Physicians for Global Survival, Canada WWW - at the address below.

Ross Wilcock
rwilcock@web.net
<http://web.net.pgs/~pgs/>

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

From: Lachlan Forrow [SMTP:lforrow@IGC.APC.ORG]
Sent: 18 February, 1997 10:46
To: ALICE SLATER; International Peace Bureau
Cc: 'ABOLITION-CAUCUS'; 'Johnson, Rebecca'; 'Atwood, David'; 'ISMUN'; 'WILPF'
Subject: RE: NPT PrepComm

For the goal of reaching 1000 sponsoring NGO's: Is there a current list of sponsors? If that's posted on a web site somewhere, then each of us could check from time to time to help us think of new sponsors we might recruit.

Also, what does it take to be a supporter? (both in terms of the content of an endorsement, and the kind of organization that 'counts').

For example, the American College of Physicians, the American Public Health Association, and the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association (!) have all recently specifically endorsed the "signed global agreement by the year 2000..." nuclear abolition language, but not the 11-point statement.

Finally, should new sponsors respond directly to Pamela?

Lachlan Forrow
PSR/IPPNW and
Albert Schweitzer Fellowship

From kschultz@mail.cdi.orgTue Feb 18 14:47:34 1997
Date: Tue, 18 Feb 1997 15:46:09 -0500
From: kathryn schultz <kschultz@mail.cdi.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: NATO Expansion

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

Greetings!

Thought y'all might be interested in this speech which Admiral Shanahan will deliver on the Hill in a little over an hour. It can also be found on the issues section of our web page (<http://www.cdi.org/issues/>) under European Security.

Hasta,

Kathryn

Given the chats Prepared Remarks to the Progressive Caucus of the U.S. Congress RE: NATO Expansion for Vice Admiral John J. Shanahan, USN (Ret.) Director, Center for Defense Information 18 February 1997 For more information, contact Kathryn Schultz (contact information at bottom).

In his State of the Union Speech two weeks ago, President Clinton stated that "we stand at another moment of change and choice --and another time to be farsighted, to bring America 50 more years of security and prosperity. In this endeavor, our first task is to help to build, for the first time, an undivided, democratic Europe. When Europe is stable, prosperous and at peace, America is more secure."

I couldn't agree more. I strongly disagree, however, with the President's methodology for building this undivided, democratic Europe, namely the expansion of the NATO alliance. In fact, I would argue that the very way in which he plans to build this peaceful, stable, and prosperous Europe will actually make the world less peaceful, Europe less stable, and America less prosperous.

LESS PEACEFUL:

NATO was formed to shield Western Europe against Soviet military aggression. This purpose no longer exists. The Soviet Union vanished. It's alliance, the Warsaw Pact, is dead. But, NATO? No, the now-16-member nations of NATO are determined not only to maintain NATO's preeminent role in Western Europe, but also to expand the alliance eastward. To paraphrase Star Trek, NATO is "searching out new life and new civilizations" in the form of new members in order to justify its continued existence in the absence of any real mission or threat.

This is a provocative and dangerous policy. Already, talk of expanding NATO eastward has clouded U.S.-Russian relations and threatens to undermine rather than enhance the security of Europe and the world. Perhaps George Kennan stated it best in his 5 February 1997 editorial in the New York Times, when he wrote "expanding NATO would be the most fateful error of American policy in the entire post-cold-war era."

First, expanding the NATO alliance will likely increase anti-Western sentiment and may undermine democratic reform in Russia.

The United States and its NATO allies promote NATO as a non-threatening entity with only positive qualities to bring to the European stage. Secretary Albright has compared NATO expansion to the Marshall Plan. "We need to do for Central and Eastern Europe what was done for Western Europe after the second World War; that is, try to provide some sense of stability, try to make sure that ethnic conflicts and border disputes don't overwhelm, and that is what NATO expansion is about. It is not anti-Russian." (27 January)

All the reassuring words proffered by U.S. and NATO officials also cannot erase history. For 45 years, Russia understandably considered NATO the foremost threat to Russian security. Throughout the Cold War, NATO was described in official Soviet literature as "a military bloc of capitalist countries under American leadership, directed against the USSR and other peaceful countries." This baggage will not disappear overnight. According to Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin, the West "wants us to explain to our people that there is nothing to fear. How am I supposed to explain it to my people" who have been brought up to believe "NATO is the enemy?" (3 Feb. 1997, WP)

Chernomyrdin also argued that the real danger is not whether or not other nations join up with NATO but what effect that will have on the situation within Russia. He told the Washington Post that "I'm not afraid that Poland

or Hungary or anyone else will be within NATO. It is not so dangerous for Russia. The thing is I'm worried about Russia, what might happen in Russia, and nothing else. ...Developments in Russia could take an ominous turn." Ultrationalists like Vladimir Zhirinovskiy "will accuse the president and the government of doing nothing to prevent this development . . . so we have to arm ourselves. The production facilities are there in brand new condition, they are waiting," he said. "This is how the employment problem will be resolved. . . . The tanks will be rolling out, and the planes. Do we need this?"

Opposition to NATO expansion seems to be one of the few things that varying political factions in Russia can agree on. To many, it represents a Western attempt to gloat over their self-proclaimed victory in the Cold War. In the words of The Jerusalem Post (9 February 1997) "This has gone beyond a celebration of the end of Communism, which most Russians could share quite happily, to a perception that Russia as a nation was somehow defeated."

According to Russian presidential Chief of Staff Anatolii Chubais, this was a matter on which he agreed with Messrs. Zyuganov and Zhirinovskiy "for the first time in his life". (Speech to the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, 3 February 1997) Chubais warned that if NATO accepts new members without addressing Russian concerns, it would be "the biggest mistake the West has made in 50 years." He believes that NATO expansion would trigger "serious changes" in European politics and force Russia to reconsider its attitude toward Western economic institutions. He argued that advocates of NATO expansion, "not understanding the real situation in Russia," were actually playing into the hands of "nationalists" and "anti-Western forces" in Moscow.

By pursuing NATO expansion and by clinging to thousands of nuclear weapons, in the words of then-Secretary Perry, as a "hedge" against a resurgent Russia, the United States may well be provoking the Russians to take actions that we do not want. In October 1995, Dr. Sergey Rogov, the insightful director of the Russian Academy of Sciences' Institute of USA and Canada Studies, warned that "treating Russia like an inevitably aggressive state today may encourage belligerence in the future rather than deter it. Russia is still a military superpower with a huge area and a large population. It is a country with enormous economic capabilities which has extraordinary potential for good or ill. But now it is a humiliated country

in search of identity and direction. To a certain extent, the West and its position on NATO expansion will determine what direction Russia chooses. The future of the European security depends on this decision."

Senator Sam Nunn used similar reasoning recently in warning against actions which might push Russia in the wrong direction: "We will not be doing anyone in Europe a favor if, by taking certain action regarding NATO expansion, we end up giving an edge in the political process to the most extremist elements in Russia....Although the West cannot control events in Russia, and probably can assist political and economic reform there only on the margins, as the medical doctors say, our first principle should be to do no harm."

Second, NATO expansion could renew a conventional arms race with Russia or, even worse, push Russia to rely more heavily upon its nuclear arsenal.

NATO expansion means that the mighty NATO military machine will move ever closer in proximity and will grow in terms of military capability. According to Chernomyrdin, (3 February 1997, Washington Post) "We know the military component of NATO. We know that NATO means a powerful nuclear presence, nuclear forces, and all of this is being moved toward Russia." If Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary join NATO, the zone of NATO's responsibility will grow by 650-750 km in the east, thus considerably reducing the buffer zone between the bloc's states and Russia. NATO's military capabilities will also grow.

According to Duma First Vice-Speaker Alexander Shokhin (3 February 1997 press-conference), "This will demand adequate measures on the part of Russia, amounting above all to its arms modernisation." Shokhin pointed out that if NATO makes use of military aerodroms left in East European states for its strategic aviation, then Russia will have to resume the production of strategic bombers.

Many believe that Russia would be hard pressed to find money to renew a conventional arms race. This could push them even closer to the nuclear trigger. Then-Senator Sam Nunn gave a moving speech in October 1995 warning that "if NATO's enlargement stays on its current course, reaction in Russia is almost inevitably going to be a sense of isolation by those that are committed to democracy and democratic reform with varying degrees of paranoia, nationalism, and demagoguery emerging from across the current

political spectrum.... Because a conventional military response from Russia in answer to NATO enlargement is not feasible economically, a nuclear response in the form of a higher alert status for Russia's remaining strategic nuclear weapons and conceivably renewed deployment of tactical nuclear weapons is more likely. I recall very well when the United States and our allies felt we were overwhelmed with conventional forces by the former Soviet Union. How did we respond? We responded by building up tactical nuclear forces. We responded by deploying thousands of tactical nuclear forces because we did not have the artillery tubes to meet the conventional challenge. Are we confident the Russians would be so different from us if they truly have a nationalistic surge and end up believing the NATO enlargement is a threat to them? I am not confident that would not be their response as it was ours years ago. The security of NATO, Russia's neighbors and the countries of Eastern Europe will not be enhanced if the Russian military finger moves closer to the nuclear trigger."

Third, the increased tensions between the United States and Russia could undermine other real security interests, leaving the world much less secure.

This sentiment was expressed again by then Senator Sam Nunn when he warned

his colleagues that "we must avoid being so preoccupied with NATO enlargement that we ignore the consequences it may have for even more important security priorities." (October 1995) Priorities such as reducing

the numbers of nuclear and conventional weapons directed at the United States and its European allies under the CFE and START I and II Treaties as

well as multilateral efforts to control the spread of materials and technology which could be used to turn Minneapolis, Madrid, or Munich into

the next Hiroshima. We've already seen the prospect of NATO expansion hinder

the Russian Duma's ratification of the START II Treaty -- which if implemented will eliminate all Russian MIRVed ICBMs including the feared SS-18.

LESS STABLE:

Advocates of NATO expansion claim that enlargement will make Europe a more stable, democratic, and prosperous continent. However, should NATO expand eastward, as is expected, it will not welcome all of the nations of Europe

at once, if ever. It is expected that NATO will announce this summer at its

summit in Madrid which countries will be admitted into the alliance by the

year 1999. Most analysts expect that this group will only include Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic. This limited expansion eastward will accomplish exactly what US officials claim they do not want: new dividing

lines in Europe.

While accepting Poland, for example, in NATO may help the Poles feel more secure, it will not enhance the security of Lithuania. "Ironically, those countries with the most valid concerns in this regard [the possibility of future Russian aggression]... are, because of their proximity to Russia, the least likely to gain NATO membership in the short run," cautioned Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-Texas) on the floor of the Senate in October 1995.

"The people of these countries are unlikely to feel more secure if NATO expands eastward but stops short of their borders, in effect, placing them in a buffer zone between an enlarged NATO and a more paranoid Russia."

You cannot be the principal security organization in a peaceful Europe without including all of the nations of Europe, and, most importantly, the largest nation in Europe. We've heard time and time again from US and NATO officials that "security in Europe cannot be established without Russia." (NATO Secretary General Javier Solana, 16 January 1997, in Austria) Unfortunately, to those in NATO, including Russia means doing joint exercises on occasion through the Partnership for Peace and signing a treaty. Instead of truly modifying itself into a political organization which includes Russia, NATO continues to treat Russia as an outsider. While it's important to establish friendly ties with Russia, singling them out in a treaty is not the way to go. Instead, if we really want NATO to be the chief security organization in Europe, then Russia should be made a member. Better yet, NATO should be downplayed rather than expanded and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) fashioned as the principal security organization for Europe. After all, the OSCE already includes all of the nations of Europe on an equal footing and deals with all aspects of security - political, social, economic, environmental, and military.

LESS PROSPEROUS:

Expansion of the NATO military alliance could result in a less prosperous America. According to a March 1996 study by the Congressional Budget Office, expanding NATO will cost between \$61 Billion and \$125 Billion through 2010. An April 1996 study by Rand, funded by the Pentagon, put the cost at between \$14 Billion and \$110 Billion over the next decade. The Pentagon, eager to expand the NATO military alliance, takes Rand's cheapest option at \$14

Billion with the necessary US contribution estimated at about \$100 million per year. These costs vary depending on many things including how many countries join NATO, how much improvement is needed in their infrastructure to allow for rapid reaction by NATO forces in the case of crisis, and whether or not NATO troops and forces are deployed in new member states.

Secretary of State Madeline Albright has downplayed the cost saying that new members "are not coming in as kind of scholarship students who are not earning their way.... Those countries that will be invited in will be those who can carry their share of the burden." While it is true that members will be required to meet a variety of standards, if past is prologue, then we shouldn't count on having new members carry the majority of the burden. When I served at NATO headquarters, we Americans were always concerned about burdensharing. NATO set various standards with regard to defense spending, weapons stockpiles, and the like. Rarely did our allies meet these levels; the United States carried the bulk of the load. If the United States could not count on its healthy, wealthy, and powerful Western European allies to carry their share of the load, what will it be like if economically troubled nations join NATO?

It will also be expensive to ensure the inter-operability of forces in an expanded NATO. Many of these nations will seek to buy U.S. modern weapons. We already see Congress and the Administration pushing U.S. weapons. The FY 1996 foreign operations appropriations bill which allocates \$3.2 Billion for foreign military financing (FMF), the bulk of which is for Israel and Egypt, included a directive to the Clinton administration "to take steps to ensure that U.S.- produced [combat] aircraft can compete effectively" for sales to Eastern Europe. The U.S. Air Force is negotiating the sale of 100 F-16 fighter aircraft to Poland and some number of F-16s to the Czech Republic. The Navy is also courting the Czech Republic to buy F/A-18 fighter aircraft. The problem is money. For example, Poland could only buy one F-16 with the money allocated in its defense budget for imported military equipment. Because these nations cannot afford to purchase weapons, especially those

made by Uncle Sam, without loans and credits from the producing nation, the bulk of financing will come out of the pockets of American taxpayers.

SO, WHY NATO?

What will an expanded NATO mean for the citizens of the United States?

Reform in Russia may be thwarted leading to greater insecurity in the world.

Relations between Russia and the United States will be harmed, to the point

that important treaties already signed may be junked and follow-on treaties

may never be reached. It could prompt the Russians to rely more heavily on

their nuclear arsenal. We will likely see increased tension in Europe as a

whole, with greater infighting between the newly-accepted members of NATO and their European siblings not yet invited into the prestigious NATO club.

It will mean that American taxdollars which could be spent on more pressing

matters both at home and abroad will be shifted to improve the military infrastructure in Eastern Europe and to help Poland buy F-16s.

Furthermore,

it means that the United States would face an increased risk of sending its

sons and daughters into battle to defend NATO's newest members. Such a battle could involve nuclear weapons.

So, why the preoccupation with NATO in light of all these negatives? For

some, it's a matter of saving what served you well in the past for use in the future. But, while cannons were useful in the Revolutionary War, they are not needed in today's world. Some political leaders believe that expanding NATO is the only way to preserve it, and that it is imperative to

preserve NATO in order to save our seat at the head of the table of Europe.

But, speaking as a retired Admiral for a minute, many in the military want

to save NATO for more personal reasons. These individuals directly benefit

from the perpetuation of this very rewarding institution which justifies large forces and a top-heavy command structure. When I was the military adviser to the U.S. Permanent Representative to NATO, I saw first hand the

rewards -- the promotions, the chalets -- and the rigors -- the meetings in

which the biggest decision was over who provided the aircraft for the next

fishing expedition -- of serving at NATO headquarters in Brussels, Belgium.

I find this obsession with NATO very disturbing. Clinging to a military organization when the principle concerns today are political and economic is unwise and dangerous. Furthermore, the United States does not need NATO to remain engaged in Europe. Through trade, diplomacy, and, more directly, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the United States can and should remain actively engaged in Europe. I believe that NATO should be given a medal and put to bed. Failing that, if we choose to expand NATO, we'd better modify it from a common defense organization to a collective security organization and expand it all the way to include Russia from the beginning.

=====
Kathryn R. Schultz
Senior Research Analyst
Center for Defense Information
1500 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Suite 24
Washington, DC 20005
202-862-0700 (Phone)
202-862-0708 (Fax)
kschultz@cdi.org (E-mail)
<http://www.cdi.org> (CDI's home page)
<http://www.cdi.org/kschultz> (personal home page)
=====

From ippnwbos@igc.apc.orgWed Feb 19 05:07:29 1997
Date: Tue, 18 Feb 1997 14:24:18 -0800 (PST)
From: ippnwbos@igc.apc.org
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: uk press

forwarded

>From: amok@amok.antenna.nl (STICHTING AMOK)
>To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
>Subject: uk press
>Date: Fri, 14 Feb 1997 12:10:00 +0200
>Message-Id: <021497121024Rnf0.79b5@amok.antenna.nl>
>Organization: Stichting AMOK Utrecht
>Reply-To: amok@amok.antenna.nl
>X-Mailer: Rnf 0.79b5

>

>Dear Stewart Kemp,
>good plan, please continue with the press news.
>Karel Koster (Working Group Eurobomb Holland)

>

>

Michael Christ Program Director
International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War
126 Rogers St. Cambridge, MA 02142 USA
tel. (617)868-5050 fax. (617)868-2560
ippnwbos@igc.apc.org <http://www.healthnet.org/IPPNW>

IPPNW is part of Abolition 2000: A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

From prop1@prop1.orgWed Feb 19 05:08:07 1997
Date: Wed, 19 Feb 1997 00:12:29 -0500 (EST)
From: peace through reason <prop1@prop1.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Lost in Cyberspace

Bugs have eaten the last two days worth of e-mail.

If there was anything sent between 2/14/97 and 2/18/97 which anyone wants
us
to know about, please re-send the information.

From nfznsc@gn.apc.org Wed Feb 19 05:08:57 1997
Date: Mon, 17 Feb 1997 19:35:44 GMT
From: National Steering Ctte Nuclear Free Local Authorities
<nfznsc@gn.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: UK Nuclear News 15-17 February 1997

>From GMR@MCR1.poptel.org.uk Mon Feb 17 15:37:00 1997
Received: from MCR1.poptel.org.uk by gnew.gn.apc.org (8.8.5/Revision:
2.06 03 December 1996)
id PAA11582; Mon, 17 Feb 1997 15:36:27 GMT
From: GMR@MCR1.poptel.org.uk
Date: Mon, 17 Feb 1997 15:35:45 GMT
Subject: NPU Bulletin 15-17 Feb
To: nfznsc@gn.apc.org
Message-Id: <297177306MCR1@MCR1.poptel.org.uk>
Status: R

DAILY INFORMATION BULLETIN - NUCLEAR POLICY

Sat 15 Feb - Mon 17 Feb

97-8157 John Carlin on the US senator, Jesse Helms, who is trying to
block a global ban on chemical weapons. SInd 16 Feb
97-8158 Cost of building Trident refit dock in Devonport believed to be
at least #120m more than originally budgeted. STimes 16 Feb

GM Research, Metropolitan House, Hobson Street, Oldham, OL1 1QD.
Tel: 0161-911 4179. Fax: 0161-627 1736.
Internet: gmr@mcr1.poptel.org.uk

From acronym@gn.apc.orgWed Feb 19 05:09:39 1997
Date: Mon, 17 Feb 1997 13:18:45 GMT
From: Rebecca Johnson <acronym@gn.apc.org>
To: ALICE SLATER <aslater@igc.apc.org>, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: NPT PrepComm

Dear Alice and friends at Abolition Caucus,
Firstly, my thanks to you for you very full and useful reports from the
Tahiti meetings, much appreciated.

Secondly, NPT PrepCom

I have been discussing the likely structure and intentions for the
upcoming
NPT PrepCom with many of the key Geneva ambassadors, but have not posted
you
information since it is still up in the air and hasn't got beyond the
planning stage.

The information from the UN Center for Disarmament Affairs that the main
planning is being done in Geneva is correct (and usual, so not sure why
Colin Archer sounded surprised by this!). The key disarmament
ambassadors

are there and have begun meeting informally to discuss what to do in NY.
The coordinators for the Western Group and the NAM at the NPT are
expected

to be the UK and Indonesia, both of which have begun convening meetings.
In

addition a number of NGOs are trying to stimulate debate, for example,
the

Quaker UN Office and CESD (David Atwood and Sharon Riggles) organised a
very

useful seminar last month to kick things off. PPNN and Monterey have
been

convening their usual excellent meetings with ambassadors to stimulate
forward thinking too.

However, although ideas are beginning to emerge, there are no clear
programmes yet. If I get useful information or if things clarify I will
let

you know. Note of warning: since this is the first, even if they decide
on

a clear programme, there is no guarantee that this will be how it
happens.

>From procedure to substance, a lot is up for grabs, and a lot will be
determined (or stumbled on) at the meeting itself -- which is why it is
important for NGOs to help set the agenda with intelligent and focused
information.

On an admin note, in addition to letting Alice know your accommodation
needs

in NY, please can you ensure that you let the NGO Committee (Vernon
Nichols,

Ann Lakhdar or Roger Smith) if you intend to be at the NPT, and your
dates

(for the whole or part of April 7-18). This is important even if you
don't

need their help getting a UN pass, as it helps in circulation of the information and any diary dates for invitation events as well as open meetings.

hope this is helpful,
rebecca

=====
Disarmament Intelligence Review
24, Colvestone Crescent
London E8 2LH
England
Tel/fax: +44 171 241 4691

email: acronym@gn.apc.org
=====

From jburroughs@igc.apc.orgWed Feb 19 16:51:55 1997
Date: Wed, 19 Feb 1997 09:37:43 -0800 (PST)
From: John Burroughs <jburroughs@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, acronym@gn.apc.org, aslater@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: NPT PrepComm

Hi Rebecca - Because Western States has received inquiries from states regarding ideas to push at the prep com, we would URGENTLY like to know what NGOs have been proposing in addition to the Abolition 2000 and Parliamentarians for Global Action proposal to focus on 1) commencement of negotiations on an abolition convention and 2) implementation of the Canberra Commission immediate measures (taking nuclear forces off alert etc.). Thanks - John

From geowcpuk@gn.apc.orgWed Feb 19 16:52:55 1997
Date: Wed, 19 Feb 1997 16:51:05 GMT
From: George Farebrother <geowcpuk@gn.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Cities Declaration

Dear Abolitioners

Following the Ross/Lachlan correspondence, I have one query. Does endorsement of the A2000 cities Declaration carry qualify a Local Authority as an official A2000 endorser in the same way as signing the A2000 Statement would?

George Farebrother
***** World Court Project UK George
Farebrother, UK Secretary 67, Summerheath Rd, Hailsham, Sussex
BN27 3DR Phone & Fax 01323 844 269, Email geowcpuk@gn.apc.org

From NABbasic@aol.comWed Feb 19 16:53:45 1997
Date: Wed, 19 Feb 1997 12:02:16 -0500 (EST)
From: NABbasic@aol.com
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: NPT PrepCom - Report from Dan Plesch in Geneva

To: Interested parties
Dt: 13 Feb 1997
Re: NPT PrepCom plans

Possible structure for the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
PrepCom

Following discussions with Geneva-based diplomats, a tentative plan for the NPT PrepCom, scheduled for 7-18 April 1997, is emerging. The majority of the nine working days of the two-week session (one is a holiday) are likely to be spent on substantive issues. While the 3+1 nuclear-weapons states favor a stronger procedural orientation, the overwhelming feeling amongst Treaty parties, including leading Western states, is that the meeting must set a good precedent for the new review process. It must, as Canada describes, be qualitatively different from the old process.

A possible structure for the April meeting is a half a day on opening and procedural matters for this meeting (choice of chair, finances, agenda), one-two days general debate, half a day for NGO presentations, four-five days of review following the main committee structure in series rather than in parallel, and finally two days on future procedural matters. This Main Committee review in series allows for the fact that few delegations will have the staff for three committees in parallel.

It appears that discussions on the CD agenda and the Prepcom are becoming more linked politically. In particular the creation of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament is being linked to any bargaining that may have to take place over the NPT process.

From nfznsc@gn.apc.orgWed Feb 19 16:54:53 1997
Date: Wed, 19 Feb 1997 17:38:29 GMT
From: Stewart Kemp <nfznsc@gn.apc.org>
To: nfla.news@conf.gn.apc.org
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: UK Nuclear News 18-19 February 1997

>From: GMR@MCR1.poptel.org.uk
>Date: Wed, 19 Feb 1997 11:48:20 GMT
>Subject: NPU Bulletin 19 Feb
>To: nfznsc@gn.apc.org
>
>DAILY INFORMATION BULLETIN - NUCLEAR POLICY
>
>Weds 19 Feb 1997
>
>97-8165 US proposes that Nato and Russia form permanent joint military
> brigade. G,Ind,FT
>
>Tues 18 Feb 1997 - nil -
>
>
>GM Research, Metropolitan House, Hobson Street, Oldham, OL1 1QD.
>Tel: 0161-911 4179. Fax: 0161-627 1736.
>Internet: gmr@mcr1.poptel.org.uk
>
>

Stewart Kemp (nfznsc@gn.apc.org)

From pmeidell@igc.apc.org Wed Feb 19 16:55:43 1997
Date: Wed, 19 Feb 1997 10:17:19 -0800 (PST)
From: Pamela Meidell <pmeidell@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, geowcpuk@gn.apc.org
Subject: Re: Cities Declaration

Dear George,

On the face of it I wouldn't say that a local authority signing onto the Abolition 2000 cities declaration is the same as becoming an official endorser

by signing the original Abolition 2000 Statement, especially since post-Tahiti, all new signers of the statement are also signing onto the Moorea Declaration. Thanks for raising the question.

Pamela

Pamela S. Meidell
Director
The Atomic Mirror/Earth Trust Foundation
P.O. Box 220
Port Hueneme, California, USA 93044-0220
tel: +1 805/985 5073
fax: +1 805/985 7563
email: pmeidell@igc.apc.org

The Atomic Mirror is part of Abolition 2000:
A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons,
and facilitates its Global Network Office

> From owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org Wed Feb 19 09:54:18 1997

> >From majordomo Wed Feb 19 09:54:18 1997

> Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus>

> Received: (from majordomo@localhost)

> by igc7.igc.org (8.8.5/8.8.5) id IAA23998;

> Wed, 19 Feb 1997 08:55:53 -0800 (PST)

> X-Authentication-Warning: igc7.igc.org: Processed from queue
/var/spool/mqueue-maj

> Received: from gn.apc.org (gn.apc.org [194.202.158.2])

> by igc7.igc.org (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id IAA22803

> for <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>; Wed, 19 Feb 1997 08:51:08 -0800
(PST)

> Received: by gn.apc.org (8.8.5/Revision: 1.33 03 December 1996)

> id QAA02594; Wed, 19 Feb 1997 16:51:05 GMT

> Date: Wed, 19 Feb 1997 16:51:05 GMT

> From: George Farebrother <geowcpuk@gn.apc.org>

> Message-Id: <199702191651.QAA02594@gn.apc.org>

> Subject: Cities Declaration

> To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

> Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

> Precedence: bulk

>

> Dear Abolitioners

>
> Following the Ross/Lachlan correspondence, I have one query. Does
> endorsement of the A2000 cities Declaration carry qualify a Local
> Authority as an official A2000 endorser in the same way as signing
> the A2000 Statement would?

>
> George Farebrother
> ***** World Court Project UK George
> Farebrother, UK Secretary 67, Summerheath Rd, Hailsham, Sussex
> BN27 3DR Phone & Fax 01323 844 269, Email geowcpuk@gn.apc.org

From rwilcock@execulink.comWed Feb 19 16:56:26 1997
Date: Wed, 19 Feb 1997 14:49:34 -0500
From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>
To: 'George Farebrother' <geowcpuk@gn.apc.org>,
"abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>
Subject: RE: Cities Declaration

That is a good point George - I think a City's Declaration should imply endorsement - and all such cities should be on the list!

There are already some UK cities and Councils on the list eg Bolsover and Leeds I think. Sheffield should be - and probably many others.

If a decision is made, it would be helpful if the name of a responsible person with address etc could be provided for the database.

The list itself is just a list and a new batch can be added to it. Cities and Councils can of course add their own Endorsements using the WWW. method

This "upgrade" should be confirmed by the A2000 Steering Committee.

Ross Wilcock
rwilcock@web.net
<http://web.net.pgs/~pgs/>

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

From: George Farebrother [SMTP:geowcpuk@gn.apc.org]
Sent: 19 February, 1997 11:51
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Cities Declaration

Dear Abolitioners

Following the Ross/Lachlan correspondence, I have one query. Does endorsement of the A2000 cities Declaration carry qualify a Local Authority as an official A2000 endorser in the same way as signing the A2000 Statement would?

George Farebrother

***** World Court Project UK George
Farebrother, UK Secretary 67, Summerheath Rd, Hailsham, Sussex
BN27 3DR Phone & Fax 01323 844 269, Email geowcpuk@gn.apc.org

From aslater@igc.apc.orgWed Feb 19 16:57:04 1997
Date: Wed, 19 Feb 1997 12:41:01 -0800 (PST)
From: ALICE SLATER <aslater@igc.apc.org>
To: NABbasic@aol.com, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: NPT PrepCom - Report from Dan Plesch in Geneva

Thanks for the report Dan. Any chance of coming out of this with a commitment to begin negotiations in 1997 leading to a convention and to implement the remaining five immediate recommendations of the Canberra Commission in 97? We were hoping to get such a commitment similar to the promise we got in '95 to negotiate a CTB. Is there anything further you would recommend for the Abolition Network to pursue in order to get that result? Many thanks. Regards,

Alice Slater

GRACE

Global Resource Action Center for the Environment
15 East 26 St., Room 915
New York, NY 10010
212-726-9161 (tel)
212-726-9160 (fax)
aslater@igc.apc.org <email>

From panukes@igc.apc.org Wed Feb 19 16:58:17 1997
Date: Wed, 19 Feb 1997 14:06:30 -0800 (PST)
From: Peace Action - National Office <panukes@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: letter on START III

Dear abolitionists:

Here is a copy of a model letter that Peace Action activists and others are sending to their senators to generate movement on this START III framework agreement idea before the Clinton-Yeltsin Summit in March.

You can format it to become a letter to President Clinton that can be sent from your organization whether you're in the US or not -- I think it would be great for Clinton and Yeltsin to hear from European and Canadian citizens on this issue.

Thanks,
Karina Wood, Peace Action Education Fund, USA.

Honorable Senator _____
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Attention: (appropriate staffer)

February xx, 1997

Dear Senator,

Last year your efforts helped secure Senate ratification of START II, and the signing of the global Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). Today the world is a safer place thanks to you.

This year, we have a chance to open the way for talks on a global agreement to eliminate all nuclear weapons. We must break the current deadlock over ratification and implementation of the second U.S.-Russian Strategic Arms Reduction Agreement (START II), which would still leave nearly 10,000 weapons on each side. To do so, our organizations are urging President Clinton NOW to make deeper reductions in the still enormous superpower arsenals through a "START III" agreement. We are also urging him to address the growing tension with Russia over plans for expanding the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) -- which currently jeopardizes U.S.-Russian disarmament prospects. We are asking the President to reconsider the wisdom of expanding NATO; or at the very minimum, to commit NATO to the following:

- * a formal guarantee not to deploy nuclear weapons in new member states,
- * the negotiation of a nuclear weapon-free zone in Central and Eastern Europe,

* the elimination of all remaining non-strategic nuclear weapons in Europe,

* an agreement by each member state not to deploy nuclear weapons outside its own national borders.

We urge you to personally communicate this message to the President before his Summit meeting with President Yeltsin on March 20-21 in Helsinki, Finland.

The March summit presents President Clinton with a historic opportunity to make his name as a world peace-maker by taking action to rid the world of nuclear weapons, which retired General Lee Butler has described as "inherently dangerous, hugely expensive, militarily inefficient and morally indefensible."

With your demonstrated leadership, experience and knowledge on issues of arms control and national security, we believe you will be uniquely persuasive in urging the President to pursue the sound policy of a START III framework agreement at this Summit.

Thank you very much for your attention to this issue. We look forward to a response.

Sincerely,

(all the prominent individuals and organizations in your state who can sign on by the end of February, 1997.)

From aslater@igc.apc.orgWed Feb 19 16:59:53 1997
Date: Wed, 19 Feb 1997 13:34:29 -0800 (PST)
From: ALICE SLATER <aslater@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Tahiti Resolution to Cancel Nuke Space Launch

Dear Friends,

Here is one more resolution we adopted at our meeting in Moorea, Tahiti to stop the obscene launch of the Cassini deep space probe with 72 pounds of plutonium on board!

NUCLEAR ABOLITION 2000

RESOLUTION TO CANCEL THE CASSINI SPACE LAUNCH

Adopted January 25, 1997

The Abolition 2000 Conference held in Moorea, calls for the US Space Agency (NASA) to cancel the launch of the Cassini deep space probe with its plutonium power source (72.3 lbs.) which is set for October 1997, from Cape Canaveral, Florida, USA.

The failure of recent space probes, one by Russia and the other by the US raises our level of concern since any malfunction of the Cassini launch could endanger millions of lives throughout the world.

Alice Slater

GRACE

Global Resource Action Center for the Environment
15 East 26 St., Room 915
New York, NY 10010
212-726-9161 (tel)
212-726-9160 (fax)
aslater@igc.apc.org <email>

From wandwill@clark.netWed Feb 19 17:00:36 1997
Date: Wed, 19 Feb 1997 18:34:38 -0500 (EST)
From: WAND/WILL <wandwill@clark.net>
To: wandwill@clark.net
Subject: Minutes of MSWG meeting, Feb. 10th

The next meeting of the Military Spending Working Group (MSWG) is scheduled for Monday, February 24, 1-2pm (immediately following Monday Lobby) at the Mott House, 122 Maryland Ave, NE, Washington, DC.

Included in this message are:

* A draft agenda for Monday's meeting - please review and let me know if you have any suggestions or additions

* Minutes from previous MSWG meeting, February 10

DRAFT AGENDA
MSWG MEETING
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24
1:00-2:00 PM, THE MOTT HOUSE

A. LEGISLATIVE EFFORTS, CAPITOL HILL, THE ADMINISTRATION:

1. Interpreting recently released DoD budget numbers: what is our "spin"?

2. Congressional plans on DoD budget

3. Update on Progressive alternatives:
- Dellums alternative DoD budget
- Wyden/Wellstone plans in the Senate

4.. Update on Rep. Conyers' effort to open Intelligence Budget

5. Reports back from Military Spending lobby visits

6. Update/feedback on Top 10/Dirty Dozen List & MSWG Briefing Book

7. Potential organizing around the QDR and preparation for the release of the report in May
- Marcus Corbin, POGO

B. OUTREACH/GRASSROOTS INITIATIVES

1. Update on Rep. Frank's outreach campaign
 - details on March 10 event
 - assignments for helping to get groups there
2. Update on ongoing efforts:
 - State resolutions re: military spending (Bus. Leaders for Sensible Priorities, Women Legislators' Lobby, 20/20 Vision, Campaign for New Priorities) Organizers, others)
 - Petition for New Priorities (Center for Campus Organizers, others)
 - WAND's factsheets
 - Campaign for New Priorities charts
 - others???

C. MSWG HOUSEKEEPING, NEW BUSINESS:

1. Discuss MSWG involvement in Military Production Network's DC Days, April 27-30
2. Discuss possible MSWG roundtable with Hill staff
3. Make assignments for chairing meetings, taking minutes & distributing minutes and agendas to MSWG list
 [Note from the chair: I am looking for volunteers to help chair meetings, keep minutes at meetings sending them out afterwards, etc. Also, I will be taking a leave of absence June - August (baby on the way) and will need someone to coordinate MSWG. Step forward if you can help with any of these tasks.]

MSWG MEETING MINUTES
 MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10

A. LEGISLATIVE EFFORTS, CAPITOL HILL, THE ADMINISTRATION:

1. Review of Clinton's FY98 DoD Budget Proposal
 - *General discussion. Consensus of the "experts" is that add-ons are coming.
 - *There was some discussion of the differences noted in the materials handed out by the various groups. Also noted was that a portion of funds were shifted from the entitlement category to the domestic

discretionary category in the federal budget, thus changing the percentages of military vs. domestic

2. Hill reaction/Schedule for military spending issues
*Budget Resolution expected in mid-April.
*By March 10th, Sens. Wellstone & Wyden and Reps. Frank & Dellums hope to have an alternative DoD budget ready
* A Republican effort to re-introduce "firewalls" preventing a shift of defense funds to domestic programs is likely.

3. Update on Rep. Conyers' effort to open Intelligence Budget
*Carl LeVan informed the group that Rep. Conyers would introduce the legislation to open up the intelligence budget "top-line" (same bill as last year) Bill will be introduced Thursday (Feb. 13) in conjunction with media event. Bill has 20 original co-sponsors; all of last year's plus Rep. Blumenauer. Other bills on reform of the intelligence community have been delayed because of lack of consensus among "supporters." Rep. Conyers does plan to pursue these proposals.

4. Military Spending lobby visits
*Announcement of visit scheduled that afternoon with Rep. Blumenauer.
*Suzy Kerr (CLW) is scheduling these meetings, let her know if you are interested in attending.

5. Update on Top 10/Dirty Dozen List & MSWG Briefing Book
*CLW, CDI and FAS in process of putting together cost/savings estimates of each program. CLW working to have MSWG Briefing Book out ASAP; have drafts of text for 90% of items. Contact Chris Davis at CLW for more info.

B. OUTREACH/GRASSROOTS INITIATIVES

1. Update on Rep. Frank's outreach campaign
*Report of Monday morning's meeting (Feb. 10) of domestic groups and Rep. Frank seemed positive. The meeting seemed well-attended, some big name groups. (AFL-CIO, NEA, Aids Action Council, National Low Income Housing.)
The goal of the meeting was to bring "on board" domestic constituency groups that do not normally work on military spending.

*Rep. Frank and Dellums have tentatively set March 10 for a day-long event

on Capitol Hill - two to three panel sessions on military spending, budget trends, and why domestic groups should be concerned/involved. We should have more details soon - and a letter of invitation from members of Congress hosting the event that we should send to any domestic group contacts we have.

2. Update on ongoing efforts:

*Did not discuss

3. Determine messages and actions for grassroots, also identify any

materials we may want to get out to the grassroots soon

*Did not discuss

C. MSWG HOUSEKEEPING, NEW BUSINESS:

1. Discuss MSWG involvement in Military Production Network's DC Days,

April 27-30

* Did not discuss

2. Discuss possible MSWG roundtable with Hill staff

* Generally felt to be a good idea, but no action, no volunteers.

3. Make assignments for chairing meetings, taking minutes & distributing

minutes and agendas to MSWG list

* Did not discuss

Women's Action for New Directions (WAND)
Deborah Walden, WAND Director of Policy and Programs
Women Legislators' Lobby (WiLL)
Cynthia Campbell, WiLL Washington Director
110 Maryland Avenue, N.E., Suite 205
Washington, D.C. 20002
voice: 202/543-8505
fax: 202/675-6469
e-mail: wandwill@clark.net

WAND's mission is to empower women to act politically to reduce violence and militarism and redirect military resources toward human and environmental needs.

WiLL (the Women Legislator's Lobby) is the only national multi-partisan

network of women state legislators working to influence public policy at the federal level, and to ensure that our nation's spending priorities meet human and environmental needs. WiLL includes women legislators from all 50 states, representing millions of constituents. One in three women state legislators is a WiLL member.

From NABbasic@aol.comThu Feb 20 16:00:40 1997
Date: Wed, 19 Feb 1997 18:04:48 -0500 (EST)
From: NABbasic@aol.com
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Dutch Government Crisis on NATO Expansion

To: Abolition 2000 members in the US
From: BASIC and AMOK

REQUEST FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION.

DUTCH GOVERNMENT CRISIS ON NATO EXPANSION

US GROUPS SHOULD CONTACT DUTCH AMBASSADOR AND
DUTCH MEDIA

A Parliamentary debate will be held next week in the Netherlands on NATO expansion. There is not much time, so the voice of the US NGOs is needed urgently to reassure the Dutch that opposing NATO expansion is not anti-American and that many Americans oppose expansion.

A former conservative Defence Minister Mr. Fritz Bolkestein has openly expressed his opposition to NATO expansion speaking on behalf of his party (VVD) even though his party is part of the government. The VVD and Bolkestein were vital in keeping Holland loyal to NATO during the missile debates of the 1980s, so his opposition now is very important. This rift has been seized upon by the Christian Democrat opposition. Some time next week the Dutch parliament will hold a debate on this issue. BASIC and AMOK would like to take advantage of this opportunity to strengthen the arguments against NATO expansion within the Dutch debate, in turn slowing down the rapidly developing process of enlargement.

Below is a list of contact information for the Dutch Ambassador to the USA and Dutch correspondents living the DC area. Please join us in our effort to bolster the arms control community's opposition to NATO expansion by sending these people your opinion, any new data, op-eds, and other material that strengthen the anti-NATO expansion argument. The more the merrier. Please let BASIC or AMOK know what you have managed to contribute to this effort.

We expect that this initiative will be the first of many-let the faxes flow.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP

Best wishes

Dan Plesch
BASIC
fax: (202) 387-6298
e-mail: basicus@aol.com

Karol Koster
AMOK
fax: +31 30 441 723
e-mail: k.koster@inter.ni.net

Netherlands Press Association
Amb. Jacobovits de Szeged
Vienna, VA
Embassy of the Royal Netherlands
fax: (703) 938-2846
Fax: 537-5124
e-mail: 71342.1101@compuserve.com

Oscar Garschgen.
de Volksstraat
Bethesda, MD
fax: (301) 469-6827
tel: (301) 469- 6153

Jaap A. van Wesel
Dutch News Agency
Rockville, MD
fax: (301) 816-9173
e-mail: 76304.666@compuserve.com

Juurd Eijsvoogel
NCR Handelsblad
Washington DC
fax: (202) 537-2959

From pmeidell@igc.apc.org Thu Feb 20 16:01:29 1997
Date: Wed, 19 Feb 1997 10:17:19 -0800 (PST)
From: Pamela Meidell <pmeidell@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, geowcpuk@gn.apc.org
Subject: Re: Cities Declaration

Dear George,

On the face of it I wouldn't say that a local authority signing onto the Abolition 2000 cities declaration is the same as becoming an official endorser

by signing the original Abolition 2000 Statement, especially since post-Tahiti, all new signers of the statement are also signing onto the Moorea Declaration. Thanks for raising the question.

Pamela

Pamela S. Meidell
Director
The Atomic Mirror/Earth Trust Foundation
P.O. Box 220
Port Hueneme, California, USA 93044-0220
tel: +1 805/985 5073
fax: +1 805/985 7563
email: pmeidell@igc.apc.org

The Atomic Mirror is part of Abolition 2000:
A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons,
and facilitates its Global Network Office

> From owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org Wed Feb 19 09:54:18 1997

> >From majordomo Wed Feb 19 09:54:18 1997

> Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus>

> Received: (from majordomo@localhost)

> by igc7.igc.org (8.8.5/8.8.5) id IAA23998;

> Wed, 19 Feb 1997 08:55:53 -0800 (PST)

> X-Authentication-Warning: igc7.igc.org: Processed from queue
/var/spool/mqueue-maj

> Received: from gn.apc.org (gn.apc.org [194.202.158.2])

> by igc7.igc.org (8.8.5/8.8.5) with ESMTP id IAA22803

> for <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>; Wed, 19 Feb 1997 08:51:08 -0800
(PST)

> Received: by gn.apc.org (8.8.5/Revision: 1.33 03 December 1996)

> id QAA02594; Wed, 19 Feb 1997 16:51:05 GMT

> Date: Wed, 19 Feb 1997 16:51:05 GMT

> From: George Farebrother <geowcpuk@gn.apc.org>

> Message-Id: <199702191651.QAA02594@gn.apc.org>

> Subject: Cities Declaration

> To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

> Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

> Precedence: bulk

>

> Dear Abolitioners

>
> Following the Ross/Lachlan correspondence, I have one query. Does
> endorsement of the A2000 cities Declaration carry qualify a Local
> Authority as an official A2000 endorser in the same way as signing
> the A2000 Statement would?

>
> George Farebrother
> ***** World Court Project UK George
> Farebrother, UK Secretary 67, Summerheath Rd, Hailsham, Sussex
> BN27 3DR Phone & Fax 01323 844 269, Email geowcpuk@gn.apc.org

From prop1@prop1.org Thu Feb 20 16:02:23 1997
Date: Thu, 20 Feb 1997 07:18:12 -0500 (EST)
From: peace through reason <prop1@prop1.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: NPT Strategy Suggestion

At 08:04 AM 2/14/97 -0800, ALICE SLATER wrote:

>Dear Friends,

[SNIP]

>We need an accessible bulletin board to post our documents for
>easy referral. (such as abolition statement, Moorea declaration,
>resolutions, fact sheets, etc.) ANY SUGGESTIONS?

Yes, check out: <<http://www.prop1.org/prop1/nas.htm>>.

Although it's not exactly a "bulletin board," many of the specific documents

Alice refers to have been at that web site, available to download, for some

time. E.g., <<http://prop1.org/2000/abolintr.htm>>

Additionally, in an effort to get folks on the same sheet of music, the framework for a "Nuclear Weapons Abolition Communication Center" is available at <<http://prop1.org/2000/nwaf.htm>>. In the event that anyone is

seriously interested in this resource, it is suggested that they first review the "User's Manual" <<http://prop1.org/2000/960216.htm>> to get some idea of how it's supposed to work.

At the January '96 San Francisco meeting of Abolition 2000, group members proposed the establishment of a web site; the minutes of the February 3rd Philadelphia meeting <<http://prop1.org/2000/9602min1.htm>> announced the Nuclear Abolition Summit web site. Nonetheless, due to an apparent lack of

interest in this web site, lately we haven't put as much effort into it as

we think it deserves.

However, if folks think that it may be of some value to the Abolition 2000

group, we can devote a little more effort to the project.

From lforrow@igc.apc.org Thu Feb 20 16:03:07 1997
Date: Thu, 20 Feb 1997 05:50:48 -0800 (PST)
From: Lachlan Forrow <lforrow@igc.apc.org>
To: Pamela Meidell <pmeidell@igc.apc.org>, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org,
geowcpuk@gn.apc.org
Subject: Re: Cities Declaration

At 10:17 AM 2/19/97 -0800, Pamela Meidell wrote:

>Dear George,
>On the face of it I wouldn't say that a local authority signing onto the
>Abolition 2000 cities declaration is the same as becoming an official
endorser
>by signing the original Abolition 2000 Statement, especially since post-
>Tahiti, all new signers of the statement are also signing onto the
Moorea
>Declaration. Thanks for raising the question.
>Pamela

At the risk of sounding relentlessly narrow and conservative, I think that making the Moorea Declaration a mandatory part of the Abolition 2000 Statement for new signers is a mistake. For example, that means that any individuals or organizations that I would approach would have to feel comfortable with officially agreeing with the words "theft of land for nuclear infrastructure". Whether or not that is an objective and accurate description of history isn't the point -- a lot of people are simply going to be unsure and will, I fear, hesitate or decline to join Abolition 2000.

Another way of putting this is that I believe that there are many important potential partners for us who would agree with all of our policy goals but disagree about interpretations of history. Agreement on our policy goals should, I believe, be the sole criterion for full Abolition 2000 partnership.

I thought the founding statement was clear and sufficient.

Lachlan Forrow,
PSR/IPPNW and
Albert Schweitzer Fellowship

From rwilcock@execulink.comThu Feb 20 16:04:22 1997
Date: Thu, 20 Feb 1997 10:47:51 -0500
From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>
To: 'Lachlan Forrow' <lforrow@igc.apc.org>,
Pamela Meidell <pmeidell@igc.apc.org>,
"abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>,
"geowcpuk@gn.apc.org" <geowcpuk@gn.apc.org>
Subject: RE: Cities Declaration

The comments arising from George's seemingly simple request about "The Cities Declaration" are showing that the A2000 Focus is becoming fragmented!

1. How is it that The Cities Declaration is not fully consistent the primary Abolition Statement? Has a procedural mistake been made here? Is it necessary to consult the Cities in question and ask them now if they wish to endorse the Primary Statement?
2. It is not ethical to change the Primary Statement after people representing 680 organizations have signed it!
3. After "The Family," the city is a fundamental unit of human organization. Surely cities can endorse A2000 - some already have and councils too, why not Regions, Nations... The United Nations, The Council of Europe for example? - all are organizations, and surely all are components of "We the People" - Are all these being approached and lobbied?
3. The Moorea Statement is a new issue. Is an endorsing procedure required for it? Is it about the Primary Purpose of Abolition 2000.? If not - why is it necessary?

The amount of chat and comment peripheral to the primary A2000 purpose is disturbing some people to the point of leaving this list.

Would it be helpful to the Primary Purpose to sort out the wheat from the chaff? This may be a question of personal discipline and orientation, but if people become confused about "the direction" - perhaps some more will leave.

Ross Wilcock
rwilcock@web.net
<http://web.net.pgsg/~pgs/>

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

From: Lachlan Forrow [SMTP:lforrow@igc.apc.org]
Sent: 20 February, 1997 8:51
To: Pamela Meidell; abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org; geowcpuk@gn.apc.org
Subject: Re: Cities Declaration

From pmeidell@igc.apc.orgThu Feb 20 16:06:39 1997
Date: Thu, 20 Feb 1997 11:49:48 -0800 (PST)
From: Pamela Meidell <pmeidell@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Back Online!

February 20, 1997

Dear Abolition Friends,

Just to let you all know that I am back online, after the Abolition 2000 meeting in Tahiti/Moorea and followup work there. I am pouring through more than 500 email messages, plus snail mail, so I ask for your patience. Thanks to everyone who has posted reports on the meeting. More to come in the next days and weeks.

For those who asked about the financial situation, I am working with several members of the IMG to come up with a full report that we will make available to everyone who wants to see it. The short version is that we have a shortfall from the meeting and have depleted the existing funds of the Network Office. From the mailing that we sent out in December, asking for a suggested \$100 contribution from all of the 700+ groups in the Network, we have received responses from 28 groups for a total of \$5,500. Thank you to all who responded so quickly.

In peace,
Pamela

Pamela S. Meidell
The Atomic Mirror/Earth Trust Foundation
P.O. Box 220
Port Hueneme, California, USA 93044-0220
tel: +1 805/985 5073
fax: +1 805/985 7563
email: pmeidell@igc.apc.org

The Atomic Mirror is part of Abolition 2000:
A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons,
and facilitates its Global Network Office

From lforrow@igc.apc.org Thu Feb 20 16:07:24 1997
Date: Thu, 20 Feb 1997 11:15:35 -0800 (PST)
From: Lachlan Forrow <lforrow@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: What IS "Abolition 2000"?

My own personal view is that to support Abolition 2000 all that any person or organization should should need to consider is whether they want to endorse a SINGLE goal (not even the 11 points):

There shall be a signed global agreement by the year 2000 committing the world to the permanent elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified timeframe.

If we're trying to amass large numbers of supporters, then I think that anything else is of secondary importance and risks unnecessarily complicating our already-challenging task of making this the kind of bandwagon we need to succeed.

As an historical note, the phrase "Abolition 2000" (referring to this single-sentence goal and nothing more) came out of the December 1994 IPPNW Board meeting in Stockholm; the whole point was to have something so simple in name and concept that anyone in the world could join easily, and that no one would "own". Other organizations, including the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, had by this time also begun advocating abolition and seeking endorsers, and considerable effort went into getting agreement on the concept of "agreement by the year 2000" and "a specified timeframe."

The 11 points got put together at the April 1995 NPT meeting, where the NGO Abolition Caucus was formed and prepared a core statement in which the specific abolition paragraph included more specific language about a nuclear weapons "convention" that has "provisions for effective verification and enforcement." Adoption of "Abolition 2000" as the name of this evolving coalition, however, did not come until months later.

I hope that we can find a way to be able to cite ALL who support a signed agreement by the year 2000 committing the world to abolition as supporters of "Abolition 2000". If so, we could already include the American Public Health Association (the world's largest), the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association, the American College of Physicians. We could also quickly add, I'm sure, many, many cities/towns/churches/others who would rapidly agree with the single-sentence goal.

I'd like to see us get 2000 endorsers (from ALL these categories) of this conception of "Abolition 2000" by this year's Hiroshima and Nagasaki commemoration.

In our more detailed advocacy within the UN and with governments,
I think the 11-point statement should remain as the basis of our
educational and lobbying work.

Lachlan Forrow
PSR/IPPNW and
The Albert Schweitzer Fellowship

From rwilcock@execulink.comThu Feb 20 16:08:12 1997
Date: Thu, 20 Feb 1997 13:39:41 -0500
From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>
To: "Abolition Caucus List (E-mail)" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Endorsers Update

Sorry, I am getting behind the times - today saw a record A2000 WWW Sign-up originating in Wales - that is - Cymru

The total number of A2000 Endorsements is now 697.

Well done Cymru!

Ross Wilcock
rwilcock@web.net
<http://web.net.pgs/~pgs/>

From Majordomo@igc.org Thu Feb 20 16:09:02 1997
Date: Thu, 20 Feb 1997 15:18:29 -0800 (PST)
From: Majordomo@igc.org
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: Welcome to ctb-followers

--

Welcome to the ctb-followers mailing list!

If you ever want to remove yourself from this mailing list,
you can send mail to "Majordomo@igc.org" with the following command
in the body of your email message:

```
unsubscribe ctb-followers
```

If you try to unsubscribe from this mailing list, and your
request is rejected, then send mail again to "Majordomo@igc.org"
with the following command in the body of your email message:

```
unsubscribe ctb-followers Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>
```

Here's the general information for the list you've
subscribed to, in case you don't already have it:

Welcome CTB Followers everywhere!

From pmeidell@igc.apc.org Sat Feb 22 10:16:19 1997
Date: Thu, 20 Feb 1997 14:14:12 -0800 (PST)
From: Pamela Meidell <pmeidell@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Summary of Moorea Resolutions...

February 20, 1997

Dear Friends,

In response to Colin's request earlier for a list of the resolutions passed at the Abolition 2000 conference in Moorea, here it is: Twelve resolutions were passed, and two additional documents were included in the official proceedings. The reports of working groups and regions are separate.

Thanks,
Pamela

Resume of Resolutions passed at the Abolition 2000 Conference
Moorea, January 20-28, 1997.

* The Moorea Declaration is a supplemental statement to the founding Abolition 2000 statement. It recognises that colonised and indigenous peoples have, in large part, borne the brunt of this nuclear devastation--from the mining of uranium and the testing of nuclear weapons on indigenous land, to the dumping, storage and transport of plutonium, and the theft of land for nuclear infrastructure. It affirms and states that indigenous peoples must be central to the work of Abolition 2000. The inalienable right to self-determination, sovereignty and independence is crucial in allowing all peoples of the world to join in the common struggle to rid the world forever of nuclear weapons.

* The IAEA Resolution speaks to the inadequacies of the IAEA study of the effects of the French nuclear testing in the Pacific, in particular an independent epidemiological study on the health effects on the peoples exposed to radiation from the beginning of the nuclear testing program in 1966.

* A resolution establishing a global Radiation Health Effects working group to work with international agencies and victims of radiation exposure to collect the data necessary to assess their impacts and to provide health care support.

* A resolution calling for an end to the creation and transshipment of high level nuclear waste from France to Japan through Pacific waters.

* A resolution against the military/nuclear option of the Republic of Palau--US Compact of Free Association.

* A resolution from the youth caucus at the Abolition 2000 conference to support the involvement of youth in the struggle to rid the world of nuclear weapons.

* A petition to the President of the State of Israel for the release from prison of Mordechai Vannunu who is currently in the ninth year of solitary confinement for revealing that Israel has nuclear weapons.

* A petition to the President of the State of Israel to stop the design and production of nuclear weapons and sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

* A statement calling on governments to honor their commitments to the elimination of nuclear weapons at the first NPT preparatory committee meeting in April, 1997 at the United Nations in New York.

* A resolution stating that the delegates at the Abolition 2000 conference support in spirit the Tarahoi Statement.

* A resolution calling on the US Space Agency, NASA, to cancel the Cassini space launch scheduled for October 1997 from Florida, which will carry a payload of 72lb of plutonium.

* A call for the government of the USA to cancel its plans to conduct subcritical underground nuclear tests in Nevada this year on the indigenous land of the Western Shoshone Nation.

Also entered into the record as official conference documents were:

*a letter from conference delegates to the Earth Council, calling for their action because the nuclear testing at Moruroa and Fangataufa has created a nuclear waste dump in a marine environment, a violation of the Earth Charter.

*a statement from Corbin Harney, Western Shoshone Spiritual Leader, calling for united efforts to abolish nuclear weapons and return to a more natural way of life.

Pamela S. Meidell
The Atomic Mirror/Earth Trust Foundation
P.O. Box 220
Port Hueneme, California, USA 93044-0220
tel: +1 805/985 5073
fax: +1 805/985 7563
email: pmeidell@igc.apc.org

The Atomic Mirror is part of Abolition 2000:
A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons,
and facilitates its Global Network Office

From epp92@antenna.nl Sat Feb 22 10:17:43 1997
Date: Thu, 20 Feb 1997 23:15:14
From: epp92@antenna.nl
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: START III/anti-NATO meeting report from Tahiti

Dear friends,

Thank you for sharing this report. Please let me make an essential remark regarding nuclear free zones in Europe:
I do fully underline the importance and opportunities for a NWFZ in Eastern and Central Europe. I would however like to stress that this must not be the end goal. I would favor a goal that strives towards an European Nuclear Weapons Free zone (thus including the EU countries). In our attempts to reach this goal there are the opportunities as described in your action plan and the opportunities to argue and work on withdrawal of nuclear weapons from "non-nuclear" NATO members, withdrawal from their positions in the NATO NPG etc.. Also use the positions of e.g. Norway, Denmark and Spain as examples to withdraw nuclear weapons.

The above approach is a less "colonial" approach than working towards a nuclear free Central and East Europe.

Thus I would like to rephrase:

> A Nuclear Weapon-Free Central & Eastern Europe!
into:

A nuclear Weapon-Free Europe! Starting in Central & Eastern Europe!

Second: Although I personally would like to remove NATO and WEU from the face of this earth, I would like to refrain from discussions concerning NATO extension. I would rather discuss the position of the OVSE as an alternative for European and transatlantic security. The OVSE is the only alternative at this time not being a military alliance!

Kindest regards,

Dirk Jan Dullemond

```
*****
Dirk Jan Dullemond                Nederlandse Kernstop Coalitie
v Doesburglaan 124 G              Herenstraat 9
6708 MD Wageningen                6701 DG Wageningen
the Netherlands                    the Netherlands
```

```
Tel   +31 317 423481 (Home)
      +31 317 422140 (Work)
Fax   +31 317 423588
```

Email epp92@antenna.nl

```
*****
```

From scott@aloha.netSat Feb 22 10:18:34 1997
Date: Thu, 20 Feb 1997 11:59:41 -1000 (HST)
From: Scott Crawford <scott@aloha.net>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: RE: Tahiti Resolutions

At 7:33 pm -0000 2/20/97, International Peace Bureau wrote:

> New Moorea resolutions keep popping up. Can anyone post a complete list
> of
> them?

I don't know if it is a complete list, but what I have pulled from this
listserver has been posted online at:

<http://www.hookele.com/abolition2000/reports.html>

I would appreciate if folks would take a look at these and let us know if
any are missing or if there are later versions of some of the draft
reports.

Mahalo,

Scott Crawford

From geowcpuk@gn.apc.org Sat Feb 22 10:19:16 1997
Date: Thu, 20 Feb 1997 22:53:52 GMT
From: George Farebrother <geowcpuk@gn.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Cities Declaration

abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org Dear Abolitioners

Having raised the City Declaration/Founding Statement issue, and watched the burgeoning correspondence on it with a certain quizzical detachment, I thought it was time I put in my two pennyworth.

The matter is a little urgent as I'm speaking to Nuclear Free Local Authorities (NFLA) tomorrow. Liz Westmorland (who works for NFLA) will be there - she has been pushing the Cities Declaration (as well as Round Tables) and I discussed the matter with her before I brought it up on this network. We shall probably offer them the Cities Declaration as a matter of priority and then let them digest the Founding Statement at their leisure. I think I might not mention the Moorea statement at the moment. One thing at a time.

Whatever they sign I think this should qualify them to be "on the list". As Ross says, lists are just lists and categories within them have to be thought about carefully.

Having said this, we find that there is value of categorising people and organisations WITHIN a database - as local authority, religious organisations, organisms occupying the category Declaration signatory but not Statement signatory if you like, nice well-meaning people, etc, for special sub-mailings on particular topics.

The question of pushing material we get from email out to non-modem people came up a few days ago in our discussions. World Court Project UK already does this for about 40 such people in our network who comprise a fast-reaction team. It is easy to download really important material (such as Nicola's notice about the need to send letters to the House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee) the day it comes in, run off the labels, and send them out. These are mainly people who, whilst not full-time activists, know what they are talking about and can write letters etc without detailed guidance.

Anyway, NFLA will probably take up Ross' suggestion of identifying a useful contacts from UK Local Authorities who endorse the Cities Declaration, treating them AS IF they had signed the Founding Statement (some of them will have anyway) and sending them useful information from time to time.

Is this a way through the woods?

George Farebrother

***** World Court Project UK George
Farebrother, UK Secretary 67, Summerheath Rd, Hailsham, Sussex
BN27 3DR Phone & Fax 01323 844 269, Email geowcpuk@gn.apc.org

From wilpfnatl@igc.apc.org Sat Feb 22 10:20:02 1997
Date: Thu, 20 Feb 1997 15:30:42 -0800 (PST)
From: Z <wilpfnatl@igc.apc.org>
To: Jack & Felice Cohen-Joppa <nukeresister@igc.apc.org>, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: Missile sites in FL (forwarded query)

Dear Friends,

SEveral WILPF members in FL have been organizing around this proposed base in FL. There were hearings last week where they testified. Our best guess is that this threat is meant to scare Cuba. If you need more info let me know and I'll get you Lizzie Poole's address and phone number.

Peace
Z - WILPF Program Director

At 01:05 PM 2/13/97 -0700, Jack & Felice Cohen-Joppa wrote:

>>X-Sender: jlydiard@popserver.sfu.ca
>>Mime-Version: 1.0
>>Date: Sun, 9 Feb 1997 23:23:42 -0800
>>To: NanooseNet@mail.island.net
>>From: jlydiard@sfu.ca (Joyce Lydiard)
>>Subject: NN: Missile sites
>>Sender: owner-nanoosenet@mail.island.net
>>Precedence: bulk
>>Reply-To: NanooseNet@mail.island.net
>>

>>There is a rumour that the US is installing missile launching sites along
>>the Florida coast. Can anyone verify this rumor, or direct me to a reliable
>>source that would provide information on this topic? Thank you in advance
>>for your assistance.

>>
>>

>>~~~~~
>>NANOOSE CONVERSION CAMPAIGN
>>Submissions: NanooseNet@mail.island.net
>>Subscriptions: NanooseNet-Request@mail.island.net
>>World-Wide Web: <http://nanaimo.ark.com/~convert/>
>>STOP NUCLEAR SUBMARINE WEAPONS TESTS IN GEORGIA STRAIT

>>~~~~~
>>
>
>

From wslf@igc.apc.org Sat Feb 22 10:20:46 1997
Date: Thu, 20 Feb 1997 16:13:24 -0800 (PST)
From: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Cc: tomatompn+@igc.org
Subject: More news you can use!

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: February 20, 1997
CONTACT: Jackie Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation (510)
839-5877
Marylia Kelley, Tri-Valley CAREs (510) 443-7148
Al Jones, American Friends Service Committee (510) 238-8080

OAKLAND DECLARES FEBRUARY 22 "NUCLEAR ABOLITION DAY"
IN SUPPORT OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA ABOLITION 2000 CONFERENCE
UNANIMOUS CITY COUNCIL CALLS ON GOVERNMENTS TO NEGOTIATE A
TIMETABLE FOR THE ELIMINATION OF ALL NUCLEAR WEAPONS

OAKLAND, CA -- In a strongly-worded declaration, the Oakland City Council, at its February 18 meeting, voted unanimously in favor of a Resolution to Declare February 22, 1997 "Nuclear Abolition Day" and to support Abolition 2000, a global campaign to eliminate nuclear weapons.

The Abolition 2000 Resolution was introduced in support of the Northern California Abolition 2000 Conference slated for Saturday, February 22, at Oakland's Laney College. Speakers include: former California Senator Alan Cranston, Chair of the Gorbachev Foundation/USA; Dr. Michio Kaku, best selling-author and Professor of Physics at City University of New York; Mpendulo Kumalo, South African Consul; Betty Burkes, President, U.S. Section Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; Virginia Sanchez, Director, Citizen Alert Native American Program; H. Lee Halterman, Congressman Ron Dellums' office; Dennis Bernstein, of KPFA Radio; and Pamela Meidell, Global Network Office Facilitator for Abolition 2000. Corbin Harney, a Western Shoshone spiritual leader, will open the conference at 9:30 a.m. Thematic workshops will explore the relationships between nuclear weapons and the economy, nuclear weapons and the environment, and nuclear weapons and violence. Featured musicians will include the Vukani Mawethu South African Choir, and folk legend Utah Philips, who will perform at 7:30 p.m. A special documentary photographic exhibit by noted nuclear scholar James Lerager will be on display.

In its Abolition 2000 Resolution, the City of Oakland, a Nuclear Free Zone, "reaffirms its commitment to full implementation of its Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance and supports the further development of Nuclear Free Zones throughout the world." Oakland also "calls upon the governments of all Nuclear Weapon States to begin negotiations immediately on a Nuclear Weapons Convention which sets a timetable for the elimination of all nuclear weapons" and "urges that these negotiations be completed by the year 2000 so that the people of the world may

enter the next millennium with an international treaty in place for the prohibition and elimination of all nuclear weapons."

The Northern California Abolition 2000 Conference, sponsored by over 40 peace, environmental, social justice, and student organizations, will initiate a regional campaign in support of the growing international Abolition 2000 movement to eliminate nuclear weapons. More than 700 non-governmental organizations from countries on every continent have already signed the Abolition 2000 Statement, which calls as its central demand for conclusion, by the turn of the century, of negotiations on a treaty to eliminate nuclear weapons within a timebound framework.

A copy of Oakland's Abolition 2000 Resolution follows (2 pages). Interviews with conference speakers can be arranged upon request.

OAKLAND CITY COUNCIL

RESOLUTION NO. 73299 C.M.S.

RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT ABOLITION 2000 AND DECLARE FEBRUARY 22, 1997 "NUCLEAR ABOLITION DAY"

WHEREAS, more than 20,000 nuclear weapons, deployed around the world, pose a continuing threat to civilization, the human species, and the structure and stability of life itself; and

WHEREAS, since 1940 the United States has spent more than \$4 Trillion on the nuclear arms race, is currently spending more than \$30 Billion annually to maintain, service and clean up after its nuclear weapons, and plans to invest \$40 Billion over the next decade to preserve its capacity to maintain, test, modify, design and produce nuclear weapons well into the next century; and

WHEREAS, the declared Nuclear Weapon States pledged at the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review and Extension Conference in May 1995 to pursue "systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goal of eliminating these weapons"; and

WHEREAS, the International Court of Justice on July 8, 1996 unanimously declared, "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control"; and

WHEREAS, in its August 1996 report, the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, found that "nuclear weapons pose an intolerable threat to all humanity and its habitat," and called for "taking nuclear forces off alert" and "removal of

warheads from delivery vehicles;" and

WHEREAS the end of the Cold War has provided an unparalleled opportunity to end the nuclear weapons era, which would be a gift to children everywhere and to all future generations; and

WHEREAS, the people of Oakland have reiterated their opposition to nuclear weapons in 1982, 1986, 1992, and 1995; and

WHEREAS, the City's Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance recognizes that the public morality is affronted by the expenditure of City funds on goods and services produced by nuclear weapons makers, the investment of City funds on goods and services produced by nuclear weapons makers, the investment of City funds in nuclear weapons makers, and the presence of nuclear weapons and work on nuclear weapons which may ultimately lead to death and destruction;

THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED the City of Oakland reaffirms its commitment to full implementation of its Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance and supports the further development of Nuclear Free Zones throughout the world; and

RESOLVED the City of Oakland calls for all nuclear weapons to be taken off of alert status, for all nuclear warheads to be separated from their delivery vehicles, and for the Nuclear Weapon States to agree to unconditional no first use of these weapons; and

RESOLVED the City of Oakland calls for the termination of all nuclear weapons research, development and testing activities; and

RESOLVED the City of Oakland calls upon the governments of all Nuclear Weapon States to begin negotiations immediately on a Nuclear Weapons Convention which sets a timetable for the elimination of all nuclear weapons; and

RESOLVED the City of Oakland urges that these negotiations be completed by the year 2000 so that the people of the world may enter the next millennium with an international treaty in place for the prohibition and elimination of all nuclear weapons; and

RESOLVED the City of Oakland proclaims February 22, 1997 "Nuclear Abolition Day" in support and recognition of the Northern California Abolition 2000 Conference being held in the City this day.

I certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of a Resolution passed by the City Council of the City of Oakland, California on Feb. 18, 1997

CEDA FLOYD
City Clerk and Clerk of the Council

IN COUNCIL, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, FEB. 18, 1997

PASSED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES- BRUNNER, CHANG, DE LA FUENTE, HARRIS, MILEY, NADEL, REID,
RUSSON, AND SPEES

NOES-

ABSENT-

ABSTENTION-

*** Jackie Cabasso * Western States Legal Foundation ***
1440 Broadway, Suite 500 Oakland, California USA 94612
Telephone: +(510)839-5877 / Fax: +(510)839-5397
***** E-mail: WSLF@igc.apc.org *****
Western States Legal Foundation is part of Abolition 2000,
A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

From gdaniell@wt.com.au Sat Feb 22 10:21:31 1997
Date: Fri, 21 Feb 1997 12:49:28 +0800 (WST)
From: Graham Daniell <gdaniell@wt.com.au>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

In response to the following comment from Lachlan Forrow, I couldn't agree more. As another recent message said, the Abolition 2000 movement risks becoming fragmented and falling into internal bickering and division, and losing sight of the original goal. Remember the old adage, "United we stand, divided we fall". With only a little more than 1000 days to go until 2000, we don't have time for divisions.

Graham Daniell
People for Nuclear Disarmament, Perth Western Australia

Lachlan Forrow's comment:

My own personal view is that to support Abolition 2000 all that any person or organization should need to consider is whether they want to endorse a SINGLE goal (not even the 11 points):

There shall be a signed global agreement by the year 2000 committing the world to the permanent elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified timeframe.

If we're trying to amass large numbers of supporters, then I think that anything else is of secondary importance and risks unnecessarily complicating our already-challenging task of making this the kind of bandwagon we need to succeed.

Lachlan Forrow
PSR/IPPNW and
The Albert Schweitzer Fellowship

Towards a nuclear-free millennium,
Graham Daniell
Perth, Western Australia
gdaniell@wt.com.au

From support4@igc.apc.org Sat Feb 22 10:23:27 1997
Date: Fri, 21 Feb 1997 03:26:42 -0800 (PST)
From: "Art McGee, IGC Technical Support" <support4@igc.apc.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Need for advice

Greetings,

Here's how to download all of your unread messages using Pine.

- 1) In Pine type "i" to view the index of your incoming folder.
- 2) Type ";" <--(that's a semicolon)
- 3) When asked for Select Criteria type "s" for Status
- 4) Type "n" for New
- 5) An "X" will appear next to all "New" (or unread) messages.
- 6) Now type "a" to Apply a command to the selected messages, and then type "e" to download these messages.
- 7) Select a protocol. Enter a filename to store the message in and then instruct your modem software to begin the transfer.
- 8) The messages will be stored in a file with the name that you selected in step 7 in a directory determined by your communications software. If you have trouble finding the downloaded file, use a "find" command on your computer.
(Windows 3.1 users can use the Search command in File Manager.)
- 9) Once you find the file you can open it with a text editor or a word processor to read the messages.

```
-----  
| Arthur McGee (IGC Technical Support)      <support4@igc.org>      |  
| Institute for Global Communications        http://www.igc.org/         |  
| Voice: +1-415-561-6100                    Fax: +1-415-561-6101      |  
| PeaceNet * EcoNet * ConflictNet * WomensNet * LaborNet |  
-----
```

> Date: Thu, 20 Feb 1997 16:16:59 -0800 (PST)
> From: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>
> To: IGC Technical Support <support@igc.apc.org>
> Subject: Need for advice
>
> I have two queries.
>
> (1) I'm new to IGC. Because my computer has low capacity, I am using
> BananaCom to access e-mail. I am downloading files one at a time from

> the index with "e" command, then enter "z" for modem and assign a file
> name. Likewise I am deleting one at a time from the index. Is there
> any
> way I can download the entire folder of messages at one time. I can
> then
> sort them with my word processor program.
>
> (2) We are forming a Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition as
> part of the broader Abolition 2000 campaign. We want to set up a
> ListServe to supplement abolition-caucus. How do we do this?
>
> Howard Hallman
> phone/fax 301 896-0013
> mupg@igc.apc.org
>

From acronym@gn.apc.org Sat Feb 22 17:36:52 1997
Date: Fri, 21 Feb 1997 10:29:50 GMT
From: Rebecca Johnson <acronym@gn.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, mosnex@online.ru,
joachim.euchner@student.uni-tuebingen.de,
foesydney@peg.apc.org,
mapw@ozemail.com.au, Tom.Sauer@soc.kuleuven.ac.be,
shundahai@radix.net,
hiro-tsugu.aida@itu.ch, goldblat@ties.itu.ch,
klas.lundius@alinks.se,
lars.lindskog@alinks.se, pbatch@ccr.uct.ac.za,
vineeta@nii.ernet.in,
guardian@peg.apc.org, iakim@glas.apc.org,
gensuikin@igc.apc.org,
cnic-jp@po.iiijnet.or.jp, tgrimwood@ucsusa.org,
abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, mary@vi.org, ukwglm@msn.com,
banmines@sover.net
Subject: CD agenda agreed

to DISARMAMENT INTELLIGENCE RECEIVERS
1997 DisInt Report # 1.1
21 February, 1997

This is just a short appendix to the long report and analysis on
the CD
(DisInt Report # 1) sent to you on February 4.

On the last day of his presidency, the South Korean Ambassador
Joun Yung Sun
managed to push through agreement on an agenda for the CD. This
does not
mean they have agreed their programme of work! All that
agreement on the
agenda means is that there broad approval on the relevant areas
for
consideration. In practice it means that this diversionary
argument is now
out of the way and the CD can concentrate on trying to decide
what it will
actually do -- its programme of work. Refer to report # 1 for
discussion
of the options.

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.

In a clear reference to landmines, the President 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.'

As regards the programme of work, there doesn't look like there's much hope for movement. The G-21, now chaired by Iran, are working out a mandate for their proposed ad hoc Committee on nuclear disarmament. However, there is still no resolution of the division between those that want a mandate to negotiate a timetable for nuclear disarmament, which they stand no chance of getting at present (India is the main pusher here. Egypt, Iran, Pakistan also, but there are behind the scenes indications that they would settle for a non-negotiating committee); and those who are pushing for a deliberative mandate, to set the precedent for a nuclear disarmament committee first and get the ball rolling (with a view to a negotiating mandate in 1 or 2 years). This second group includes Chile, Morocco, South Africa with Brazil and several others wobbling. The western group haven't yet come up with anything. The western nuclear weapon states are still opposed to a nuclear disarmament committee, irrespective (they say) of the kind of mandate...actually there are a few cracks in these positions, but little movement can be expected until Britain's government changes! The linkage still seems to be 'no fissban committee without a nuclear disarmament committee', and even that is not certain. Landmines discussions continue to percolate through, but no sign of a decision. I'll be reporting soon on the CTBT implementing organisation's attempts to get up and running at its reconvened PrepCom, March 3-11.

=====
Disarmament Intelligence Review
24, Colvestone Crescent
London E8 2LH
England
Tel/fax: +44 171 241 4691

email: acronym@gn.apc.org
=====

From disarmament@igc.org Sat Feb 22 17:36:52 1997
Date: Fri, 21 Feb 1997 07:18:28 -0800 (PST)
From: disarmament@igc.org
To: ctb-followers@igc.org
Subject: Albright - Russia

The New York Times Feb. 21, 1997

Albright Offers Russia Plan to Ease Fears on NATO

By MICHAEL R. GORDON

MOSCOW -- Secretary of State Madeleine Albright on Thursday presented the Kremlin with a new arms control proposal that would freeze military forces near Russia's European periphery, the West's first detailed response to Russian anxieties about NATO expansion.

The proposal, which was outlined by senior Western officials on condition that they not be identified, is part of a broader American arms control plan that seeks to persuade Moscow that the expansion of NATO would not bring the alliance's military might to Russia's doorstep.

But the new plan would not require reductions in NATO forces or dramatically alter the military balance on the European continent, American officials said.

Albright outlined the plan in a meeting with Russian Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov. The plan was also presented on Thursday to NATO allies in Vienna.

Sergei Yastrzhembsky, President Boris Yeltsin's spokesman, said that the Kremlin would carefully study the new ideas. But Moscow has also continued to publicly refrain from saying that the expansion of NATO may destabilize Russia and renew old tensions.

The main aim of the new proposal is to ease Moscow's fear that NATO is trying to take advantage of Russia at a time of weakness. Fear of encirclement has long been a theme in Russian military thinking, and most of Moscow's recent proposals have been aimed at constraining NATO's ability to operate on the territory of new Eastern European members.

To address Russian concerns, the new proposal would update the 1990 treaty slashing conventional forces with Europe, which was hammered out between the NATO alliance and the old Soviet-led bloc. That treaty has also led to the destruction of some 50,000 weapons.

"What this does is reduce NATO's military potential and limit the forces that are close to Russian territory," a Western

official said.

The new proposal covers tanks, armored personnel carriers, and artillery. It has several basic elements.

First, it stipulates that the number of weapons in the so-called Visegrad nations that are candidates for early NATO membership cannot be increased. These are Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Hungary.

This goes only part way to meeting Russian demands. The new NATO plan, for example, rejects Primakov's demand for a ban on the construction of new NATO bases and other installations in these nations.

Nor does it accept Russian proposals for limits on the movement of American and Western European forces on the territory of new NATO members.

In other words, while the number of tanks, armored personnel carriers, and artillery in each of the Visegrad nations cannot grow, the makeup of the force can change. That is, American or German tanks can be deployed in Poland without Russia's blessing if Poland reduces its tanks so that the total number of tanks is not increased.

To accept more onerous restrictions, American officials say, would be to hamstring the alliance's military capability.

As part of the plan to lower tensions in central Europe, comparable weapons ceilings would be established in Belarus, Ukraine, and the Russian enclave of Kaliningrad north of Poland.

Such limits are important politically because they will be used by Washington to reassure the new NATO members that they are not being discriminated against.

Another main element of the plan seeks to lower the number of weapons that each NATO nation is entitled to have, as part of a reciprocal agreement that would apply to Russian forces.

Western officials assert that the proposal provides Moscow with an assurance that NATO nations will not try to build up their forces. But this aspect of the plan is unlikely to require actual reductions in the number of weapons. Due to budget cuts and the end of the Cold War, NATO nations have already cut their forces more than required.

The United States, for example, is entitled to have some 4,000 tanks in Europe under the 1990 treaty. In fact, it has less than 1,500. Thus, the United States could agree to a lower weapon allotment without actually cutting its forces.

Beyond putting a cap on NATO's military potential, American officials note that the proposal tries to get away from the notion of opposing military blocs by expressing the new measures in terms of national ceilings and territorial limits.

One American official said that any agreement that is reached would also include a clause that would allow the United States and its allies to augment their forces in the event of a major military crisis.

Behind all the arms control details is the basic military question of whether the inclusion of new NATO members will change the balance of military power in Europe.

The answer is somewhat, but not much, some analysts say. The inclusion of the Polish army within NATO, for example, provides

the alliance with additional tanks, planes, and troops.

Indeed, American officials say that Poland's 2,000 tanks outnumber the number of American tanks deployed in Europe, although the American tanks are deemed to be far superior.

Still, many analysts say that if war broke out between NATO and Russia, Poland would probably fight on the West's side regardless of whether it was a formal NATO member.

Further, the real backbone of the alliance is, and will remain, American military power and technology. Nonetheless, integrating East European armies into NATO will make them more effective.

This is not the first time the United States offered to amend the conventional forces treaty to meet Russian concerns. It previously agreed to relax limits on Russian forces on the southern flank of its territory.

This was done after Russia demanded the additional flexibility to protect against instability on its southern periphery and to prosecute the war in Chechnya.

NATO has already offered other assurances not to deploy nuclear weapons on the territory of new members, but these assurances are not legally binding.

Albright, who was accompanied by military experts armed with charts and graphs, declined to characterize her meeting with Primakov.

American officials said it may take the Russians some time to digest the new proposal. But Moscow's public position was unchanged.

Russia will continue to oppose NATO expansion, Yastrzhembsky said, "whatever the outcome of the negotiations between Russia and the Atlantic alliance."

RTw 02/21 0848 Albright sees NATO-Russia progress, still problems

By Carol Giacomo

MOSCOW, Feb 21 (Reuter) - U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, said on Friday the United States and Russia had made progress on a European security deal, but there had been no breakthrough after two days of intensive talks.

Albright, speaking after talks with Boris Yeltsin and Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov, described the Russian president as engaged and "very much in charge."

She was the first senior Western official to visit Yeltsin in the Kremlin this year and the meeting marked another step for the president in reasserting his authority in foreign policy.

Albright, on her first foreign trip since taking office, said there had been "important progress" on plans for a document defining post-Cold War ties between Russia and the NATO alliance. But much complex work remained to be done.

She said it was far from certain that a deal could be in place by the time NATO holds a summit in Madrid in July to decide which former Warsaw Pact states to bring in as new members.

Foreign Minister Primakov, describing Albright as "an Iron Lady but a constructive lady," said Russia remained firmly opposed to expansion of the alliance.

"We are ...also trying to do everything possible to minimise the complications that may arise if expansion goes ahead," he said.

Russia has already warned NATO that its plans to grant membership to some of Moscow's Cold War allies in central and eastern Europe could upset the European security balance.

But since NATO made clear it would not change its plans to cope with Russian objections, Moscow has concentrated on negotiating a deal which would guarantee its security interests.

There are still many sticking points.

Moscow says NATO should sign a legally binding document on ties with Russia if expansion goes ahead, ceding some say to Moscow on future development.

The U.S. rejects the idea of a legally binding paper, although it says NATO has no plans to station nuclear weapons on the territory of new member states.

She refused to comment on Yeltsin's health -- the president had heart problems last year and pneumonia this year -- but said he was alert.

Reporters at the meeting said Yeltsin's face looked pale and waxen, as if he was wearing make-up.

Albright's spokesman said she had given Yeltsin a letter from President Bill Clinton discussing the likely agenda for a summit the two leaders plan to hold in Helsinki next month and outlining what they want to achieve there.

U.S. officials said Albright spoke Russian at the start and end of the meeting, dispensing with the interpreters' services from Russian to English at the end because she understood and because she and Yeltsin wanted to speed up the talks.

Appealing to the Russian people at a news conference after her meeting with Primakov, she said Russia was now on the same side as its one-time NATO foes.

"We are no longer in a situation of you versus us. We are all on the same side," she said. "The new NATO is not the NATO of the Cold War."

The NATO-Russia package is designed to assuage Russian concerns about alliance expansion.

That includes a charter or document defining NATO-Russia ties in the future and promises of vastly enhanced Russia-alliance cooperation, including the possibility of a joint military unit that would probably focus on peacekeeping.

But Kremlin spokesman Sergei Yastrzhembsky indicated that the military unit was not a priority.

"In the alphabet of our interests it is somewhere close to the first letter of my name," said Yastrzhembsky, whose name starts with the last letter in the Russian alphabet.

RTw 02/21 0818 Russian nuclear forces in good shape-Chernomyrdin

MOSCOW, Feb 21 (Reuter) - Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin said after inspecting the headquarters of Russia's nuclear missile forces on Friday that they were under firm control and effective.

"Russian strategic missile forces are capable of effectively carrying out all tasks entrusted to them," Interfax quoted him as saying after visiting the headquarters situated in the town of Odintsovo outside Moscow.

President Boris Yeltsin ordered Chernomyrdin to inspect the missile forces, the backbone of Russia's nuclear strike power, after Defence Minister Igor Rodionov complained last week that they were close to collapse because of poor funding.

Rodionov later said he had not meant there was any immediate threat of the nuclear forces going out of control.

"The nation's nuclear shield is in reliable hands," Chernomyrdin said.

But he said the government wanted more information about the real situation in the missile forces. There have been reports of poor morale, maintenance difficulties and other problems -- all of which have caused concern in the West.

"Our task is to get an objective picture of what is happening here," Itar-Tass news agency quoted Chernomyrdin as saying in Odintsovo.

Chernomyrdin said the government considered it a priority task to provide funding and other necessary conditions for maintaining the high readiness of the missile forces.

Russian leaders have said they will consider taking "adequate measures" if NATO goes ahead with plans to expand eastwards and is worried that new members in eastern Europe could have nuclear weapons based on their territory.

Rodionov has said that under certain circumstances, Moscow's missiles might be pointed westwards, although other Russian leaders have played down his suggestion.

As part of its efforts to reassure Moscow that NATO enlargement poses no threat, the alliance has said it sees no reason to base nuclear weapons on the soil of new members.

REUTER

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street #700 Washington DC 20005

TEL: 202 898 050 ext. 232 FAX: 202 898 0172

<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

From rwilcock@execulink.com Sat Feb 22 17:36:52 1997

Date: Fri, 21 Feb 1997 08:17:33 -0500

From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>

To: "'pmeidell@igc.apc.org'" <pmeidell@igc.apc.org>

Cc: "Abolition Caucus List (E-mail)"

<abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>

Subject: A2000 Documents

Dear Pamela,

Thank you for your very helpful summary of the Tahiti Documents.

I have used it as the basis for a new A2000 Documents item in the PGS A2000 section to offer easy access to all the necessary A2000 documents.

Please comment and correct any errors or omissions that you may find there.

Ross Wilcock
rwilcock@web.net
<http://web.net.pgs/~pgs/>

From rwilcock@execulink.com Sat Feb 22 17:36:52 1997
Date: Fri, 21 Feb 1997 10:13:25 -0500
From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>
To: "Abolition Caucus List (E-mail)"
<abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>
Subject: A2000 Documents

I have made all the documents including the report Card available via our A2000 section.

I hope this will help solve some of the problems arising from recent discussions.

Comments and further suggestions are welcome.

Ross Wilcock
rwilcock@web.net
<http://web.net.pgs/~pgs/>

From ippnwbos@igc.apc.org Sat Feb 22 17:36:52 1997
Date: Fri, 21 Feb 1997 08:35:34 -0800 (PST)
From: ippnwbos@igc.apc.org
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: correction Dutch nato action request

forwarded
>Date: Thu, 20 Feb 1997 23:08:32 +0100 (MET)
>From: "k.koster" <K.Koster@inter.nl.net>
>To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
>cc: amok@amok.antenna.nl
>Subject: correction Dutch nato action request
>Message-ID:
<Pine.SUN.3.91.970220230721.4377A-100000@hatert.nijmegen.inter.nl.net>
>MIME-Version: 1.0
>Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
>
>Dear Friends,
>
>Just a small but important correction to the 19 Feb NABASIC
>request for immediate action regarding the Dutch political
>debate on NATO extension.
>
>My name, e-mail and fax nrs are incorrect and should be as
>follows:
>
>Karel Koster

>K.Koster@inter.nl.net
>tel 31-30-2 722 594
>or
>tel 31-30-2 442 122
>
>FAX
>31-30-2 441 723
>
>Please let me know of any action you may be taking such as
>contacts with the Dutch press or diplomatic corps. I need thsi
>information urgently.

>
>Karel Koster
>AMOK
>HOLLAND

>
>
From ippnwbos@igc.apc.org Sat Feb 22 17:36:52 1997
Date: Fri, 21 Feb 1997 08:35:38 -0800 (PST)
From: ippnwbos@igc.apc.org
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Abolition 2000 - reports and resos online

forwarded

>Date: Thu, 20 Feb 1997 11:06:53 -1000 (HST)
>Message-Id: <10302090daf31d50e5ebe@[204.94.118.68]>
>Mime-Version: 1.0
>Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
>To:
>From: Scott Crawford - Pacific Impact <scott@hookele.com>
>Subject: Abolition 2000 - reports and resos online

>
>Aloha Kakou,

>
>Many new reports and resolutions from the January 21-28, 1997,
Abolition
>2000 Conference in Moorea have been added to the Abolition 2000
website at:

>
> <http://hookele.com/abolition2000/reports.html>

>
>Documents now online include:

>
> Conference Schedule and Daily Journal

>
> Statement from Moorea

>
> Taraho Statement: INITIATED BY THE MAOHI PEOPLE AT THE
ABOLITION

> 2000 INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE FOR THE ABOLITION OF NUCLEAR
ARMS

>
> Tahiti - And Nuclear Colonialism

>

> Report on 1-24-97 Meeting of Nuclear Weapon Convention
Working Group,
> Combined with Nuclear Threat Working Group, and with
Non-proliferation
> Treaty Preparatory Committee Working Group, at Moorea
Conference
>
> One Thousand Days to Nuclear Abolition: Report on the
General Assembly
> of Abolition 2000
>
> Draft Notes from the North American Region Meeting
>
> Report of the Regional Working Group in Europe
>
> Report from the Asian Group Meeting
>
> Canada (North America Region) Regional Report Summary
>
> Resolution Presented by the Israeli Delegation to the
Conference
>
> Plans of the Alba Circle, Hungary
>
> Youth Caucus Presentation
>
> Resolution to Cancel the Cassini Space Launch
>
> Resolution Addressing the Inadequacies of the IAEA Study
of the
> Effects of French Nuclear Testing in the Pacific
>
> Resolution Against the Military/Nuclear Option of the
Republic of
> Palau-United States Compact of Free Association
>
> Letter to the Earth Council
>
> A Petition to the President of Israel for the Release of
Mordechai
> Vanunu
>
> Nuclear Test Anniversary: Tahiti March & Health Study
>
> American Friends Service Committee Report
>
> Impressions of a French Peace Activist after the Abolition
2000
> Conference in "French" Polynesia
>
>

>

>Pacific Impact - freezone@hookele.com -
http://hookele.com/abolition2000
>
>
>
>

Michael Christ Program Director
International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War
126 Rogers St. Cambridge, MA 02142 USA
tel. (617)868-5050 fax. (617)868-2560
ippnwbos@igc.apc.org http://www.healthnet.org/IPPNW

IPPNW is part of Abolition 2000: A Global Network to Eliminate
Nuclear Weapons

From wilpfnatl@igc.apc.org Sat Feb 22 17:36:52 1997
Date: Fri, 21 Feb 1997 09:17:46 -0800 (PST)
From: Z <wilpfnatl@igc.apc.org>
To: peace through reason <prop1@prop1.org>,
abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: A serious question for all Abolitionists

Dear Friends,

Please send us the material on Rep. Norton's bill. We had been
told she
wasn't planning to reintroduce the bill in this session. WILPF
would be
more than glad to work to forward the initiative.

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
1213 Race Street
Phila, PA 19107

fax # (215) 563-5527

Thanks
Z - Program Director

At 08:02 AM 2/11/97 -0500, peace through reason wrote:
>Dear friends,
>
>I've been trying to figure out why we're not getting any
positive response
>from you guys about Congresswoman Norton's "Nuclear Disarmament
and Economic
>Conversion Act."
>
>I've come up with some tentative answers:
>

>1. You haven't read our messages.
>2. You think we're crazy, and therefore want nothing to do with the proposal.
>
>With the World Court decision, the generals' press conference, etc., this
>bill is timely. It asks for a commitment from the U.S. that we'll get rid
>of our nukes if everyone else does, and will earmark the money saved for
>converting the war machine and cleaning up the environmental mess that's
>been made.
>
>PLEASE help.
>
>Delegate Norton needs letters of support for re-introducing the measure each
>session since 1994. (For those who don't know, the bill was introduced
>after a successful grassroots voter initiative in DC in September 1993.)
>Your local representatives need letters urging them to co-sponsor the bill.
>
>More information can be found at <http://prop1.org/prop1.htm>,
Let me know
>if you can't access the Web and I'll send you the text of the bill, list of
>co-sponsors, etc.
>
>Please respond one way or another so I know you received this?
>
>Thanks so much.
>
>Ellen Thomas
>Proposition One Committee
>P.O. Box 272107, Washington DC 20038
>202-462-0757
><http://prop1.org> -- prop1@prop1.org
>
>

From: greensfelder@igc.apc.org Sat Feb 22 17:36:52 1997
Date: Fri, 21 Feb 1997 09:19:17 -0800
From: Claire Greensfelder <greensfelder@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Tahiti:Plutonium Transport Letter

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

To: Abolition Caucus
From: Claire Greensfelder, Mayumi Oda -- Plutonium Free Future

Here follows a copy of the letter on the Plutonium Waste Shipment that was drafted by the Nuclear Waste Action Group and approved by plenary at the Abolition 2000 Meeting in Moorea this January. The action steps were drawn from an earlier letter sent to a similar list of public officials by Nuclear Control Insititute (Washington, DC) , Citizens Nuclear Information Center, (Tokyo, Japan), Greenpeace International (Amsterdam, the Netherlands) and the World Information Service on Energy (Paris).

We have included a list of those who signed at the meeting in Moorea. If we missed anyone who signed, please forgive us and email or fax us your name and signature.

We just received word from Tom Clements of Greenpeace International that the plutonium waste shipment is believed to be in the vicinity of Tasmania near the Tasman Sea. A number of nations have made statements about the shipment and logged protests with the responsible parties. We will post further information about this later today.

We are continuing to circulate this letter, and other parties are welcome to sign on.

Please email or fax us your name, title and organization (if applicable) and Nation if you wish to sign on at this time. Thank you.

Open Letter to the Parties Responsible for the Shipment of High Level Nuclear Waste Currently en route from Cherbourg, France to Rokkasho-Mura, Japan

25 January 1997

The Honorable Riichiro Chikaoka
Director General, Science and Technology Agency, Tokyo, JAPAN

Hiroshi Araki
President, DENJIREN
The Federation of Electric Utilities, Tokyo, Japan

The Honorable Franck Borotra
Minister of Industry, Paris, FRANCE

The Honorable Corinne Lepage
Minister of the Environment, Paris, FRANCE

The Honorable Federico Pena
Secretary of Energy (nominated), USA

The Honorable Madeleine Albright
Secretary of State, Washington D.C., USA

Honorable Officials,

We write to you as a deeply concerned group of 82 Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO's) from 23 countries assembled on the island of Moorea in French-Occupied Polynesia. We are here in support of the goals of the Abolition 2000 campaign to rid the world of nuclear weapons. We wish to inform you of our deep concern about the shipment of high level nuclear waste from plutonium production that is currently making its way from Cherbourg , France to Rokkasho-Mura, Japan. We ask that you consider our serious request to immediately halt this shipment and turn this boat back to port. Further, we insist that you cancel all the future shipments of plutonium and plutonium waste that you have planned between now and the year 2010.

Over the past week, we have grieved with our colleagues from around the world. We heard one testimony after another on the serious and irreversible consequences of nuclear contamination. We also are aware that the previous shipment of plutonium waste that arrived in Rokkasho-Mura on April 26, 1995 contained a canister that leaked radiation inside of the cask. Had there been an accident either at sea or at port, a nuclear disaster could have occurred. There is no scientific evidence provided by the industry that the

radioactive cargo can withstand such an accident.

You must be aware that these canisters are so dangerous that a fatal dose of radiation would be received in less than one minute to a person standing within one metre of an unshielded container.

The entire world, but particularly the Pacific region where we meet today, has already endured unacceptable deadly levels of contamination due to French and US nuclear testing which has continuously violated the right to life of all peoples of the Pacific.

The path of the shipment- whether it comes by Africa or by South America, will pass through the Pacific Ocean from South to North and in territorial waters of many countries including New Caledonia, The Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and Hawaii.

The peoples, animals and plants of the Pacific Rim finally breathe free of nuclear testing, We believe it is outrageous that the US, France, and Japan are collaborating now to force yet one more life threatening nuclear insult on this region.

Therefore, on behalf of the future of the Pacific peoples, and indeed on behalf of all the peoples of the world we demand that:

1) This shipment should be immediately stopped due to the real and potential danger for a nuclear accident at sea or port.

2) You respond in writing to the concerns expressed by en-route governments and NGO's

3) You commission an environmental impact statement undertaken in accordance with the provisions of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea.

4) You answer the safety issues concerning the shipment, storage and final disposal of high level vitrified plutonium waste as raised by Dr. Edwin S. Lyman, PhD of the Nuclear Control Institute.

5) You cancel all further plans for shipments of plutonium and plutonium waste unless and until all safety and environmental concerns have been answered to the satisfaction of the governments and NGO's of en-route states and their concerned colleagues around the world.

Sincerely,

Mayumi Oda
Plutonium Free Future
USA / Japan

Claire Greensfelder
Niji-no-Hebi (Rainbow Serpent)
Plutonium Free Future Women's Network
California/USA

Isabella Sumang
Olila Beluad
Palau

Sylvia Lalin
Youth to Youth in Health
Marshall Islands

Gabriel Tetitarahi
Hiti Tau
Tahiti/Polynesia

David Gracie
American Friends Service Committee
Pennsylvania/USA

Lakota Harden
National Peace Education Committee
American Friends Service Committee
California

Karina Wood
Peace Action Education Fund
Washington DC/USA

Danny Thompson
National Peace Council
UK

Miri Vidal-Nutter
NFIP/ Ohana Koa Hawaii
Hawaii Coalition Against Nuclear Tests

Hawaii

Bill Salzman
Citizens for Peace in Space
USA

Lysiane Alezard
Mouvement de la Paix
France

Claude Nellia
Mouvement de la Paix
France

Syaman Rapongan
The Chief of Tao Council
Taiwan

Jaqueline Cabasso
Western States Legal Foundation
USA

Eric Moon
American Friends Service Committee
California/USA

Gideon Spiro
International Committee to Free Mordecai Vanunu
Israel

Fifita Tevita
Nuclear Free & Independent Pacific Movement-Tonga
Tonga

Myrla B. Baldonado
Nuclear Free Philippines Coalition
Philippines

Michael Simmons
American Friends Service Committee
USA

Alice Slater
GRACE
USA

Leina'ala Ley
American Friends Service Committee-Pacific Program
Hawaii

Kilali Alailima
American Friends Service Committee-Pacific Program
Hawaii

Maxine Davidon
Americans for Democratic Action
USA

Louise Mahdi
Open Court Press
Illinois/USA

Ian Prior
Abolition 2000 NZ
International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War NZ
Aotearoa/New Zealand

Anne Zanes
Peace Links
USA

Matteo Peixinho
Shundahai Network
Nevada/USA

Byron Plumley
American Friends Service Committee
Colorado/USA

Laurent Manuaru Bodin
A TIA I MUA T.U./Hiti Tau
Tahiti/Polynesia

Aimeho Ariiotima
Dclaration TARAHOI
Tahiti/Polynesia

Clariza Lucas
KURA ORA; Society of French Nuclear Victims
Tahiti/Polynesia

Tamara Bopp Du Pont
TA MAITAI TATOU I TE IOA O TO TATOU ATUA
Tahiti/Polynesia

Michael Styer
Connecticut Peace Action
USA

Dorothy Chan
Tufts University Student
USA

Corbin Harney
Western Shoshone Nation
USA

Kahilihiwa

Na Kapuna O Hawaii Ma
Hawaii

Sally Laidlaw Williams
American Friends Service Committee
California/USA

Vaihere Bordes
Vahine Toa
Tahiti/Polynesia

Thoai Nguyen
American Friends Service Committee
Pennsylvania/USA

William Davidon
Federation of American Scientists
USA

Masa Takubo
Gensuikin
Japan

Scilla Elworthy
Oxford Research Group
UK

Tadashi Funada
Nuclear Free Pacific Center
Japan

Hiro Umebayashi
Pacific Campaign For Disarmament & Security
Japan

Shigery Yoshikawa
Nuclear Free Pacific Center
Japan

Lars Pohlmeier
International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War
Germany

Jurgen Scheffran
INESAP
Germany

Judith Rubenstein
Santa Barbara, CA, USA

Maire Bopp
Moorea/Polynesia

Nic MacLellan
Australia

Elespie Kate Prior
New Zealand

Yoshi Elanzo
Nuclear Victim
Marshall Islands

Etienne Teparii (HAO)
French Nuclear Landright Victim
Tahiti/Polynesia

Oshiro Tatsuaki
Okinawa

Marcia Nelson
Ottawa, IL, USA

* * * * *
* * * * *

Claire Greensfelder and Mayumi Oda
INOCHI/Plutonium Free Future
PO Box 2589
Berkeley, California
Shasta Bioregion
USA
94702-0589

tel: +1-510-540-7645
fax: +1-510-540-6159
email: pff@igc.apc.org

From plough@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca Sat Feb 22 17:36:52 1997
Date: Fri, 21 Feb 1997 11:44:41 -0500 (EST)
From: Project Ploughshares <plough@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Anti-Nuclear War Fund

Announcement...

Organizations working toward nuclear weapons abolition are encouraged to apply to the Anti-Nuclear-War Fund, administered by Project Ploughshares. The Fund provides grants for projects that advance the purpose and goal of the Fund, which is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, worldwide.

The Fund was established in November 1990, and since then has supported more than 25 projects in 8 countries, with grants ranging from \$300 to \$10,000.

Application deadlines are March 31 and September 30. The Anti-Nuclear-War Fund committee meets twice each year, in April and October.

If you are interested in applying to the Fund, contact Nancy Regehr at Project Ploughshares for more information.

by mail: Nancy Regehr
Project Ploughshares
Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies
Conrad Grebel College
Waterloo Ontario N2L 3G6 Canada
by telephone: 1-519-888-6541, ext. 268
by fax: 1-519-885-0806
by E-mail: nregehr@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca

From cfpa@cyberenet.net Sat Feb 22 17:36:52 1997
Date: Fri, 21 Feb 1997 11:39:11 -0500
From: Coalition for Peace Action <cfpa@cyberenet.net>
To: Lachlan Forrow <lforrow@igc.apc.org>
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: What IS "Abolition 2000"?

I completely agree with the sentiment by Lachlan Forrow that only the commitment to negotiating a treaty by the year 2000 on eliminating nuclear weapons within a defined timeframe should be all that is necessary for an entity to be considered part of the Abolition 2000 campaign. That is very much like during the nuclear weapons freeze

campaign, when thousands of groups approved diverse resolutions, but they all agreed on the simple goal of a U.S.-Soviet freeze on nuclear weapons.

I also like to goal of getting 2000 such commitments by this year's Hiroshima commemoration. Here in New Jersey, we are working on a city resolution campaign, and on February 10, Roosevelt, NJ became the first New Jersey municipality to pass a resolution. We are working on about 10 others, and I think they all should be added to the list of supporters/endorsers as soon as they approve a resolution.

By the way, we have a model municipal council resolution, and guidelines available for getting one approved. If anyone wants these materials, they can email us back or contact me at the address/phone/fax below.

Rev. Bob Moore
Coalition for Peace Action
40 Witherspoon St.
Princeton, NJ 08542
(609) 924-5022 Phone
(609) 924-3052 Fax
From greensfelder@igc.apc.org Sat Feb 22 17:36:52 1997
Date: Fri, 21 Feb 1997 14:57:59 -0800
From: Claire Greensfelder <greensfelder@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Tahiti: Resolution on Creation & Transportation of Nuclear Waste

Dear Friends in the Abolition Caucus and Other Interested Colleagues:

Here follows the final version of the second resolution that was presented in Moorea by the Nuclear Waste Action Group that met during the workshop sessions. (The first was the Plutonium Waste Transport Letter that I posted earlier today.)

Please accept our apology for the inaccuracies in the version that was posted earlier by Alice Slater of Grace. The fault was my own, not Alice's - she had received one of a few copies that had been stapled in the wrong order

(my mistake in the rush of the plenary) and had posted the resolution with the first and second pages reversed. Please replace the earlier version with this one.

The correct resolution begins with the quote from Corbin Harney. Also, this one has an 8th action point for industry and governments that was added by the plenary in the discussion before final adoption.

The names of the delegates who participated in the drafting of this resolution are listed as well.

Thank you.

Claire Greensfelder
Plutonium Free Future

* * * * *
* * * * *

ABOLITION 2000 CONFERENCE - 20-28 JANUARY 1997 - MOOREA ISLAND

Submitted by the Nuclear Waste Action Group Meeting at A2000 Conference

Participants:

- Miri Vidal, Nuclear Free & Independent Pacific,
- Ohana-Koa/Hawaii Coalition Against Nuclear Tests;
- Tony White, Hiti-Tau
- Corbin Harney, Western Shoshone Nation,
- Tadashi Funada, Nuclear Free Pacific Center;
- Mayumi Oda, INOCHI-Plutonium Free Future
- Claire Greensfelder, Plutonium Free Future

Women's Network,

Final Version - Approved by Plenary

RESOLUTION CALLING FOR AN END TO THE CREATION AND TRANSPORTATION OF NUCLEAR WASTE

There is one air.
There is one water.
There is one mother earth that is being affected by radiation.
Every step
of the
nuclear chain creates contamination.

- Corbin Harney, Spiritual Leader of the Western Shoshone People

We, the organizations and individuals gathered on the beautiful island of Moorea in French-occupied Polynesia to attend the Abolition 2000 International Meeting from 20-28 January, 1997 reaffirm the concern expressed in the preamble to the Abolition 2000 Statement and signed by over 600 NGOs from around the world:

The inextricable link between the 'peaceful' and warlike uses of nuclear technologies and the threat to future generations inherent in creation and use of long-lived radioactive materials must be recognized.

We must move towards reliance on clean, safe, renewable forms of energy production that do not provide the materials for weapons of mass destruction and do not poison the environment for thousands of centuries.

The true 'inalienable' right is not to nuclear energy, but to life, liberty and security of person in a world free of nuclear weapons.

Nuclear weapons testing has profoundly disturbed the traditional way of life of all Polynesian peoples as well as destroying islands on which nuclear tests have been conducted. The entire Pacific region has been put at risk. Further, we have heard moving testimony over the past week describing how peoples in every region of our earth have suffered from the radioactivity released at every link of the nuclear chain.

The Pacific Region peoples have worked for thirty years to put a stop to the French nuclear tests in the Pacific and around the world. And now that the testing is finally stopped, we find we are threatened indefinitely with land, sea and air shipments of nuclear waste that are ten or more times more radioactive than the Chernobyl accident.

Half way around the world, the Western Shoshone people face the same tragedy - the moment of relief at the end of nuclear testing was

shattered with
the recent arrivals of three shipments a day of nuclear weapons
waste from
all across the US to be dumped - in unlined trenches - at the US
nuclear test
site in Nevada, North America. Spent fuel rods from civilian
nuclear
reactors are also now scheduled for 'temporary' storage at the
test site. The
Shoshone people have lost their life, land, food and water to
nuclear
contamination.

We heard from a Hanford, Washington down-winder who has
personally
lost her father, brother and now her own health and perhaps soon
her life as
a result of contamination from radioactivity from nuclear weapons
production.

We listened and grieved as we heard from our sister from the
Marshall
Islands who personally suffered the loss of stillborn children as
well as live
birthed children with severe deformities and retardation, all as
a consequence
of US nuclear weapons testing.

As we plan for completion of an international convention to ban
nuclear
weapons by the year 2000, many countries in the Asian region,
aided and
encouraged by the nuclear export superpowers - US, Japan, France
and Canada
- are planning another 35 new nuclear power plants over the next
two
decades. New nuclear waste dumps and transport routes are planned
for
every corner of the globe, from Ward Valley, California, on the
sacred lands
of the Ft. Mojave Indian Nation, to Rokkasho Village, Japan, near
a
traditional rural fishing village. Further, the US military plans
to spend \$40
billion over the next 10 years for new nuclear weapons research.

It is unconstitutional to we gathered here in Moorea, that the
superpowers
continue with ever more construction of nuclear power and weapons
when
we have no idea whatsoever how to safely store, transport or
clean up the
radioactive waste from the past 50+ years.

Therefore, we call upon the nuclear industry and the nations of the world to:

- 1) Stop all shipments of nuclear waste by air, sea or land;
- 2) Cancel new construction plans and shut down all nuclear power plants.
Keep all wastes nearby or directly upon the site where they are generated;
- 3) Produce no more materials that they cannot safely dispose of - and there is no safe disposal of nuclear waste - containment and isolation from the biosphere is the only alternative available at this time;
- 4) Give full public disclosure of the routes and the emergency safety provisions of all shipments currently en route or scheduled;
- 5) Take action to implement safe, clean renewable energy systems;
- 6) Stop producing nuclear weapons and use the billions saved to seriously research and seek solutions for the global nuclear waste crisis; and
- 7) Amend standing Nuclear Free Zone treaties to include the prohibition of shipment of nuclear waste through nuclear free zones.
- 8) Stop reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel

We call upon NGOs around the world to join us to:

- 1) Identify nuclear waste transport routes in their cities, regions and nations and to protest all shipments of nuclear waste along these routes;
- 2) Work with labor unions representing truck drivers, dock and airport workers and emergency response technicians to protest their exposure to dangerous radioactivity by virtue of their jobs;
- 3) Eliminate one major incentive of nations to build more nuclear power capability by supporting the conclusion by the year 2000 of negotiations on a nuclear weapons abolition convention.

Claire Greensfelder - Mayumi Oda
INOCHI / Plutonium Free Future
P.O. Box 2589
Berkeley, California 94702-0589
Shasta Bioregion, USA
tel: +1-510-540-7645
fax: +1-510-540-6159
email: pff@igc.apc.org

From wdavidon@haverford.edu Sat Feb 22 17:36:52 1997
Date: Fri, 21 Feb 1997 11:10:11 -0500
From: "William C. Davidon" <wdavidon@haverford.edu>
To: Lachlan Forrow <lforrow@igc.apc.org>, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: What IS "Abolition 2000"?

I agree wholeheartedly with Lachlan Forrow when he wrote:

>My own personal view is that to support Abolition 2000 all
>that any person or organization should should need to consider
>is whether they want to endorse a SINGLE goal (not even the
>11 points):

>
> There shall be a signed global agreement by the year
2000
> committing the world to the permanent elimination of
nuclear
> weapons within a specified timeframe.

>
>If we're trying to amass large numbers of supporters, then
>I think that anything else is of secondary importance and
>risks unnecessarily complicating our already-challenging
>task of making this the kind of bandwagon we need to
>succeed.

We sorely need a global network which focusses on aboliting
nuclear
weapons. While many other matters are related to this, other
organizations
are working on them and we each support more than one.

Could we not also set up separate email lists for other topics
like NATO
expansion so that each of us could subscribe selectively?

Bill Davidon

E-mail: wdavidon@haverford.edu
Homepage: <http://www.haverford.edu/math/wdavidon.html>

From aslater@igc.apc.org Sat Feb 22 17:36:52 1997
Date: Fri, 21 Feb 1997 16:41:20 -0800 (PST)
From: ALICE SLATER <aslater@igc.apc.org>

To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: NPT PrepComm Working Group Minutes

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

ABOLITION 2000 NPT WORKING GROUP

MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 20, 1997

ATTENDING REPRESENTATIVES: Vince Comiskey (Pax Christi International), Anne Marie Corominas (LCNP), Cathey Falvo (PSR) , Kate Gunning (GRACE), Babette Linfield (PNSR), Jane Milliken, Betty Obal (Peace Action), Sonya Ostrom (Peace Action), Mary Ellen Singsen (Scarsdale Campaign for Peace through Common Security), Alice Slater (GRACE), Roger Smith (NGO Committee on Disarmament), Aaron Tovish (Parliamentarians for Global Action), Alyn Ware (Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy), Hannah Wasserman (Peacelinks)

~~AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:~~

~~1. REVIEW OF PANELS~~

~~Panels were confirmed for April 7th (Nuclear Weapons Convention Panel) and~~

~~April 8th (Nuclear Energy & Environmentally Sustainable Alternatives). We~~

~~have use of a small conference room for NGO use throughout the PrepComm.~~

~~Contact the NGO Committee on Disarmament for room allotment (Tel: 212-687-4568; Fax: 212-687-1643; Email: disarmtimes@igc.apc.org).~~

~~Alice Slater put in a formal request for Jackie Cabassos Abolition 2000~~

~~Working Group, for time slot for a panel on CBT and Beyond during the PrepComm.~~

~~It was agreed that it was important to arrange an NPT display in the UN~~

~~foyer/visitors lobby if possible, or in another location.~~

~~Babette Linfield~~

~~will contact the Creative Coalition to engage artists to help with the display.~~

~~Other Panels:~~

~~A) Health and Waste Panel. It was agreed that the group should arrange a~~

~~Health & Waste panel to occur during the PrepComm. Alice Slater~~

~~will
speak to Pam Ransom at WEDO about this. Cathey Falvo will speak
to people
at Mt. Sinai Community Health Center. Alyn Ware thought that we
should
consult the
Abolition 2000 Health Working Group and get survivors and victims
of nuclear
waste to come to speak at the panel. Cathey Falvo will contact
Pamela
Meidell to find out who the coordinator of the Health Working
Group is.
Vince Comiskey will contact Claudia Strauss about a newly formed
NGO
Committee on Health. That Committee might be a good group to
co-sponsor the
panel and broaden our network. Michael Simmons (AFSC) should
also be
contacted about this panel.~~

~~B) Report on the NATO panel. Roger Smith reported (on behalf of
Cora Weiss)
that the space for the panel has not yet been guaranteed, however
it is most
likely to be the 2nd floor of the Church Center. Thomas Magnesen
of Sweden
and Cora Weiss will co-chair the meeting (unless Mai-Britt
Theorin can
come). The speakers who have been arranged are: Admiral Carroll,
David
Cortwright, Solange Fernaud and Sharon Riddle. We will also
invite Doug
Roche. Cora also wants someone who can present a Russian/Eastern
European
perspective. Alice and Alyn will try to get the Russian mission
to send
someone to speak. Cora suggested that each speaker have 15
minutes; Alyn
thought 10 would be enough. The speakers should last no longer
than an
hour, then the floor will be open to discussion. There can be
designated
speakers from the floor.~~

~~2. STRUCTURE OF NATO DAY (APRIL 12TH)~~

~~Alice handed out an email from Colin Archer about leaving the
afternoon of
April 12th open for an Abolition 2000 meeting. People were asked
to read
the email and make comments on the structure of the afternoon
session next week.~~

~~3. POSITION PAPER~~

~~Alice handed out an email from John Burroughs (Western States~~

Legal

~~Foundation) about whether the Abolition Caucus will be producing a position statement at the PrepComm. It was agreed that we should use the Abolition 2000 Statement and also circulate the papers produced by various groups. The time that it would take the Caucus to draft a statement and get everyone to agree with it, is too long. Individual groups (including the WSLF) can put out papers in their own name.~~

~~Alyn Ware will speak with the Energy Working Group about preparing a draft paper to present at the CSD meeting.~~

~~4. BASIC PAPERS~~

~~Alice handed out the British American Security Information Council publication BASIC Papers. People were asked to read the papers and be able to discuss them next week.~~

~~Alice presented an email from Dan Plesch, BASIC, (Geneva) on the structure of the PrepComm. He reports that a possible structure for the April meeting is a half a day on the opening and procedural matters, 1-2 days general debate, day for NGO presentations, 4-5 days of review following the main Committee in series rather than in parallel as few delegations will have the staff for three committees in parallel and 2 days on future procedural matters. It appears that discussion on the CD agenda and the PrepComm are becoming more linked politically.~~

~~5. PARLIAMENTARIANS for GLOBAL ACTION PACKAGE~~

~~Aaron Tovish has sent off 90 packages to parliamentarians, trying to get parliamentarians from around the world to sign an international petition to abolish nuclear weapons. The package includes the Letter to Parliamentarians that Alice and Alyn wrote laying out the Abolition 2000 demand that the PrepComm require that work be initiated on negotiations to eliminate nuclear weapons and to further implement the remaining five steps set forth by the Canberra Commission, as well as General Butlers~~

~~statement,
the NY Times article on Butler, the list of organizations
endorsing the
Abolition 2000 statement and the petition.~~

~~Aaron needs people to follow up on this petition. He handed out
a list of
people who he had sent the packages to, so that they could be
contacted. If
there is a strong showing (i.e. lots of signatures) the
international
petition will be made public at the NPT PrepComm. Please let
Aaron know if
you do any follow up work. Cathey will forward the list to
IPPNW. Alice
will sent it to AFSC.~~

~~6. RICHARDSON~~

~~Ambassador Richardson, the new US UN representative, is holding a
briefing
session today for NGOs at the US mission. It was agreed that we
should give
him the Abolition 2000 and NPT Fact statements and that we should
try to
schedule a meeting with him.~~

~~7. ANNOUNCEMENTS~~

~~Babette Linfield announced that PNSR is having a conference at
the Bar
Association on April 26th (the anniversary of Chernobyl) on
nuclear waste
transportation. There will be a flyer out about it next week.~~

~~Sonya Ostrom announced that US Congressman Major Owen has said
that he will
circulate a letter for Congressional signatures to be sent to
Clinton
requesting that he change his nuclear policy in light of General
Butlers
statement. She also announced Metro New York Peace Actions
lobby trip to
Washington on Monday, March 17th. People were asked to donate
money to help
students go. It costs \$30 to send one student.~~

~~A meeting will be scheduled with Bill Epstein for 2 weeks time.~~

~~Alyn Ware will try to arrange for the acting Malaysian Ambassador
Mr. Hasny
to speak to the group on March 6th about the NPT.~~

~~The Dag Hammarskjold auditorium has been booked for March 11th
between 10am
and 12 noon for an overview of the PrepComm to be given.~~

~~8. NEXT MEETING~~

~~The next meeting will take place at 9am on February 27th, at the Church Center, 777 UN Plaza. It will be listed as the NPT meeting on the notice board. Agenda items for next week: Housing, Structure of NATO day, BASIC papers, Training day, April 6th.~~

~~—
—
—
—~~

~~Alice Slater~~

~~GRACE~~

~~Global Resource Action Center for the Environment~~

~~15 East 26 St., Room 915~~

~~New York, NY 10010~~

~~212-726-9161 (tel)~~

~~212-726-9160 (fax)~~

~~aslater@igc.apc.org <email>~~

~~From ngill@emerald.tufts.edu Sat Feb 22 17:36:52 1997~~

~~Date: Fri, 21 Feb 1997 19:17:42 -0500 (EST)~~

~~From: Nick <ngill@emerald.tufts.edu>~~

~~To: Graham Daniell <gdaniell@wt.com.au>~~

~~Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org~~

~~Subject: Re: your mail~~

~~All,~~

~~this is why I wrote that the NATO expansion issue seems a side-track.~~

~~While it is a clearly relevant issue, is it going to bring all the~~

~~parties on board who need to be on board, or is it divisive and a diversion?~~

~~I wholeheartedly support Graham and Lachlan's position. I'm personally too~~

~~worried about China to spend a lot of time on Russia/NATO. We need to get~~

~~ALL parties to agree that as a species we have limited time left to~~

~~save ourselves and haven't a moment to lose building more nuclear weapons.~~

~~The environmental crisis is not going to go away. It is going to get~~

~~worse. We will be extinct in a geological blink of the eye if we do not~~

~~engage in a paradigm shift and figure out what sustainable development~~

~~means and get there as fast as possible.~~

~~We need more democracy, less materialism, and no nuclear weapons. The movement of the late 80's and early 90's proved that we are an adaptive species capable of integrating information into conscious action for change. Look at the Velvet Revolution and at events in Belgrade recently. The world is changing fast, thanks to communications technology. Let us use it wisely.~~

~~Nick Gill
Arlington, Massachusetts~~

~~On Fri, 21 Feb 1997, Graham Daniell wrote:~~

~~> In response to the following comment from Lachlan Forrow, I
couldnt agree
> more. As another recent message said, the Abolition 2000
movement risks
> becoming fragmented and falling into internal bickering and
division, and
> losing sight of the original goal. Remember the old adage,
"United we
> stand, divided we fall". With only a little more than 1000
days to go until
> 2000, we dont have time for divisions.~~

~~>
> Graham Daniell
> People for Nuclear Disarmament, Perth Western Australia~~

~~>
>~~

~~> Lachlan Forrow's comment:~~

~~>
> My own personal view is that to support Abolition 2000 all
> that any person or organization should should need to consider
> is whether they want to endorse a SINGLE goal (not even the
> 11 points):~~

~~>
>----- There shall be a signed global agreement by the year
2000
>----- committing the world to the permanent elimination of
nuclear
>----- weapons within a specified timeframe.~~

~~>
> If we're trying to amass large numbers of supporters, then
> I think that anything else is of secondary importance and
> risks unnecessarily complicating our already challenging
> task of making this the kind of bandwagon we need to
> succeed.~~

>
> ~~Lachlan Forrow~~
> ~~PSR/IPPNW and~~
> ~~The Albert Schweitzer Fellowship~~
>

> ~~Towards a nuclear-free millennium,~~
> ~~Graham Daniell~~
> ~~Perth, Western Australia~~
> ~~gdaniell@wt.com.au~~

>
>
>

~~From: rwilcock@execulink.com~~ Sat Feb 22 17:36:52 1997
~~Date: Fri, 21 Feb 1997 21:17:03 -0500~~
~~From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>~~
~~To: "Abolition Caucus List (E-mail)"~~
~~<abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>~~
~~Subject: Thoughts~~

~~It is very encouraging to see strong comments of commitment to~~
~~Abolition 2000, and to note that Cities, Councils and Regions are~~
~~being lobbied and are coming on board.~~

~~While A2000 began as an "NGO effort" which in another way of~~
~~speaking is "upscale citizen diplomacy", it seems to happen that~~
~~institutions then join the wave so it can become formalized.~~

~~I am wondering why there are no National Endorsements for~~
~~Abolition 2000? Is this a policy decision and something cast in~~
~~stone? I would be most pleased to encourage our Government to~~
~~endorse Abolition 2000. There is now quite a persuasive and well~~
~~documented story to tell.~~

~~Asking governments to endorse it might also be a way of~~
~~getting/keeping this subject on official agendas.~~

~~Two well know religious leaders have already endorsed Abolition~~
~~2000 but for some reason they do not appear in the endorsers list~~
~~— perhaps theirs was a personal endorsement — though some Church~~
~~organizations have already "signed". What about denominations and~~
~~"the higher levels?"~~

~~There could come a point when it would be interesting to see~~
~~which "organizations" choose not to endorse Abolition 2000!~~

~~Ross Wilcock~~
~~rwilcock@web.net~~
~~http://web.net.pgsg/~pgsg/~~

From support@igc.org Sat Feb 22 10:14:13 1997
Date: Thu, 20 Feb 1997 16:22:17 -0800 (PST)
From: IGC User Support <support@igc.org>
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: "Need for advice"

Dear Friend,

Your message regarding:
"Need for advice"

has been received by IGC's User Support department. Messages sent by e-mail are normally answered within twenty-four hours. You may also call us at (415) 561-6100 Monday through Friday 9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m. Pacific Time. If we are unable to take your call, we will call you back on the same or following business day.

The IGC User Support World Wide Web page at <http://www.igc.org/support/> contains manuals, answers to frequently asked questions, software updates, and other helpful information. You will also find answers to many questions in the troubleshooting section of your IGC manual.

IGC support publications are also available via automatic reply e-mail. A few of the automatic reply addresses are listed below. To obtain a complete list of available support publications, send a blank message to support-info@igc.org.

Thank you,
The IGC User Support Team

Send a blank message to any of the following addresses to receive more information by e-mail:

support-info@igc.org
Current list of user support automailers (this document).

igc-info@igc.org
Information about IGC and order form.

interact-info@igc.org
Information and order form for IGC InterACT for Windows.

eudorafaq-info@igc.org
Eudora Pro for Windows frequently asked questions.

pegasusfaq-info@igc.org
Pegasus Mail frequently asked questions.

code-pegasus-info@igc.org

Pegasus Mail encoding and attachment information.

netscapefaq-info@igc.org

Netscape for Windows frequently asked questions.

netscapenewsfaq-info@igc.org

Netscape Newsreader frequently asked questions.

newsexpressfaq-info@igc.org

NewsXpress frequently asked questions.

macinteract-info@igc.org

Information and Order form for IGC InterACT for Macintosh.

newswatcherfaq-info@igc.org

NewsWatcher frequently asked questions.

win95-info@igc.org

How to configure Windows95 TCP/IP to connect to IGC.

majordomo-info@igc.org

Majordomo mailing list information and order form.

connect-info@igc.org

How to find IGC access numbers nationwide.

rates-info@igc.org

Prices for IGC services.

From aslater@igc.apc.org Mon Feb 24 16:34:32 1997
Date: Mon, 24 Feb 1997 09:23:49 -0800 (PST)
From: ALICE SLATER <aslater@igc.apc.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>, Alice@igc.apc.org
Cc: pmeidell@igc.org, lcnp@aol.com, wslf@igc.org,
disarmament@igc.org,
panukes@igc.org
Subject: Re: NPT PreCom

At 01:53 PM 2/23/97 -0800, Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>Dear Alice:

>

>I got on e-mail and the abolition-caucus two weeks ago. I'm very impressed with the thorough NGO preparation for the NPT PreCom. Thanks to all of you for your efforts.

>

>Query: What is being done by whom to influence the positions the U.S. Government will take at the PrepCom? How can we support those efforts?

>

>With best regards,

>

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

>

>Dear Howard,

Thanks for the compliments. The Working Group for the PrepComm is moving along. You raise an interesting question and I don't think we've addressed that issue. We've been trying to influence other governments to put pressure on the US and other nuclear powers. Aaron Tovish at Parliamentarians for Global Action just wrote to 90 parliamentarians urging them to sign the Cranston petition of the generals and to take a position at the PrepComm that negotiations should begin on a Nuclear Weapons Convention and that the Canberra recommendations should be implemented. (all in 1997) Each of the Parliamentarians received a list of the Abolition organizations in their country. We are now trying to get a letter out to the Abolition members with the names of their parliamentarians, asking them to follow-up.

As for the US, perhaps we can start a sign on letter to Clinton, with copies to Senators. Would you be interested in starting that?

How did the religious meeting leaders meeting go? Is there a report that can be posted?

On a small matter, we are running into red tape at the Methodist Building (777 UN Plaza). We can't seem to get a commitment that our Abolition 2000 Caucus can meet every day from 8:00 to 9:00 AM during

the PrepComm (April 7th-11th, 14th-18th). They want to make it available to all NGOs, not just Abolition 2000 but we do need our own room -- and at 8:00 AM that shouldn't be a big problem. Someone is making inquiries into reserving a room at the Episcopal Building on 2nd Ave. and 44th St, but I wonder if there is anything further you think we can do to obtain a contribution of a meeting room for our cause from the Methodists. People are used to meeting in that building and it would be better if they could make the early morning room available there. One requirement we have is that we would be permitted to list our name on the Board --Abolition 2000. At the present time, we are unable to list our name for the Thursday morning NPT meetings -- some kind of red tape of being open to all NGOs.

Many thanks for your help,

Warmest regards,

Alice Slater

GRACE

Global Resource Action Center for the Environment

15 East 26 St., Room 915

New York, NY 10010

212-726-9161 (tel)

212-726-9160 (fax)

aslater@igc.apc.org <email>

From mupj@igc.apc.org Mon Feb 24 16:34:32 1997
Date: Sun, 23 Feb 1997 13:53:11 -0800 (PST)
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
To: Alice@igc.apc.org
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: NPT PreCom

Dear Alice:

I got on e-mail and the abolition-caucus two weeks ago. I'm very impressed with the thorough NGO preparation for the NPT PreCom. Thanks to all of you for your efforts.

Query: What is being done by whom to influence the positions the U.S. Government will take at the PrepCom? How can we support those efforts?

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW Washington, DC 20036
phone/fax: 301 896-0013
mupj@igc.apc.org
From int@fme.knooppunt.be Mon Feb 24 16:34:32 1997
Date: Sun, 23 Feb 1997 19:48:09
From: Pol D'Huyvetter <int@fme.knooppunt.be>
To: yvonneti@dds.nl, lcpn@aol.com, cnd@gn.apc.org, aduta@pcnet.pcnnet.ro, nde@igc.apc.org, NFPC@phil.gn.apc.org, shundahai@saltmine.radix.net, pmeidell@igc.apc.org, DavidMcR@aol.com, aslater@igc.apc.org, hgw@lol.shareworld.com, tom@motherearth.knooppunt.be, pierre.pierart@umh.ac.be, peacenews@gn.apc.org, 73610.2427@CompuServe.COM, rush@hnrc.tufts.edu, 101624.3211@CompuServe.COM, epp92@antenna.nl, geowcpuk@gn.apc.org, koen.moens@ping.be, office@motherearth.knooppunt.be, krista@motherearth.knooppunt.be, int@fme.knooppunt.be, A.Malten@net.HCC.nl, nukeresister@igc.apc.org, walk@igc.apc.org, J.HOSSBACH@LINK-F.rhein-main.de, dweber@math.uni-goettingen.de
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, fme@knooppunt.be
Subject: International Peace Camp - Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days - Hiroshima - Nagasaki - Update # 3

Concerns :

* Nuclear Weapons Abolition Day 1997 - Hiroshima - Nagasaki
UPDATE #3

PROPOSAL FOR

INTERNATIONAL PEACE CAMP AND NUCLEAR WEAPONS ABOLITION ACTIONS
August 1st - August 11th - NATO HQ - Belgium

Return form attached

For :

- Koen Moens (WRI - B)
- Pierre Pierart (Euro. Nuclear Test Ban Coalition - B)
- Tom Keunen (For Mother Earth - Belgium)
- Dietrich Weber (Atomteststopp-Kampagne - D)
- Jurgen Hops Hosbach (Atomteststopp-Kampagne - D)
- Marion Kuepker (FME -D)
- Nishi Yuichiro & Hideaki Ishibashi (Asahi Shimbun - JP)
- Ak Malten (GANA - NL)
- Dirk-Jan Dullemond (EPP92 - NL)
- Yvonne Timmermans (NL)
- Corazon Fabros (Nuclear Free Philippines Coalition)
- Aungiira Aurel Duta (FME - Rumania)
- David Polden (Non-violence Resistance Network - UK)
- George Farebrother (WCP - UK)
- Peacenews (WRI - UK)
- Alyn Ware (Lawyers Comm. on Nuclear policy - USA)
- Jack & Felice Cohen (Nukeresistor - USA)
- Mark Stansbery & Kevin Kamps (FME - USA)
- Jennifer Viereck (Healing Global Wounds (USA)
- Pamela Meidell (Abolition 2000 network)
- Nevada Desert Experience (USA)
- Corbin Harney (Shundahai Network - USA)
- Krista van Velzen (FME International - CZ)
- David Rush (? - ?)

C.c. Abolition 2000
For Mother Earth network

Dear friends,

The proposal for non-violent direct actions, to enforce the ruling of the International Court of Justice, at NATO HQ on Augsut 6th and at different 'sites of crime' (nuclear weapon labs and -bases) on August 9th 1997, was consensed upon by the international meeting of the For Mother Earth network last week.

At the meeting the idea for organising an international peace camp in Belgium took shape.

Today we wish to inform you that we hope to welcome many of you during this peace camp from Friday August 1st 1997 till August 10th 1997.

We also propose to VIP's at the action. Please don't hesitate to contact us with your suggestions.

We will discuss this proposal next march 8th - 9th during the first international meeting to prepare this 'Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days'.

We propose following schedule for the peacecamp

Fri. August 1st	Welcoming participants
Sat. August 2nd	Work-shops on NATO policy, international law, Hiroshima and Nagasaki, why civil disobedience,
Sun. August 3rd	
Mon. August 4th	Non-violent direct actions training Action preparation
Tue. August 5th	Action preparation continued
Wed. August 6th	HIROSHIMA COMMEMORATION International newsconference and actions at NATO HQ in Evere/Brussels Possible actions are blockade, tresspass, ...
Thu. August 7th	Some participants might leave to prepare their local actions Belgian camp will move to north-east, near the USA base of Kleine Brogel with B-61 nukes
Fri. August 8th	Action preparation
Sat. August 9th	NAGASAKI COMMEMORATION Non-violent direct action at Kleine Brogel military base in Belgium, simultaneous with actions at other nuclear sites. At this moment there is growing interest in Germany, Netherlands, UK and USA. We hope to make contacts with people in France, Greece, Israel, Italy, Turkey, ... and Russia
Sun. August 10th	Rest, evaluation and party !!!!
Mon. August 11th	Good-bye's

We hope you'll take your agenda, and decide to be part of this event. Please bring your tent, sleeping bag, music instruments,

materials for action, good spirit, and toothbrush. It will be serious and fun!! We are contacting vegetarian cooks to provide us with the best meals.

Don't hesitate to return the attached form today.

Peace !

Tom Keunen Pol D'Huyvetter
For Mother Earth international collective

XX
X

RETURN FORM

Yes !!! :-) ;-)

- () please keep me updated on Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days. Add my account to the automatic mailer !!

- () I'm interested to participate in the peace camp

- () I'm interested to help organising
- () the international event on August 6th
- () a non-violent abolition action on August 9th in

- () and will be at meeting March 8 - 9 1997

Name :
Organisation :

Address :
Code : City :
Country :
Phone :
Fax :
E-mail :
E-mail :

Please include following people on electronic mailing-list :

Name :
Organisation :

Address :
Code : City :
Country :
Phone :
Fax :
E-mail :
E-mail :

Name :
Organisation :

Address :
Code : City :
Country :
Phone :
Fax :
E-mail :

* For Mother Earth International office
*

* Lange Steenstraat 16/D, 9000 Gent, Belgium
*
* Phone/fax +32-9-233 84 39
*
* E-mail: int@fme.knooppunt.be
*

* WWW:<http://www.knooppunt.be/~fme>
*

* Postal account : 000-1618561-19
*

* For Mother Earth is member of Abolition 2000 - a global
*
network to eliminate nuclear weapons, the International Peace
* Bureau (IPB) and World Information Service on Energy (WISE)
*

For Mother Earth has offices in Belgium, Slovakia, Sri Lanka,
* USA,aswell as active members/groups in Belarus, Finland,
*
* Germany, Netherlands, Rumania and Ukraine
*

From A.Malten@net.HCC.nl Mon Feb 24 16:34:32 1997
Date: Mon, 24 Feb 1997 10:07:13 +0100 (MET)
From: Ak Malten <A.Malten@net.HCC.nl>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: What IS "Abolition 2000"?

My dear Friends,

This will be my only contribution to the --What Is "Abolition 2000"? discussion. If you want to comment on it then, please, comment directly to my personal e-mail address: A.Malten@net.HCC.nl (Ak Malten).

Let me tell you something about the history of the Abolition 2000 Network.

I hope that it will clarify a lot and can end the discussion about what should be our common goal in the Abolition 2000 Network.

I was there at the ICJ oral hearings; I was there at the birth of the

Abolition 2000 Network in The Hague November 1995 and I was there when the ICJ gave their advisory opinion to the World on July 8th 1996.

And at other meetings, regarding Nuclear Issues, with participation of

Abolition 2000 -workinggroups and -member organisations, since November 1995.

What I understood from working with the people from World Court Project,

IPPNW, IPB, INES, INESAP, NGO of Disarmament, IALANA and other groups, during those long day's and sometimes nights was, that we might have different ways in dealing with the subjects of Nuclear Disarmament, but that we agree on one thing: WE ALL WANT TO GET RID OF THOSE NUCLEAR WEAPONS, as soon possible.

When we established the Abolition 2000 Network, we agreed that in contact

with new groups, press, governments, etc. we would state that the only thing

we as groups assembled in the Abolition 2000 Network had in common was that

we all endorsed the ABOLITION 2000 STATEMENT.

So please let us stop the discussion about what we of the Abolition 2000

network should have in common. That can only be the Abolition 2000 Statement.

Besides that statement, of course every group will be free to sign or to

co-sign other statements dealing with specific Nuclear Issues, such as

e.g. Nuclear Colonialism, Nuclear Waste, Uranium Mining, Nuclear Testing,

Plutonium Transport, etc.

Peace,
or saved by
the pigeon,

Ak Malten,

Global Anti-Nuclear Alliance.

=====
The Global Anti-Nuclear Alliance (GANA) -- is a member of
The Abolition 2000 Network, A Global Network to Eliminate
Nuclear Weapons

Address: c/o Ak Malten
Irisstraat 134 Tel:+31.70.3608905
2565TP The Hague Fax:+31.70.3608905
The Netherlands E-Mail: A.Malten@net.HCC.nl

GANA's website: <http://www.inter.nl.net/hcc/A.Malten>

The ICJ Advisory Opinion on Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons,
including ALL the Separate Opinions of ALL the Judges,
the Canberra Report and the CTBT Text and Protocol can be
found at:

<http://www.inter.nl.net/hcc/A.Malten/docs.html>

=====
From nfnzsc@gn.apc.org Mon Feb 24 16:34:32 1997
Date: Mon, 24 Feb 1997 15:02:31 GMT
From: Stewart Kemp <nfnzsc@gn.apc.org>
To: nfla.news@conf.gn.apc.org
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: UK Nuclear News 22-24 February 1997

>From: GMR@MCR1.poptel.org.uk
>Date: Mon, 24 Feb 1997 14:29:23 GMT
>Subject: NPU Bulletin 24 Feb
>To: nfnzsc@gn.apc.org
>
>DAILY INFORMATION BULLETIN - NUCLEAR POLICY
>
>Mon 24 Feb 1997
>
>97-8192 Police protect shipment of n/waste in N Germany from 3,000
> protesters. G
>97-8193 US puts `modest' \$35bn price tag on Nato expansion. T
>97-8194 Yeltsin expects to forge a compromise on question of Nato
> expansion. FT
>
>Sun 23 Feb 1997
>
>97-8190 British scientists had secret plan in 1950s to stage a
> Chernobyl-type accident at Dounreay, to see what happened.
Obs
>97-8191 Nato's enlargement plans - and Russia's opposition - are
> setting off alarm bells, reports Christopher Bellamy. SInd
>

>Sat 22 Feb 1997
>
>97-8183 Nato may admit eastern European members before concluding deal
> with Russia. FT
>97-8184 Wild boar killed in eastern France was highly radioactive,
> probably from Cherobyl plume: fears raised that Chernobyl
> contamination may have been worse than supposed. T
>
>
>GM Research, Metropolitan House, Hobson Street, Oldham, OL1 1QD.
>Tel: 0161-911 4179. Fax: 0161-627 1736.
>Internet: gmr@mcr1.poptel.org.uk
>
>

Stewart Kemp (nfzns@gn.apc.org)
From wdavidon@haverford.edu Mon Feb 24 16:34:32 1997
Date: Mon, 24 Feb 1997 10:15:07 -0500
From: "William C. Davidon" <wdavidon@haverford.edu>
To: Ak Malten <A.Malten@net.HCC.nl>, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: What IS "Abolition 2000"?

I agree wholeheartedly with Ak Malten, who wrote:

>
>What I understood from working with the people from World Court Project,
>IPPNW, IPB, INES, INESAP, NGO of Disarmament, IALANA and other groups,
>during those long day's and sometimes nights was, that we might have
>different ways in dealing with the subjects of Nuclear Disarmament,
>but that we agree on one thing: WE ALL WANT TO GET RID OF THOSE NUCLEAR
>NUCLEAR
>WEAPONS, as soon possible.
>
>When we established the Abolition 2000 Network, we agreed that in contact
>with new groups, press, governments, etc. we would state that the only thing
>we as groups assembled in the Abolition 2000 Network had in common was that
>we all endorsed the ABOLITION 2000 STATEMENT.
>
>So please let us stop the discussion about what we of the Abolition 2000
>network should have in common. That can only be the Abolition 2000 Statement.
>
>Besides that statement, of course every group will be free to sign or to
>co-sign other statements dealing with specific Nuclear Issues, such

as

>e.g. Nuclear Colonialism, Nuclear Waste, Uranium Mining, Nuclear Testing,
>Plutonium Transport, etc.

Bill Davidon

E-mail: wdavidon@haverford.edu

Homepage: <http://www.haverford.edu/math/wdavidon.html>

From acronym@gn.apc.org Mon Feb 24 16:34:32 1997

Date: Mon, 24 Feb 1997 16:12:01 GMT

From: Rebecca Johnson <acronym@gn.apc.org>

To: ALICE SLATER <aslater@igc.apc.org>

Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Subject: Re: NPT PrepComm Working Group Minutes

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

Dear Alice,
thank you for sending the minutes of the NY NPT prep meeting and
for keeping
us informed. I just have one small clarification regarding your
para below:

>4. BASIC PAPERS

>Alice handed out the British American Security Information Council
>publication BASIC Papers. People were asked to read the papers
and be

>able to discuss them next week.

>

>Alice presented an email from Dan Plesch, BASIC, (Geneva) on the
structure

>of the PrepComm. He reports that a possible structure for the April
meeting

>is a

>half a day on the opening and procedural matters, 1-2 days general
debate,

>day for NGO presentations, 4-5 days of review following the main
Committee -

>in series rather than in parallel as few delegations will have the
staff for

>three committees in parallel - and 2 days on future procedural
matters. It

>appears that discussion on the CD agenda and the PrepComm are
becoming more

>linked politically.

As Dan wrote in his message, this is only a possible structure
for the
PrepCom. There are more and more meetings both within governments

(last week London, since the UK, as I reported earlier, is likely to be coordinating the western group, as usual), and among diplomats and officials in Geneva. The structure is by no means finalised and several different options are being considered. The option Dan reports on follows the structure of past review conferences, but some delegations want a clearer break with the past to ensure that the substance is dealt with more creatively and constructively than in set 'general debate' policy speeches followed by unfocused main committee debates. Nor has the half day for NGO presentations been agreed, although some delegations are pushing for it.

So, to conclude with a note of warning: the likely structure tends to change depending to whom in Geneva one talks, and when. What BASIC sent out was probably correct at the time Dan wrote it (and may even end up being the front runner), but it cannot be assumed at this time for the purposes of your planning. hope this is helpful, rebecca

=====
Disarmament Intelligence Review
24, Colvestone Crescent
London E8 2LH
England
Tel/fax: +44 171 241 4691

email: acronym@gn.apc.org

=====
From aslater@igc.apc.org Mon Feb 24 16:34:32 1997
Date: Mon, 24 Feb 1997 10:45:17 -0800 (PST)
From: ALICE SLATER <aslater@igc.apc.org>
To: Rebecca Johnson <acronym@gn.apc.org>
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: NPT PrepComm Working Group Minutes

Thanks Rebecca for expanding on the fact that the proposed structure for the NPT PrepComm as set forth is only a "possible" structure as we stated in the minutes. The fact that nothing is set in stone gives NGOs an opportunity to influence the structure and agenda and that's why Dan's report is so useful

as a jumping off point. Would it be possible to post it to the abolitioncaucus? Or have things already changed so much since it was

written? Regards,
Alice Slater

GRACE

Global Resource Action Center for the Environment
15 East 26 St., Room 915
New York, NY 10010
212-726-9161 (tel)
212-726-9160 (fax)

aslater@igc.apc.org <email>

From: disarmament@igc.org
Date: Mon, 24 Feb 1997 14:32:21 -0800 (PST)

From: disarmament@igc.org

To: ctb-followers@igc.org

Subject: Albright-China, NATO, B61-11

RTw 02/24 1200 Albright says U.S.-China arms talks set for March

BEIJING, Feb 24 (Reuter) - U.S. and Chinese officials will meet in Beijing next month for talks on controlling exports of weapons of mass destruction, U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright said on Monday.

"We have agreed today that expert level talks will be held in Beijing in mid-March," she told reporters.

"Halting the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is an area of utmost interest to the United States and to the preservation of global peace and security," she said.

Albright made the remarks following meetings with Chinese President Jiang Zemin, Premier Li Peng and Foreign Minister Qian Qichen during a brief visit to Beijing.

She did not give further details of the weapons talks, but other U.S. administration officials said the American side would be led by Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Robert Einhorn.

The talks would cover chemical weapons as well as missile and nuclear technology, they said.

China has agreed in the past not to provide assistance to unsafeguarded nuclear facilities and has expressed its willingness to respect guidelines of the missile control regime.

Beijing and Washington agreed during a visit to China last year by then secretary of state Warren Christopher to meet regularly on non-proliferation and arms control issues.

REUTER

RTos 02/24 0859 NATO-Russia Begin Dialogue on Enlargement

BRUSSELS (Reuter) - NATO and Russia appear to have entered a business-like dialogue over their future relationship amid signs that Russia has resigned itself to NATO's eastward enlargement but is determined to get the highest price it can.

Continuing a frantic merry-go-round of diplomatic activity, Russian Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov flew out of Brussels on Monday to Norway after meeting NATO Secretary-General Javier Solana for the second time in five weeks in Brussels.

After their talks a brief statement said: "progress is emerging although differences remain." It added preparations would begin at once for another meeting between the two men in Moscow.

Primakov declined to talk to journalists during his visit to Brussels. Early on Monday, a black limousine swept the former Cold War spy-master to a private plane waiting in a secluded corner of Brussels airport. He left shortly afterwards.

Shortly before Sunday's talks at Solana's private residence, Russian President Boris Yeltsin, speaking in Moscow, gave the most explicit indication yet that the pace of the negotiations was hotting up.

Yeltsin, making his first public appearance since his bout of pneumonia at the New Year, was confident enough that progress was being made to say he expected a compromise to be struck during his summit with U.S. President Bill Clinton next month.

He said Moscow would continue its resistance to NATO expansion but then told reporters at a Kremlin wreath-laying:

"We have agreed to look for a compromise and I think we will find this compromise at the summit we are holding with President Clinton on March 20-21."

While NATO insists it will not let Moscow have a veto over who can join the alliance, it has offered a range of measures to try to reassure Russia that the admission of former Soviet satellites on its western flank will not be a security threat.

It would like to set down an agreement guaranteeing Russia a place in the new European security architecture before a NATO summit in July, when the alliance is expected to invite Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic to join.

Yeltsin's foreign policy adviser, Dmitry Ryurikov, told Russian TV6 television that any NATO enlargement, even if not intended to be hostile, would compromise Russia's security by letting the West's "military machine" approach its borders.

But he also conceded that Moscow could not stop enlargement.

And he indicated that its fears could be allayed if NATO, which has already pledged not to station nuclear weapons on the territory of new member states, gave guarantees limiting changes in the deployment of forces on the ground.

"If we can reach agreement on that, then the consequences of expansion for Russia would be minimal," he concluded.

This avenue is full of political complications for NATO, which is reluctant to let itself be told where it can and cannot station troops.

The head of NATO's military committee, General Klaus Naumann, has warned that the proposal risks making second-class allies of the new members, who themselves are wary of any hint they might be sold out by the West.

In the growing atmosphere of hard-nosed bartering, alliance diplomats had said Solana planned to ask Primakov what Russia was offering in response to a range of alliance concessions made in the past few weeks.

This approach was intended to force the pace of negotiations while circumventing for now the problem of the form which an eventual agreement with Russia should take.

While Moscow is pushing hard for a legally binding document, NATO would much prefer a robust political commitment which would not need to go through ratification by 16 member countries.

RTos 02/23 2323 Yeltsin Sees NATO Compromise

MOSCOW (Reuter) - President Boris Yeltsin, declaring himself fighting fit after pneumonia and heart surgery, has held out hope that he and U.S. President Bill Clinton would strike a deal next month to end the row over NATO's expansion into eastern Europe.

NATO leaders will be relieved the 66-year-old Kremlin leader seems ready to take matters in hand again after eight months on the sidelines with illness. And They will be happy to hear him sounding so positive on settling a dispute that has prompted increasingly bellicose rhetoric among his Kremlin colleagues.

But the negotiations, which continued Sunday night in Brussels with a meeting between Russian Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov and NATO Secretary-General Javier Solana, are complex and may require considerably more movement on either side.

Solana and Primakov said in a statement after their talks they had made progress but added that differences remained.

Primakov goes on to Norway Monday for talks with the only NATO member to have a land frontier with Russia.

"We are firm in our position," Yeltsin told reporters during his first public appearance in more than two months Sunday. "We are opposed to NATO enlargement. Our task now is to stall it as long as possible and not allow the renewal of confrontation."

But he added: "We have agreed to look for a compromise and I think we will find this compromise at the summit we are holding with President Clinton on March 20-21 in Helsinki."

Friday, Yeltsin, 66, discussed plans for the summit with U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. Albright said she made "important progress" but much work was still needed.

Yeltsin's foreign policy adviser, Dmitry Ryurikov, said late Sunday that Moscow acknowledged it could not stop NATO enlargement. But he indicated Russia would keep pressing for sweeping guarantees to preserve its own security.

"It sounds a bit odd to say 'we won't allow NATO expansion'. That's not in our power," Ryurikov told TV6 television.

Even if expansion was not meant to be hostile to Russia, he said, its security would be reduced because it would let the West's "military machine" approach its borders.

The key to overcoming Moscow's objections could, Ryurikov indicated, lie in guarantees limiting changes in the deployment of forces on the ground -- NATO has already pledged not to station nuclear weapons on the territory of new member states.

"If we can reach agreement on that (keeping NATO forces out of new member states), then the consequences of expansion for Russia would be minimal," the Kremlin adviser concluded.

Such demands from Russia, however, do not go down well in former Soviet satellites like Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, which are expected to be first in line for membership invitations after a NATO summit in Madrid in July.

An aide to Albright, who herself fled the communist takeover in her native Prague as a child, promised last week there would be no "second-class citizens" in NATO. Polish Prime Minister Wlodzimierz Cimoszewicz seized on that, urging the alliance on Friday not to cut a deal with Russia at Warsaw's expense.

But the West is anxious to soothe Russia, whose huge army and nuclear force remain key factors in Europe's defense plans, as Prime Minister Vikto Chernomyrdin pointedly remarked during a well-publicised visit to the missile command center Friday.

Russian Defense Minister Igor Rodionov kept up his anti-NATO rhetoric Sunday, warning that the army was heading for financial ruin and that the West might therefore try to place Russia's nuclear arsenal under United Nations control.

Western diplomats said Solana wanted to see how far Moscow was prepared to compromise following several NATO concessions.

It has offered to revise a 1990 treaty on the deployment of conventional forces and give Russia a formal say in NATO.

Moscow is holding out for a legally binding treaty laying down relations between it and NATO while the West wants to avoid a treaty that would need complex parliamentary review.

DEFENSE NEWS

"Bunker-Busting Bomb Prompts U.S. Discord:
-Upgraded Nuclear Capability May Prompt Russian Concern"

By Jeff Erlich - Defense News Staff Writer

WASHINGTON - The United States is ready to deploy a bunker-busting nuclear weapon that arms control watchdogs says the first new bomb developed by the department of energy since the end of the Cold War.

The bomb, call the B61-11, is designed to strike command bunkers buried hundreds of meters below the ground and other deeply buried targets.

U.S. officials maintain the device simply is an existing B61 nuclear bomb is a new carrying case.

"All we've done is put the components into a case-hardened steel shell that has the capability of burrowing quite a ways underground, through frozen tundra, though significant layers of concrete," Air Force Gen. Eugene Habiger, commander-in-chief of the U.S. Strategic Command, said in a Jan. 28 interview at his Offut Air Force Base, Neb., headquarters.

The conversion involved a new tail kit and nose cone for the bomb, an official with the Energy Department, which oversees nuclear weapons, said Feb. 18.

"This is not new, in any way, shape or form," the Energy official said.

The bomb is needed, U.S. officials said, to replace the B53 bomb, which nuclear war planners use to target deeply buried Russian command and control facilities.

But independent arms control advocates said the B61-11 provided something new, or else why deploy it?" asks the Los Alamos (N.M.) Study Group, in a Feb. 10 paper, "B-61 Concerns and Background."

New or not, Bill Arkin, an arms control consultant based in Pomfret, Vt., said developing a bomb to destroy buried Russian command and control facilities could be destabilizing.

"What that signals to the Russians is far more detrimental than any gains it makes to deterrence," Arkin said Feb. 18.

By Achieving what Habinger calls a "shock-coupling effect," the bomb directs the bulk of its energy downward, destroying everything buried beneath it to a depth of several hundred meters.

Prior to its development, which was completed in December, the best earth-penetrating nuclear weapon in the U.S. arsenal was the B53, with a force equal to 9 million tons of TNT, penetrates the earth by creating a massive crater, rather than the more precise blow the B61-11 is meant to deliver.

But the B53 cannot be carried by the B-2 bomber, and offers less assurance that it will destroy its target than does the B61-11, Arkin said.

The B61-11, which can be carried by a B-2, can produce explosions ranging from 300 tons of TNT to more than 300,00 tons, and therefore could be more appropriate for use against targets like Tarhuna, Libya, according to Bruce Hall of the international environmental group Greenpeace.

According to US officials, Tarhunah was the site of an underground Libyan chemical weapon plant under construction until late last year.

Bolstering the view that B61-11 was developed for non-nuclear targets are documents obtained from the Department of Energy under the Freedom of Information Act, Hall said Feb. 14 from his office here. These include a Dec. 18 1995, letter from Thomas Seitz, acting deputy assistant secretary of energy from military application and stockpile support, to Harold Smith, then assistant to the defense secretary for atomic energy.

In this letter, Seitz and Energy Department officials were accelerating production of the B61-11 conversion kits to provide them "as soon as possible."

Hall said the call for an accelerated schedule points to the U.S.

officials considering its use against Tarhunah.

In the spring of 1996, Pentagon officials first said they were weighing the option of destroying Tarhunah with a nuclear blast, then later retracted this statement.

From: Disarmament Clearinghouse
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005
Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 Fax: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

From A.Malten@net.HCC.nlTue Feb 25 16:55:01 1997
Date: Tue, 25 Feb 1997 10:46:43 +0100 (MET)
From: Ak Malten <A.Malten@net.HCC.nl>
To: National Steering Ctte Nuclear Free Local Authorities
<nfznsc@gn.apc.org>,
abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, geowcpuk@gn.apc.org
Subject: Re: Cities Declaration

Dear Stewart Kemp,

You wrote:

>Dear abolitionists
>
>Surely the main issue is whether people, organisations, local
>governments pledge themselves to the central plank of the
>Abolition 2000 campaign - a commitment by the nuclear weapons
>states to a time bound framework for nuclear weapon abolition by
>the year
> 2000. Tailoring the Abolition Statement to country specific
> circumstances isn't going to preclude anyone from being counted
> amongst Ab2000 supporters surely?
>
>Sincere good wishes to you all.
>
>Stewart Kemp
>
>

My comment on this is that, while my organisation is NOT a city
it can NOT sign the Cities Declaration.

But I have the feeling, that there will be No objections for a
city council or even a government of a country to sign the
Abolition 2000 Statement, because Nowhere is stated in the
Abolition 2000 Statement that one should be a NGO to be allowed
to endorse it.

Both signing the Abolition 2000 Statement would however make us
equal partners in our struggle to eliminate the World's Nuclear
Weapons.

Besides that I think it is logical for a city council to also
sign the Cities Declaration, which connects them with other
cities who co-signed that statement.

Peace,
or saved by
the pigeon,

Ak Malten,

Global Anti-Nuclear Alliance.

=====

The Global Anti-Nuclear Alliance (GANA) -- is a member of
The Abolition 2000 Network, A Global Network to Eliminate
Nuclear Weapons

Address: c/o Ak Malten
Irisstraat 134 Tel:+31.70.3608905
2565TP The Hague Fax:+31.70.3608905
The Netherlands E-Mail: A.Malten@net.HCC.nl

GANA's website: <http://www.inter.nl.net/hcc/A.Malten>

The ICJ Advisory Opinion on Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons,
including ALL the Separate Opinions of ALL the Judges,
the Canberra Report and the CTBT Text and Protocol can be
found at:

<http://www.inter.nl.net/hcc/A.Malten/docs.html>

```
=====
From: ippnwbos@igc.apc.org Tue Feb 25 16:55:01 1997
Date: Tue, 25 Feb 1997 06:18:24 -0800 (PST)
From: ippnwbos@igc.apc.org
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: Ab2000: Reports and resources online
```

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

forwarded

```
>Return-Path: <fredpax@sn.no>
>Date: Mon, 24 Feb 1997 12:10:08 +0100 (MET)
>X-Sender: fredpax@mail.sn.no
>To: ippnwbos@igc.apc.org (by way of Kurt.Hanevik@ikb.uib.no \ (Kurt
Hanevik\))
>From: fredpax@sn.no (Fredrik S. Heffermehl)
>Subject: Re: Ab2000: Reports and resources online
>X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org
id DAA13351
```

>

```
>The list of documents online at Abo 2000 does not include
>the NPT prepcom resolution
```

>

```
>The last days we have had some very important pleas to keep the
Abolition
```

```
>2000 focussed on the main, overall goal, which I fully agree with.
```

>

```
>I proposed the below resolution at Moorea, feeling a strong need
>for direction and focus in our work - We seek Abolition, and
```

>

```
>1. the practical way for this to happen is an international treaty
>2. a great, first chance to get negotiations started is the April
Prepcom.
```

>

>

>it is crucial that the NPT prepcoms dont fall into
>the old, unproductive pattern - and that the golden opportunity
>described in the below resolution, is not missed:
>
>The NPT prepcom resolution is addressed in two directions:
>
> - NPT Precom in April / states
> - Abolition 2000 and other organizations
>
>I hope the resolution will be seriously followed up by urgent
antinuclear
>activist delegations to the Foreign Ministries in all NPT states:
>
>
>
>"ABOLITION 2000
>
>STATEMENT from the Moorea 21-28 January 1997 Conference
>
>We, individuals and organizations attending the Conference in
Moorea, Te
>Ao Maohi*, of Abolition 2000, an international network with 700
signatory
>organisations throughout the world, reaffirm the principal goal
of having a
>treaty by the year 2000 on the abolition of all nuclear weapons.
>
>Since our founding statement in May 1995 the International Court
of Justice
>has stated unanimously in its Opinion of July 8, 1996, that the
nuclear
>weapons states have a legally binding obligation to negotiate
"nuclear
>disarmament in all its aspects" and bring the effort to a successful
>conclusion.
>
>In December 1996 a large majority (115 yes, 22 no, 32 abstaining)
of the
>United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution welcoming the
ICJ
>opinion and calling for negotiations leading towards a treaty on
>elimination to begin in 1997.
>
>Believing that all Non-Proliferation Treaty member states have a
legal
>responsibility to start such negotiations immediately, the
Abolition 2000
>Conference calls on the Non-Proliferation Treaty Preparatory
Committee
>meeting in New York in April 1997 to ensure that negotiations begin
in
>1997.
>
>We likewise call upon all signatory organisations of Abolition 2000,

as
>well as all other citizens' action groups, trade unions, political
parties,
>and other groups to revitalize their initiative and efforts towards
a
>successful outcome at the NPT Prep Com in April 1997, i.e. to have
the
>nuclear weapon states abide by the desires of the vast majorities
among and
>within the states of the world, including within the nuclear weapon
states
>themselves.
>
> * (French-occupied Polynesia)
>
>(Proposal by Fredrik S. Heffermehl, Vice President of the IPB,
>International Peace Bureau, for the Norwegian Forum on
>Environment and Development - Unanimously adopted)."
>
>
>
>
>

Michael Christ Program Director
International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War
126 Rogers St. Cambridge, MA 02142 USA
tel. (617)868-5050 fax. (617)868-2560
ippnwbos@igc.apc.org <http://www.healthnet.org/IPPNW>

IPPNW is part of Abolition 2000: A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

From ipb@gn.apc.org Tue Feb 25 16:55:01 1997
Date: Tue, 25 Feb 1997 12:24:36 -0100
From: International Peace Bureau <ipb@gn.apc.org>
To: "'Heffermehl, Fredrik'" <fredpax@sn.no>,
 "'Weiss, Cora'" <srfnyusa@IGC.APC.ORG>
Subject: FW: two important issues

.RTos 02/24 0859 NATO-Russia Begin Dialogue on Enlargement

BRUSSELS (Reuter) - NATO and Russia appear to have entered a business-like dialogue over their future relationship amid signs that Russia has resigned itself to NATO's eastward enlargement but is determined to get the highest price it can.

Continuing a frantic merry-go-round of diplomatic activity, Russian Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov flew out of Brussels on Monday to Norway after meeting NATO Secretary-General Javier Solana for the second time in five weeks in Brussels.

After their talks a brief statement said: "progress is emerging although differences remain." It added preparations would begin at once for another meeting between the two men in Moscow.

Primakov declined to talk to journalists during his visit to

Brussels. Early on Monday, a black limousine swept the former Cold War spy-master to a private plane waiting in a secluded corner of Brussels airport. He left shortly afterwards.

Shortly before Sunday's talks at Solana's private residence, Russian President Boris Yeltsin, speaking in Moscow, gave the most explicit indication yet that the pace of the negotiations was hotting up.

Yeltsin, making his first public appearance since his bout of pneumonia at the New Year, was confident enough that progress was being made to say he expected a compromise to be struck during his summit with U.S. President Bill Clinton next month.

He said Moscow would continue its resistance to NATO expansion but then told reporters at a Kremlin wreath-laying:

"We have agreed to look for a compromise and I think we will find this compromise at the summit we are holding with President Clinton on March 20-21."

While NATO insists it will not let Moscow have a veto over who can join the alliance, it has offered a range of measures to try to reassure Russia that the admission of former Soviet satellites on its western flank will not be a security threat.

It would like to set down an agreement guaranteeing Russia a place in the new European security architecture before a NATO summit in July, when the alliance is expected to invite Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic to join.

Yeltsin's foreign policy adviser, Dmitry Ryurikov, told Russian TV6 television that any NATO enlargement, even if not intended to be hostile, would compromise Russia's security by letting the West's "military machine" approach its borders.

But he also conceded that Moscow could not stop enlargement.

And he indicated that its fears could be allayed if NATO, which has already pledged not to station nuclear weapons on the territory of new member states, gave guarantees limiting changes in the deployment of forces on the ground.

"If we can reach agreement on that, then the consequences of expansion for Russia would be minimal," he concluded.

This avenue is full of political complications for NATO, which is reluctant to let itself be told where it can and cannot station troops.

The head of NATO's military committee, General Klaus Naumann, has warned that the proposal risks making second-class allies of the new members, who themselves are wary of any hint they might be sold out by the West.

In the growing atmosphere of hard-nosed bartering, alliance diplomats had said Solana planned to ask Primakov what Russia was offering in response to a range of alliance concessions made in the past few weeks.

This approach was intended to force the pace of negotiations while circumventing for now the problem of the form which an eventual agreement with Russia should take.

While Moscow is pushing hard for a legally binding document, NATO would much prefer a robust political commitment which would not need to go through ratification by 16 member countries.

MOSCOW (Reuter) - President Boris Yeltsin, declaring himself fighting fit after pneumonia and heart surgery, has held out hope that he and U.S. President Bill Clinton would strike a deal next month to end the row over NATO's expansion into eastern Europe.

NATO leaders will be relieved the 66-year-old Kremlin leader seems ready to take matters in hand again after eight months on the sidelines with illness. And They will be happy to hear him sounding so positive on settling a dispute that has prompted increasingly bellicose rhetoric among his Kremlin colleagues.

But the negotiations, which continued Sunday night in Brussels with a meeting between Russian Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov and NATO Secretary-General Javier Solana, are complex and may require considerably more movement on either side.

Solana and Primakov said in a statement after their talks they had made progress but added that differences remained.

Primakov goes on to Norway Monday for talks with the only NATO member to have a land frontier with Russia.

"We are firm in our position," Yeltsin told reporters during his first public appearance in more than two months Sunday. "We are opposed to NATO enlargement. Our task now is to stall it as long as possible and not allow the renewal of confrontation."

But he added: "We have agreed to look for a compromise and I think we will find this compromise at the summit we are holding with President Clinton on March 20-21 in Helsinki."

Friday, Yeltsin, 66, discussed plans for the summit with U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. Albright said she made "important progress" but much work was still needed.

Yeltsin's foreign policy adviser, Dmitry Ryurikov, said late Sunday that Moscow acknowledged it could not stop NATO enlargement. But he indicated Russia would keep pressing for sweeping guarantees to preserve its own security.

"It sounds a bit odd to say 'we won't allow NATO expansion'. That's not in our power," Ryurikov told TV6 television.

Even if expansion was not meant to be hostile to Russia, he said, its security would be reduced because it would let the West's "military machine" approach its borders.

The key to overcoming Moscow's objections could, Ryurikov indicated, lie in guarantees limiting changes in the deployment of forces on the ground -- NATO has already pledged not to station nuclear weapons on the territory of new member states.

"If we can reach agreement on that (keeping NATO forces out of new member states), then the consequences of expansion for Russia would be minimal," the Kremlin adviser concluded.

Such demands from Russia, however, do not go down well in former Soviet satellites like Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, which are expected to be first in line for membership invitations after a NATO summit in Madrid in July.

An aide to Albright, who herself fled the communist takeover in her native Prague as a child, promised last week there would be no "second-class citizens" in NATO. Polish Prime Minister Wlodzimierz Cimoszewicz seized on that, urging the alliance on Friday not to cut a deal with Russia at Warsaw's expense.

But the West is anxious to soothe Russia, whose huge army and nuclear force remain key factors in Europe's defense plans, as Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin pointedly remarked during a well-publicised visit to the missile command center Friday.

Russian Defense Minister Igor Rodionov kept up his anti-NATO rhetoric Sunday, warning that the army was heading for financial ruin and that the West might therefore try to place Russia's nuclear arsenal under United Nations control.

Western diplomats said Solana wanted to see how far Moscow was prepared to compromise following several NATO concessions.

It has offered to revise a 1990 treaty on the deployment of conventional forces and give Russia a formal say in NATO.

Moscow is holding out for a legally binding treaty laying down relations between it and NATO while the West wants to avoid a treaty that would need complex parliamentary review.

DEFENSE NEWS

"Bunker-Busting Bomb Prompts U.S. Discord:
-Upgraded Nuclear Capability May Prompt Russian Concern"

By Jeff Erlich - Defense News Staff Writer

WASHINGTON - The United States is ready to deploy a bunker-busting nuclear weapon that arms control watchdogs says the first new bomb developed by the department of energy since the end of the Cold War.

The bomb, call the B61-11, is designed to strike command bunkers buried hundreds of meters below the ground and other deeply buried targets.

U.S. officials maintain the device simply is an existing B61 nuclear bomb is a new carrying case.

"All we've done is put the components into a case-hardened steel shell that has the capability of burrowing quite a ways underground, through frozen tundra, through significant layers of concrete," Air Force Gen. Eugene Habiger, commander-in-chief of the U.S. Strategic Command, said in a Jan. 28 interview at his Offut Air Force Base, Neb., headquarters.

The conversion involved a new tail kit and nose cone for the bomb, an official with the Energy Department, which oversees nuclear weapons, said Feb. 18.

"This is not new, in any way, shape or form," the Energy official said.

The bomb is needed, U.S. officials said, to replace the B53 bomb, which nuclear war planners use to target deeply buried Russian command and control facilities.

But independent arms control advocates said the B61-11 provided something new, or else why deploy it?" asks the Los Alamos (N.M.) Study Group, in a Feb. 10 paper, "B-61 Concerns and Background."

New or not, Bill Arkin, an arms control consultant based in Pomfret, Vt., said developing a bomb to destroy buried Russian command and control facilities could be destabilizing.

"What that signals to the Russians is far more detrimental than any gains it makes to deterrence," Arkin said Feb. 18.

By Achieving what Habinger calls a "shock-coupling effect," the bomb directs the bulk of its energy downward, destroying everything buried beneath it to a depth of several hundred meters.

Prior to its development, which was completed in December, the best earth-penetrating nuclear weapon in the U.S. arsenal was the B53, with a force equal to 9 million tons of TNT, penetrates the earth by creating a massive crater, rather than the more precise blow the B61-11 is meant to deliver.

But the B53 cannot be carried by the B-2 bomber, and offers less assurance that it will destroy its target than does the B61-11, Arkin said.

The B61-11, which can be carried by a B-2, can produce explosions ranging from 300 tons of TNT to more than 300,00 tons, and therefore could be more appropriate for use against targets like Tarhuna, Libya, according to Bruce Hall of the international environmental group Greenpeace.

According to US officials, Tarhunah was the site of an underground Libyan chemical weapon plant under construction until late last year.

Bolstering the view that B61-11 was developed for non-nuclear targets are documents obtained from the Department of Energy under the Freedom of Information Act, Hall said Feb. 14 from his office here. These include a Dec. 18 1995, letter from Thomas Seitz, acting deputy assistant secretary of energy from military application and stockpile support, to Harold Smith, then assistant to the defense secretary for atomic energy.

In this letter, Seitz and Energy Department officials were accelerating production of the B61-11 conversion kits to provide them "as soon as possible."

Hall said the call for an accelerated schedule points to the U.S. officials considering its use against Tarhunah.

In the spring of 1996, Pentagon officials first said they were weighing the option of destroying Tarhunah with a nuclear blast, then later retracted this statement.

From: Disarmament Clearinghouse
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005
Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 Fax: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

From disarmament@igc.org Tue Feb 25 16:55:01 1997
Date: Tue, 25 Feb 1997 09:05:32 -0800 (PST)
From: disarmament@igc.org
To: ctb-followers@igc.org
Subject: Russia, NATO, Tritium leak

The New York Times

February 25, 1997

Russia Buys IBM Supercomputer Despite U.S. Export Controls
By MICHAEL R. GORDON

MOSCOW -- In an effort to circumvent U.S. export controls, Russia's nuclear weapons establishment says it has obtained a powerful IBM supercomputer through a European middleman.

Russian nuclear officials, who disclosed the purchase, said they planned to use the computer to simulate nuclear tests.

"If we see something we can buy on the European market, we buy it," Vladislav Petrov, the head of the public affairs department for Russia's Ministry of Atomic Energy Affairs, said in an interview.

Petrov said the computer had been purchased for \$7 million.

The purchase of the supercomputer, an IBM RS/6000 SP, underscores the vein of distrust that still colors relations between the United States and newly democratic Russia.

Even as Washington talks of partnership between NATO and Russia and supports Russia's efforts at economic reform, the two sides are still at odds over Moscow's access to sophisticated American technology.

Russian officials insist that supercomputers are needed to maintain the reliability of their nuclear stockpile now that Moscow has agreed to a ban on nuclear tests.

"Computer modeling is very important to us," Viktor Mikhailov, the minister of atomic energy affairs, said recently.

But American officials say supercomputers could help Russia design new weapons. The United States does not want to help Russia insure the effectiveness of its nuclear arsenal.

"We have made a policy decision not to assist the Russians in their stockpile stewardship program," a senior American official said. "Even though relations with the Russians are good, we are potentially a target for their nuclear forces if relations change."

The Clinton administration is also concerned about the political ramifications in Congress of aiding the Russian military establishment.

Under U.S. law, American computer manufacturers are required to consult with the Commerce Department before selling computers to Russia that are capable of performing between two billion and seven billion calculations a second. The sale of faster computers

generally requires a license.

The administration turned down applications last year from IBM and Hewlett-Packard to sell supercomputers to Russia. The Russians said the computers would be used for research on pollution and nuclear safety, but suspicions were aroused because they were to be shipped to nuclear weapons design centers.

Recently, the head of Silicon Graphics, a California-based company, acknowledged that his company had made a mistake by selling two small supercomputer systems to Russia. The U.S. attorney in San Jose has opened an investigation into that sale.

The IBM supercomputer is even more powerful and can perform 10 billion calculations a second, Russian officials say. They say it is 10 times more effective than the computers now on hand.

Russian officials decline to say precisely which middleman sold the IBM supercomputer. But they have not hesitated to publicize the acquisition, perhaps calculating that this may undermine the rationale for continued American export controls.

Russian nuclear officials say they want to purchase even more powerful supercomputers to maintain Russia's status as a nuclear superpower, with Washington's blessing.

Stressing the need for nuclear research, Mikhailov touted Russia's nuclear arsenal as a means of offsetting its weakness in conventional weapons. "The only protection throughout this period will be nuclear weapons," he said.

Tuesday, February 25 1997; Page A12 The Washington Post

Russia Shows Readiness for NATO Talks
Moscow Still Opposes Expansion But Will Discuss `Relationship'
Washington Post Foreign Service

BERLIN, Feb. 24 -- Despite continuing reservations, Russia has signaled a new willingness to work with NATO on a substantive bargain to govern relations with the U.S.-led alliance as it expands into the former Soviet Bloc nations of Eastern Europe, senior Western diplomats said today.

NATO officials said that during a meeting Sunday evening at the Brussels residence of NATO Secretary General Javier Solana, Russian Foreign Minister Yevgeni Primakov produced four draft documents that are remarkably close to NATO thinking about a new relationship between Moscow and the Western military alliance. The proposals involve creating a permanent consultative council with its own secretariat.

Although Russia is still pushing for a legally binding document and insists no sophisticated military equipment should be stationed on the territory of new members, NATO sources said the meeting demonstrated a new seriousness on Moscow's part.

"For the first time the Russians were engaged, constructive and reasonable in talking about all the issues related to enlargement," a senior NATO official said, speaking anonymously.

"We now know they basically want to cut a deal."

At a news conference after he arrived today in Oslo, Primakov said Russia still opposes NATO expansion. But he added, "I think I can say that progress is emerging regarding discussions on a number of issues pertaining to the relationship between NATO and Russia."

"This progress has not taken any vivid shape, but we could be limited optimists," he said. "And we will continue our negotiations with Mr. Solana, and I expect to see him in Moscow in the first part of March."

Primakov stressed that Russia is pursuing consultations with NATO "not for the sake of demanding a price for changing our position regarding the enlargement, [because] this change will not take place." He said Russia's aim is "to minimize the depth of those dividing lines which might appear in Europe . . . and get guarantees which would alleviate our concerns."

Russian officials have sent mixed signals for the last few months about their willingness to work with NATO on the expansion controversy. But the results of Sunday's meeting were the first indication that Russia wants to ensure that the conflict does not damage its overall relationship with the West.

NATO sources said the two sides have essentially agreed on the nature of a permanent consultative council that would govern their relations. A Russian mission headed by an ambassador would work full-time with NATO staff on matters of mutual concern; Russia is laying special emphasis on joint peacekeeping missions and wants to play a full role in key planning tasks and command structure.

Both sides now concur that Russia would have a voice in NATO decisions, but not a veto, and that meetings would take place at various levels right up to heads of state. But the format of the charter, which Russia wants to call a legal document akin to a treaty, remains unclear because NATO says it should only be political in character and not require ratification by parliaments.

NATO sources say this point should not detract from its worth, noting that the 1971 four-power agreement on Western access to Berlin and the 1975 Helsinki Final Act were non-binding political accords that were respected by their signatories.

In any event, NATO officials say they are now confident that a final NATO-Russia agreement will be endorsed by heads of state and government at a meeting in Madrid in July, when the alliance plans to announce which former Warsaw Pact states will be invited to become full members.

In his first public appearance since he was sidelined by

pneumonia at the New Year, Russian President Boris Yeltsin said Sunday that he hopes a compromise on the NATO enlargement dispute will be reached with President Clinton when they meet in Helsinki on March 20-21.

Despite signs of a more cooperative approach by Russia, NATO officials emphasized there still are serious differences over the military implications of NATO expansion. They said Primakov reaffirmed Moscow's demands for deeper unilateral cuts by the West to reduce a 3-to-1 superiority in conventional weapons, along with firm guarantees that nuclear weapons and modern military facilities will not be based on the territory of new members.

"They have come to realize the need to show flexibility and not make any of these issues a show-stopper," a senior NATO diplomat said. "But these are real sticking points that may go right down to the wire."

Last week, the 16 NATO allies offered to make dramatic cuts in their conventional arsenals at the East-West security conference in Vienna to compensate for the lopsided advantage they now enjoy following the collapse of the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union.

Since the bloc-to-bloc arrangements of the 1990 treaty limiting conventional forces in Europe are outmoded, the Western alliance agreed to adopt a Russian proposal that will establish national ceilings for tanks, helicopters, combat aircraft and artillery of the 30 countries that signed the treaty.

In addition, NATO has promised to accept territorial zone limits that would prevent any massing of allied arsenals in a way that would frighten Russia into thinking the West was preparing to attack. The exact quotas will be worked out in the course of negotiations in the months ahead.

NATO also has declared that it harbors no need, reason or intent to base nuclear weapons on the soil of new members. Both sides thus agree on a nonnuclear status for any eastern members of NATO, but Russia wants this assurance to be given a legal status.

The most difficult problem, NATO officials say, remains Russia's insistence on blocking any transfer of alliance military assets to new members in the east. They contend that Russia's demand is incompatible with the basic protection offered under NATO's founding treaty, which calls for an attack on one member to be treated as an attack on all.

NATO officials say the number and quality of new airfields, pipelines, armor and jet aircraft to be deployed in new member states may be restricted by the absence of resources or military requirements. But they insist this remains a matter for the host

country to decide, not an outside power.

RTw 02/25 0957 Yeltsin faces pressure to act over army reforms
By Timothy Heritage

MOSCOW, Feb 25 (Reuter) - President Boris Yeltsin faced growing pressure on Tuesday to take personal charge of reforming Russia's demoralised armed forces or risk the collapse of a once mighty army and its nuclear strike force.

The military reforms, discussed for five years but less developed than political or economic reforms, ran into new problems at the weekend when a dispute between the two top officials mapping out a blueprint for change flared into an open war of words.

Military experts said on Tuesday Yeltsin, the constitutional commander in chief, should cap his comeback after pneumonia and heart trouble by taking personal responsibility for the reforms and sending clear signals of what form they should take.

"Yeltsin is playing his old game of watching two tigers devour themselves from on high. It is his way of keeping the balance of power," military expert Dmitry Trenin said of the disagreements between Defence Minister Igor Rodionov and Kremlin defence aide Yuri Baturin.

"That is not a good position. The president must assume direct responsibility for reforms. Otherwise there is a real danger of the collapse of the armed forces and this is becoming the number one security danger for Russia."

Trenin, an analyst at the Moscow office of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, said the army's decline was a bigger security threat than any posed by the row with NATO over its plans to expand eastwards, separatist rebels in Chechnya or unrest in Tajikistan -- part of Russia's strategic underbelly.

Support of the army remains vital for Yeltsin, as for all previous Kremlin leaders. He turned to it in 1993 to put down a rebellion by hardliners in parliament, using tanks to blast his 7/8opponents into submission.

But the armed forces, once the pride of the Soviet Union, now face food shortages, delayed wages, a lack of fuel, poor coordination and widespread disillusionment.

The failure to defeat Chechen separatists in almost two years of fighting dealt a deep blow to morale. Rodionov has described the state of the armed forces as "horrifying" and said nuclear weapon firing systems could become unreliable.

His dire warnings are part of a campaign for more funding, which he says is needed to maintain the army as a reliable defence force and carry out planned reforms such as creating an all-professional force and reducing troop numbers.

Baturin, a long-term Yeltsin aide who was made secretary of the advisory Defence Council last year, says reforms should be based on defence spending limits already set by the government. His comments imply that Rodionov's plans are unrealistic.

Rodionov, mentioning Baturin by name, accused him on Sunday of misinforming the public. Baturin reiterated the same day that

Russia could not afford to increase defence spending.

Behind the row, analysts point to personal differences, a classic battle between a politician and a military man and a rivalry fuelled by rumours that Baturin wants Rodionov's job.

"The centre of discord is financial questions but neither Baturin nor Rodionov has a detailed concept of reforms anyway. No one has," said Alexander Konovalov, President of the Institute for Strategic Assessments think-tank.

"Without political guidelines coming down from Yeltsin, it is hard to see any reforms happening."

Defence analysts say nobody knows how many soldiers and how much equipment Russia has in its multitude of armed units, ranging from border guards and railway troops to the army.

Once the state of the armed forces is determined, a new military doctrine has to be worked out, defining where security threats come from. This involves political decisions which will be anything but straightforward.

Only when these matters have been dealt with can the military chiefs decide what its equipment needs are and how to trim the armed forces to the 1.2 million demanded by Yeltsin.

The president, 66, acknowledged on Sunday there were problems over reforms but gave no sign that he would become more closely involved in working them out or sack Rodionov or Baturin.

His ability to play a big role in everyday political affairs remains in doubt after spending most of the last eight months out of the Kremlin with heart problems and then pneumonia.

Soldiers are reported tense because some have not been paid for weeks or months, but a full-scale rebellion seems unlikely.

"A Latin-American style mutiny is ruled out. None of the generals has the stomach for it," said Pavel Felgengauer, security analyst for the Sevodnya newspaper.

Military experts say more likely scenarios if reforms do not go ahead are a breakdown of command structures, weapon systems becoming unreliable, the army becoming unable to defend Russia and perhaps even splitting along regional lines.

REUTER

APO 02/24 1749 U.S. Expects To Pay Slice of NATO

By ROBERT BURNS

Associated Press Writer

WASHINGTON (AP) -- The United States expects to pay no more than \$200 million a year, or less than 10 percent of the total cost, for expanding the U.S.-led NATO military alliance over the coming decade, U.S. officials said Monday.

The bulk of the financial burden will fall on the new member countries and the 15 other current NATO members, the officials said in releasing the Clinton administration's first comprehensive public report on the implications of NATO expansion.

Negotiations with candidate countries -- most likely Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic -- are expected to begin late this year and be completed by 1999.

The total cost was put at \$27 billion to \$35 billion. That is less than projected in other studies. The Congressional Budget

Office said last March the cost could reach \$125 billion, and the Rand Corp. think tank said last summer it could be as much as \$110 billion but more likely would come to about \$42 billion.

Moscow's strong objections to extending NATO closer to the Russian border is the most controversial aspect of the alliance's expansion plan, but cost questions may yet figure importantly in the debate. Senate approval will be required for NATO expansion, which will commit U.S. forces to defending the new member countries in the event they are threatened.

The report released Monday by the State Department was done at the request of Congress.

It said there would be no need to station more U.S. troops in Europe beyond the 100,000 there now, mostly in Germany, and that NATO countries have "no intention, no plan and no reason" to put nuclear weapons on the territory of new members. The latter is a particularly sensitive issue with Russia.

John Kornblum, the assistant secretary of state for European affairs, told reporters the 32-page report to Congress was the "first really carefully thought-out discussion" of the military implications and costs of expanding NATO.

Ted Warner, an assistant secretary of defense whose office worked out the cost projections, gave this breakdown:

--Modernizing and restructuring the armed forces of the new member countries:

\$10 billion to \$13 billion from 1997 to 2009. U.S. share: zero. The new members would bear these costs themselves.

--Improving the capability of current NATO countries to move allied troops onto the territory of the new members in the event of a crisis: \$8 billion to \$10 billion. U.S. share: zero. Warner said U.S. troops in NATO already are fully capable of performing such a contingency mission.

--Ensuring that new members' defenses can operate and communicate fully with current NATO forces: \$9 billion to \$12 billion. U.S. share: \$1.5 billion to \$2 billion, over a 10-year span starting in 2000, or about \$150 million to \$200 million a year. About one-third of these costs would be paid by the new members, and about one-half would be paid by current non-U.S. NATO members.

The report added this caveat: The cost could be higher if a serious military threat arose in Europe. "Because such a threat is hypothetical, it is not possible to estimate the costs reliably," the report said. "But there can be no question that the cost of responding to such a threat would be substantial."

The report made no assumptions about which countries might join NATO, although it noted that 11 countries in central and eastern Europe have expressed interest. Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic are widely expected to be official invited to begin membership talks when NATO leaders meet July 8-9.

The other candidates are Albania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia.

HOMES NEAR NUCLEAR WASTE LEAK WILL TAP INTO PUBLIC WATER

New York Times -- February 25, 1997
By JOHN T. McQUISTON

SHIRLEY, N.Y. -- Despite federal assurances that a nuclear waste leak at the Brookhaven National Laboratory poses no threat to their drinking water, the federal government has agreed to connect 500 nearby homes to a public water supply.

Under the agreement, announced Monday by Rep. Michael Forbes and Sen. Alfonse D'Amato, the federal Department of Energy will commit \$6.2 million for the work.

Residents have expressed fear about their well water because of what was apparently a leak of radioactive tritium from a 68,000 gallon tank used to store spent fuel used in the laboratory's High Flux Beam Reactor, which is at the center of the 5,300-acre research complex.

The leak has created a plume about 1,100 feet long that extends southward from the center of the laboratory grounds. The plume ends about a mile from the nearest residential area.

Tests have indicated that the levels of tritium at some locations are 30 times higher than federal drinking water standards allow, but federal, state and local officials have told nearby residents and laboratory workers that their drinking water is safe.

To ease their fears, however, Forbes and D'Amato announced that 500 homes in Manorville, east of the laboratory, would be connected to the Suffolk County Water Authority system.

They said the Department of Energy was monitoring the leak and had promised to clean up the contaminated soil.

D'Amato said the people living near the Brookhaven lab are entitled to peace of mind. "They should not have to worry that the health and safety of their children is being jeopardized," he said.

Tests conducted by the Environmental Protection Agency and the Brookhaven Laboratory have shown that the local ground water is safe. D'Amato said the officials agreed to connect the homes to the public water supply to show that the lab is a responsible member of the community.

A year ago, the Department of Energy ordered that 800 homes in the North Shirley area, south of the laboratory, be connected to the municipal water supply after tests detected the radioactive plume.

The leak forced Brookhaven officials to close the reactor last December, and D'Amato said it would stay closed until the problem at the laboratory was solved.

"That reactor will not be turned on," he said, "until the deficiencies are corrected and until the cleanup work is done."

The Department of Energy said the cleanup effort could begin within two months and could take years to complete. Meanwhile, Brookhaven officials said the shutdown of the reactor has put the research projects of 250 scientists from 73 universities on hold.

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street #700 Washington DC 20005

Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 Fax: 202 898 0172

<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

From: ippnwbos@igc.apc.org Tue Feb 25 16:55:01 1997
Date: Tue, 25 Feb 1997 08:31:46 -0800 (PST)
From: ippnwbos@igc.apc.org
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: NEW ACTION GROUP/NEW E-MAIL ADDRESS

forwarded

>From: LANLaction@aol.com
>Date: Mon, 24 Feb 1997 22:27:36 -0500 (EST)
>Message-ID: <970224222735_1139059690@emout19.mail.aol.com>
>To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
>Subject: NEW ACTION GROUP/NEW E-MAIL ADDRESS

>

>Feb. 24, 1997

>To: Abolitionists everywhere

>From: Peggy Prince (LANLaction@aol.com)

>Re: New action group/new e-mail address

>

>Dearest A2000 sisters and brothers;

>

>First, I want to say what an enriching experience being on the
Abolition

>caucus has been thus far. I have gotten so much really good
information and

>ideas that can and will be used in my community of Santa Fe, New
Mexico. As

>you know, we are virtually next to the Los Alamos National Laboratory
>(certainly downwind and downwater) and the Lab is engaged in lots
of awful

>stuff including a Nevada Test site subcritical test, and revving
up to

>produce more plutonium pits. We have two very good groups in Santa
Fe that

>work on weapons and waste issues, Concerned Citizens for Nuclear
Safety and

>Los Alamos Study Group. They both do tremendous work. There seems
to me to

>have been one piece of the puzzle missing however and to that end
I have, at

>last, taken up the baton of forming the Los Alamos Action Network.

This

>group is bringing the discussion of the abolition of nuclear weapons
directly

>to Los Alamos and the Lab now and will be planning, hopefully with
lots of

>other groups, a non-violent direct action at the Lab in the summer,
perhaps

>either Trinity day or Hiroshima/Nagasaki days. I believe LANL to
be pivotal

>to the future of the nuclear weapons production and development
in the

>future, and have found, to my great pleasure that Santa Feans, and

many
>people in Los Alamos are concerned and ready for action. Note:
I've gotten
>almost 1000 signatures on the Abolition 2000 petition in the last
year, and
>have placed them all on a database for mailings etc.
>
>I have requested that Los Alamos Action Network be placed as a sponsor
of
>Abolition 2000. The new e-mail address is LANLaction@aol.com Once
again,
>thank you for your friendship, good ideas and moral support. Hope
to get
>your feedback and correspondence soon.
>
>Peace, solidarity and disarmament;
>
>Peggy Prince
>(505) 989-4812 - phone & fax
>LANLaction@aol.com - e-mail
>447 Cerrillos Rd, Santa Fe, N.M. 87501 - snail mail
>
>

Michael Christ Program Director
International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War
126 Rogers St. Cambridge, MA 02142 USA
tel. (617)868-5050 fax. (617)868-2560
ippnwbos@igc.apc.org <http://www.healthnet.org/IPPNW>

IPPNW is part of Abolition 2000: A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear
Weapons

From nfnzsc@gn.apc.org Tue Feb 25 16:55:01 1997
Date: Tue, 25 Feb 1997 20:03:46 GMT
From: National Steering Cttee Nuclear Free Local Authorities
<nfnzsc@gn.apc.org>
To: nfla.news@conf.gn.apc.org
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: UK Nuclear News 25 February 1997

>From GMR@MCR1.poptel.org.uk Tue Feb 25 15:45:14 1997
Received: from MCR1.poptel.org.uk by gnew.gn.apc.org
(8.8.5/Revision: 2.06 03 December 1996)
id PAA16374; Tue, 25 Feb 1997 15:45:00 GMT
From: GMR@MCR1.poptel.org.uk
Date: Tue, 25 Feb 1997 15:44:41 GMT
Subject: NPU Bulletin 25 Feb
To: nfnzsc@gn.apc.org
Message-Id: <297289343MCR1@MCR1.poptel.org.uk>
Status: RO

DAILY INFORMATION BULLETIN - NUCLEAR POLICY

Tues 25 Feb 1997

97-8197 Russia edging closer to striking deal over Nato's plans to expand in Eastern Europe. Ind

GM Research, Metropolitan House, Hobson Street, Oldham, OL1 1QD.
Tel: 0161-911 4179. Fax: 0161-627 1736.
Internet: gmr@mcrl.poptel.org.uk
From panukes@igc.apc.org Tue Feb 25 16:55:01 1997
Date: Tue, 25 Feb 1997 14:18:46 -0800 (PST)
From: Peace Action - National Office <panukes@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, epp92@antenna.nl
Subject: Re: START III/anti-NATO meeting report from Tahiti

Dear Dirk,

I agree with both your suggestions. Thank you for your input. I think discussing NATO expansion is extremely important, and central to nuclear abolition work, especially in Europe -- how will we get a Nuclear Weapons Convention without addressing NATO's role as a nuclear umbrella alliance? But I think we should always present positive alternatives whenever possible, and the OCSE seems a good one here.

Karina Wood,
PAEF

> From owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org Thu Feb 20 16:36:16 1997

> >From majordomo Thu Feb 20 16:36:16 1997
> Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus>
> Received: (from majordomo@localhost)
> by igc7.igc.org (8.8.5/8.8.5) id OAA25696;
> Thu, 20 Feb 1997 14:47:39 -0800 (PST)
> X-Authentication-Warning: igc7.igc.org: Processed from queue
> /var/spool/mqueue-maj
> Received: from antenna.nl (root@antenna.nl [194.178.64.33])
> by igc7.igc.org (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id OAA21999
> for <abolition-caucus@igc.org>; Thu, 20 Feb 1997 14:32:24 -0800
> (PST)
> Received: from fes.antenna.nl by antenna.nl with UUCP id AA32478
> (5.67b/IDA-1.5 for abolition-caucus@igc.org); Thu, 20 Feb 1997
> 23:35:26 +0100
> Date: Thu, 20 Feb 1997 23:15:14
> From: epp92@antenna.nl
> Message-Id: <15247241@fes.antenna.nl>
> Priority: normal
> Subject: Re: START III/anti-NATO meeting report from Tahiti
> To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
> X-Link: WINDMAIL for LAN and standalone PC (fes.antenna.nl)
> X-Mailer: Pegasus Mail v3.1 (R1a)
> Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
> Precedence: bulk

> Status: 0
>
> Dear friends,
>
> Thank you for sharing this report. Please let me make an essential
> remark regarding nuclear free zones in Europe:
> I do fully underline the importance and opportunities for a NWFZ
in
> Eastern and Central Europe. I would however like to stress that
this
> must not be the end goal. I would favor a goal that strives
> towards an European Nuclear Weapons Free zone (thus including
the EU
> countries). In our attempts to reach this goal there are the
> opportunities as described in your action plan and the opportunities
to
> argue and work on withdrawal of nuclear weapons from "non-nuclear"
> NATO members, withdrawal from their positions in the NATO NPG
etc..
> Also use the positions of e.g. Norway, Denmark and Spain as examples
> to withdraw nuclear weapons.
>
> The above approach is a less "colonial" approach than working
towards
> a nuclear free Central and East Europe.
>
> Thus I would like to rephrase:
> > A Nuclear Weapon-Free Central & Eastern Europe!
> into:
> A nuclear Weapon-Free Europe! Starting in Central & Eastern Europe!
>
> Second: Although I personally would like to remove NATO and WEU
from
> the face of this earth, I would like to refrain from discussions
> concerning NATO extension. I would rather discuss the position
of the
> OVSE as an alternative for European and transatlantic security.
> The OVSE is the only alternative at this time not being a
> military alliance!
>
> Kindest regards,
>
> Dirk Jan Dullemond
>
>
>

> Dirk Jan Dullemond
Coalitie
> v Doesburglaan 124 G
> 6708 MD Wageningen
> the Netherlands
>
Nederlandse Kernstop
Herenstraat 9
6701 DG Wageningen
the Netherlands

> Tel +31 317 423481 (Home)
> +31 317 422140 (Work)
> Fax +31 317 423588
>
> Email epp92@antenna.nl
>

From PRINCELASG@aol.comWed Feb 26 14:49:09 1997
Date: Tue, 25 Feb 1997 18:16:27 -0500 (EST)
From: PRINCELASG@aol.com
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, pmeidell@igc.apc.org
Subject: NEW E-MAIL & NEW GROUP

Feb. 24, 1997
To: Abolitionists everywhere
From: Peggy Prince (LANLaction@aol.com)
Re: New action group/new e-mail address

Dearest A2000 sisters and brothers;

First, I want to say what an enriching experience being on the Abolition caucus has been thus far. I have gotten so much really good information and ideas that can and will be used in my community of Santa Fe, New Mexico. As you know, we are virtually next to the Los Alamos National Laboratory (certainly downwind and downwater) and the Lab is engaged in lots of awful stuff including a Nevada Test site subcritical test, and revving up to produce more plutonium pits. We have two very good groups in Santa Fe that work on weapons and waste issues, Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety and Los Alamos Study Group. They both do tremendous work. There seems to me to have been one piece of the puzzle missing however and to that end I have, at last, taken up the baton of forming the Los Alamos Action Network. This group is bringing the discussion of the abolition of nuclear weapons directly to Los Alamos and the Lab now and will be planning, hopefully with lots of other groups, a non-violent direct action at the Lab in the summer, perhaps either Trinity day or Hiroshima/Nagasaki days. I believe LANL to be pivotal to the future of the nuclear weapons production and development in the future, and have found, to my great pleasure that Santa Feans, and many people in Los Alamos are concerned and ready for action. Note: I've gotten almost 1000 signatures on the Abolition 2000 petition in the last year, and have placed them all on a database for mailings etc.

I have requested that Los Alamos Action Network be placed as a sponsor of Abolition 2000. The new e-mail address is LANLaction@aol.com Once again, thank you for your friendship, good ideas and moral support. Hope to get your feedback and correspondence soon.

Peace, solidarity and disarmament;

Peggy Prince
(505) 989-4812 - phone & fax
LANLaction@aol.com - e-mail
447 Cerrillos Rd, Santa Fe, N.M. 87501 - snail mail
From ipb@gn.apc.org Wed Feb 26 14:49:09 1997
Date: Tue, 25 Feb 1997 22:31:19 -0100
From: International Peace Bureau <ipb@gn.apc.org>
To: 'National Steering Ctte Nuclear Free Local Authorities'
<nfznsnc@gn.apc.org>
Cc: "'Heffermehl, Fredrik'" <fredpax@sn.no>,
'Weiss, Cora'" <srfnyusa@IGC.APC.ORG>
Subject: RE: Cities Declaration

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

From: National Steering Ctte Nuclear Free Local
Authorities[SMTP:nfznsnc@gn.apc.org]
Sent: lundi, 24. février 1997 22:07
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org; geowcpuk@gn.apc.org
Subject: Re: Cities Declaration

Dear abolitionists

Surely the main issue is whether people, organisations, local governments pledge themselves to the central plank of the Abolition 2000 campaign - a commitment by the nuclear weapons states to a time bound framework for nuclear weapon abolition by the year

2000. Tailoring the Abolition Statement to country specific circumstances isn't going to preclude anyone from being counted amongst Ab2000 supporters surely?

Sincere good wishes to you all.

Stewart Kemp

Isn't it about time we grasped the nettle - that we are creating - and indeed should be creating - (at least) two lists of supporters: those who support the Basic Demand, and a smaller list (currently around 700) of those who support the full A2000 statement. The first list of organisations should before long be in the tens of thousands if we get the snowball moving. There may be those who want to collect other, more specific, declarations - eg local/regional councils (remember not everyone lives in "cities") - or to pick out certain categories from the "Basic" or "A2000" lists - such as governments, or religious groups, or other sectors, in order to recruit more supporters within their particular spheres.

It's great that there's an electronic petition (via the PGS website), but the task of collecting individual handwritten signatures en masse is a

mammoth one. Some organisations have already started petitions as part of their public outreach. Will they catch on like the Declarations of Public Conscience (World Court Project)?? An open question. But we should be clear, if we do start this process on a grand scale, whether we are collecting for the Basic Demand or the A2000 statement.

At the moment my sense is that the Basic Demand by organisations should be the priority.

I'm against altering the A2000 Statement to suit "country-specific circumstances". This is Pandora's box. But I would say that any organisation, local council, trade union, etc can pass a resolution with its own wording, and so long as it contains the Basic Demand it can be counted with the other tens of thousands.

Colin Archer
International Peace Bureau

From disarmament@igc.org Wed Feb 26 14:49:09 1997
Date: Wed, 26 Feb 1997 08:47:56 -0800 (PST)
From: disarmament@igc.org
To: ctb-followers@igc.org
Subject: Feeling Safe?

U.S. News 2/10/97: Is World War III just a false alarm away?

Sorry to be so late in posting this - It is still on the U.S. News Website - where you can respond/discuss/interact in true internet fashion: <http://www.usnews.com> Also letters to U.S. News would be timely with the upcoming Helsinki Summit.

WORLD REPORT

Just when you thought you were safe . . . Could a false alarm still start a nuclear war?
by TIM ZIMMERMANN

You are the Russian president. The cold war is over, but Russia is chaotic and vulnerable. Your health is not what it should be, and there is a certain fog hanging over your brain as you go about your morning business. Suddenly, for the first time in your experience as president, the warning light on the nuclear "briefcase" that an aide always keeps nearby starts blinking. The case is flipped open to reveal a display that is tracking a ballistic missile rising into the skies over the Norwegian Sea. Your eyes stray to the row of buttons that authorize a range of retaliatory strike options for your 4,700 nuclear warheads on alert. If it's a false alarm and you give the launch order, you have just started World War III. If you don't, and an American nuclear warhead detonates over Russia, your ability to retaliate may be crippled. You have four minutes to decide.

This would be a diverting war-game scenario if not for the disturbing fact that it is exactly the situation Russian President Boris Yeltsin faced on Jan. 25, 1995. Perhaps Yeltsin did not even come close to panicking under the intense time pressure. If he had, Armageddon would have been triggered by a meteorological rocket fired from Norway to gather information about the aurora borealis.

The doomsday machine.

During the cold war the hair trigger was a deliberate creation: If you could fire your missiles before an attack landed, an adversary would have little incentive to launch a surprise strike. But five years after the end of the intense confrontation that was used to justify such readiness, U.S. and Russian nuclear doctrine continues to rely on extraordinarily rapid decision making. As President Clinton contemplates his arms control agenda for a second term, a growing number of military experts argue that this hair trigger--combined with the "x factor" of human error--creates a possibility for miscalculation that surpasses the threat of a surprise attack as the most clear and present nuclear danger.

Human error is more than a theoretical concern. In the Norwegian case, Moscow had been notified in advance of the launch, but no one thought to pass word to senior military officials. In more than one instance, real launch orders have been transmitted by mistake during American nuclear training exercises. And in 1979, the inadvertent introduction of training data into the NORAD early warning system computer mimicked a large Soviet attack. Soviet leaders got the same treatment in 1983, as a solar storm duped early warning satellites into indicating a massive U.S. attack. "The danger is if we have such mistakes simultaneously with another crisis. If you have time, you can correct mistakes," says Fred Ikle, a defense analyst.

Ikle, who was an under secretary of defense in the Reagan administration, is not your usual arms-controlnik. Neither is retired Gen. George Lee Butler, who plunged into the debate late last year--joined by 60 retired generals and admirals from nuclear states around the world--by publicly calling for the negotiated abolition of all nuclear weapons. From 1991 to 1994, Butler was the commander responsible for the plans and operations of the entire U.S. strategic nuclear arsenal. Today, he would like the United States to take its arms control focus beyond the START reduction process that has shrunk U.S. and Russian arsenals from about 10,000 strategic warheads in 1992 to the current 7,000 apiece. START II, which has been ratified by the U.S. Senate but remains stalled in the Russian Duma, would further reduce each side's arsenal to 3,500 by 2003, but it does nothing to alter alert postures. "As opposed to this sort of mechanical, lockstep, phased-down, numbers-driven arms control process we've been in most of my life, we need to pursue practical, verifiable, and I think immediately achievable steps--such as standing weapons down off alert, separating the warheads, and putting them in

centralized monitored storage," Butler argues.

The Bush administration took a step in this direction in 1991 by taking long-range nuclear bombers off alert, and the Clinton administration followed in 1994 by making the oceans instead of Russia the standby aim points for U.S. intercontinental ballistic missiles on alert. Yet Washington still has more than 3,000 strategic warheads on land- and submarine-based missiles that can be launched within minutes. It is roughly the same for Russia. And "detargeting," which is unverifiable in any case, can be reversed in a matter of seconds for both American and Russian missiles.

Paging Dr. Strangelove.

Clinton administration officials defend the status quo with the cold logic of the cold war. "To talk about it in this climate is almost surreal, but we believe the way you get stability is to ensure that there are no first-strike incentives," says a senior White House aide. "De-mating warheads and storing them sounds superficially attractive. But if you put all your eggs in one basket, you increase those incentives."

Yet political and economic chaos in Russia may yet make de-mating warheads, or other schemes to mitigate the dispersed and launch-ready posture of Russia's nuclear forces, an increasingly attractive option. A classified CIA report last September concluded that command and control over Russian nuclear forces is deteriorating and referred to incidents of insubordination in nuclear units in Russia's Far East. While President Yeltsin has the legal authority to launch nuclear weapons, members of the Russian general staff have technical control over the arsenal. Another worry: Many of Russia's important early warning radars now lie outside Russian territory, and its military reconnaissance satellite program is a shambles--further raising the danger of false alarms or misinterpretation.

Ironically, reductions under START II could actually make the threat of miscalculation worse. Current U.S. nuclear war plans aim for about 80 percent destruction of some 2,500 targets, almost all in Russia. With fewer warheads in their arsenal, U.S. commanders will face greater pressure to make every weapon count. "To increase stability under START II we need new presidential guidance that drastically cuts the target list and the requirements for damage," says Bruce Blair, an expert on nuclear command and control at the Brookings Institution in Washington. "Otherwise our forces will rely more than ever on rapid alerting in a crisis and launch on warning."

What's more dangerous in the post-cold-war era, a premeditated first strike or an inadvertent first strike? It's another tough exercise. But the president needs to decide.

Forbes (02/24/97) Commentary
By Caspar W. Weinberger
NATO ENLARGEMENT-OUR HIGHEST PRIORITY

SHORTLY AFTER the U.S. won the Cold War, many of the Eastern European nations that had been under the Soviets' heel for nearly 50 years turned to the West, hoping the end of communism would mean peace and freedom.

Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic made great, quick strides toward establishing democratic and comparatively free-market regimes. All urgently sought and are still seeking membership in NATO. It is a natural fit: NATO is the quickest and safest way for these newly free countries to seal their fledgling friendships with the U.S. and the West. And NATO needs the additional defensive strength the East European nations would bring to blocking any westward thrust that an already unstable Russia might try. Those Russians who cannot admit that they lost the Cold War and that their dreadful economic condition precludes their again being a superpower for years to come, object violently to the idea of their old "colonies" joining NATO.

The Clinton Administration, dominated by Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott (a Russophile since his student days, during which time he cemented his friendship with the President), incredibly supported Russia and turned its back on these nations. In January 1994 President Clinton described their new aspirations as merely an attempt to "draw a new line through Europe, just a little further east." Forgetting Russia's century-old moves to secure ever-widening "buffer zones" to protect its borders, Mr. Clinton used his typical approach: We would not exactly say no to the requests to join NATO; instead, we would offer them a "Partnership for Peace," which anyone, including Russia, could join.

This was another Clinton charade designed to remove a controversy from the headlines. The big "prize" of the Partnership for Peace was that the "partners" could "consult with NATO." The East European nations may have been just emerging, but they were not stupid; they renewed their pleas for full NATO membership.

With Russia still objecting and making crude threats, Talbott insisted that if NATO enlargement were approved at this July's summit in Madrid, there would still have to be a two-year delay to settle technical details. No such delay was required when we begged Spain to join NATO in the 1980s.

But far worse than this delay are the ways in which we are still trying to appease Russia and buy its wholly unnecessary support. We have offered:

A charter for Russia that will give it a "real voice" in the security issues NATO acts on. According to outgoing Defense Secretary William Perry, this goes further. Russia will share in

NATO decision making.

A possible new START III agreement, apparently forgetting that Russia has not yet ratified START II.

To put Russian observers in all major NATO posts. A promise that no matter what future military situations might require, we will put neither military bases nor nuclear weapons in any new NATO nations.

Nothing will change Russia's opposition. Victor Ilyukhin, a communist member of the Duma, has said that Russia will deploy nuclear weapons if NATO enlargement proceeds. The only way to satisfy Russia is to agree to make NATO impotent - Russia's goal since 1949. But why do we have to satisfy Russia?

The West should help Russia economically, as it has. Unfortunately, we have refused to link our aid to, at the least, Russia's signing treaties it has agreed to and its not selling modern weapons to China and other enemies of the West. Helping Russia recover from 70 years of communism emphatically does not mean that we should endanger the security of our NATO allies or ourselves. As Henry Kissinger said, "NATO's enlargement represents above all an overriding American political interest [because] our security is inextricably linked with Europe's," and NATO is the instrument which provides that security.

If Secretary of State Albright can persuade the President to abandon allowing Russia to have a veto over our policies and, instead, to support alliances with our real friends, she will have performed an invaluable service.

RTw 02/26 0854 India has no money to meet defence needs--analysts

By Jawed Naqvi

NEW DELHI, Feb 26 (Reuter) - India does not have enough money to provide badly needed weaponry to its defence forces, putting the country at risk against neighbours Pakistan and China, defence analysts said on Wednesday.

They said New Delhi might have to consider going nuclear to beef up its defences in the short term to stem the erosion in the defence budget, estimated last year to be 2.26 percent of gross domestic product (GDP).

"In the 1980s it used to be around three percent of GDP but since 1987 the budget has hovered a little above two percent," Jasjit Singh, director of the state-funded Institute of Defence Studies and Analyses, told Reuters.

Finance Minister P. Chidambaram will unveil the budget for fiscal 1997/98 (April-March) on Friday, including allocations for the armed forces.

"Everyone knows, and no one better than the army, that the

money has not been coming forth to modernise ageing weaponry," Jasjit Singh said. "The navy recently retired an aircraft carrier and will lose another one in three or four years. The navy badly needs new submarines too."

He said the Indian Air Force was losing an average of 24 aircraft annually in crashes, and needed a complement of at least 350 combat planes in the next 10 years.

According to Defence Ministry sources India now has 22 squadrons of some 440 ground attack aircraft and 20 squadrons of 375 interceptor fighter planes.

The army was coping with old Soviet-supplied tanks and needed new 155-mm field guns.

"Where is all the money going to come from?" Jasjit Singh asked. "The nuclear option looks even more compelling under the circumstances, at least until the conventional forces can be beefed up."

"It is beyond the pale of the United Front government to adequately answer the challenges of today's defence budget-making," said former finance minister Jaswant Singh.

Jaswant Singh's rightwing Hindu nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) is regarded as hawkish on India's defence preparedness and advocates the development of nuclear weapons, which New Delhi says it can build but does not want to for now.

India, which exploded a nuclear device in 1974, says its nuclear programme is peaceful.

Jaswant Singh's views on Prime Minister H.D. Deve Gowda's United Front coalition were echoed by defence ministry officials.

They criticised Deve Gowda for providing hefty subsidies to farmers at the expense of what they said were more important needs of the military.

They said India's quest for improved relations with China and Pakistan should not be at the expense of the defence force.

China, with whom India fought a brief border war in 1962, is one of the world's five declared nuclear weapons states.

India's military budget is keenly watched by neighbouring Pakistan. The neighbours have fought three wars since independence from British rule in 1947.

Indian officials say Pakistan has developed nuclear weapons, a claim backed by U.S. intelligence reports. Islamabad denies it has a nuclear weapons programme.

Chidambaram last year raised the budget outlay on defence to 277.98 billion rupees (\$7.7 billion) from 268.79 billion.

Jasjit Singh said he expected Chidambaram to raise the budget outlay by about 16 percent over last year's planned expenditure to keep this year's allocation at par with last year's.

"If you take into account inflation and GDP growth, that's the least we would expect," he said.

REU

APO 02/26 0832 Rivals To Build Subs Together

NEWPORT NEWS, Va. (AP) -- The nation's two submarine makers --

Newport News Shipbuilding and General Dynamics' Electric Boat Corp. -- agreed to work together to build the Navy's next generation of nuclear submarines.

At the urging of the Navy, each shipyard will build parts of four submarines. Each shipyard originally was scheduled to build two submarines.

Electric Boat, in Groton, Conn., will continue its role as lead design yard for the new attack submarines.

"This is a forward-looking approach to the challenges of post-Cold War shipbuilding," John Welch, president of Electric Boat, a division of General Dynamics Corp., said Tuesday when the agreement was announced.

Each submarine is expected to cost \$1.5 billion to build.

Electric Boat originally had hoped to build all of the new submarines.

However, last year Congress mandated that Newport News be allowed to compete with Electric Boat for construction contracts.

Electric Boat will assemble, test and deliver the first and third submarines, while Newport News shipyard will deliver the second and fourth submarines.

Electric Boat will build the engine room and the command and control portions of the subs. Newport News will build the living quarters, the top-side sail that houses the periscope and the auxiliary machinery rooms.

APO 02/25 1829 Clinton Pushes for Pena Vote

By RON FOURNIER

Associated Press Writer

WASHINGTON (AP) -- Trying to break the logjam over President Clinton's nomination for energy secretary, chief of staff Erskine Bowles and Sen. Frank Murkowski met at the White House Tuesday, with no immediate resolution to the standoff.

A Senate Energy Committee vote on Federico Pena's confirmation has been delayed while the panel battles the White House over a proposed interim storage site for nuclear waste in Nevada.

The administration is opposed to temporarily storing the waste.

Bowles met with the Murkowski, R-Alaska, trying to ease the senator's concerns with the administration's position -- or at least separate Pena's confirmation vote from the waste dispute. Murkowski chairs the Energy panel.

Aides close to the senator and Bowles said there was no immediate breakthrough, though both men expected to talk again. The meeting took place one day after the Energy panel postponed for a second time a vote on Pena's confirmation.

"I don't know that any views were changed, but it was a good opportunity for us to hear the senator's thinking on the issue, for perhaps the senator to hear a little more about administration policy on the matter," presidential spokesman secretary Mike McCurry said.

White House aides and an official close to the committee said they expect the nomination will eventually be put to a vote. The

White House believes the former transportation secretary will be easily confirmed once a vote is taken. . . .

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005
Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 Fax: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>
From kgrossman@hamptons.com Wed Feb 26 14:49:09 1997
Date: Wed, 26 Feb 1997 08:24:27 -0800 (PST)
From: Karl Grossman <kgrossman@hamptons.com>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

For further info call:
Bruce Gagnon (352) 468-3295 <fcpj@afn.org>
Bill Sulzman (719) 389-0644 <lwirbel@aol.com>
Karl Grossman (516) 725-2858

<kgrossman@hamptons.com>
(In U.K.) Anna Rehin 01273 476358 or 0171 700 2349

MEETINGS, PRESS CONFERENCES IN EUROPE TO CHALLENGE
CASSINI SPACE MISSION WITH RECORD AMOUNT OF PLUTONIUM

Events in United Kingdom, Germany, Netherlands, Belgium

Citizens for Peace and Space and the Global Network Against Weapons
&
Nuclear Power In Space will be holding a series of meetings and press
conferences in Europe for a 10-day period between Saturday, March 15 and
Monday, March 24 to challenge U.S. plans to launch the Cassini space
probe
this October with 72.3 pounds of deadly plutonium -- more plutonium than
has
ever been used on a space device.

A press conference in London is set for 6 p.m. Tuesday evening,
March 18 at Conway Hall on Red Lion Square (near the Holborn Tube).
(Individual interviews can be arranged for media who cannot attend the
press
conference by reaching the telephone numbers or the E-mail addresses
above.)

There will be a public presentation after the press conference
with
speakers including Bruce Gagnon, co-coordinator of the Global Network,
and
Professor Karl Grossman whose book on the use of nuclear power and
weapons
in space, *The Wrong Stuff*, is soon to be published and whose journalism
on
the issue is being cited by Project Censored, a U.S. media monitoring
program, as involving the most "under-reported" story in the U.S. in
1996.

In October, NASA plans to launch the Cassini space probe with 72.3 pounds of plutonium. Not only could there be a disastrous accident on launch releasing plutonium, NASA admits. But then it intends to have the Cassini probe hurtle back at the Earth for a low-level (500 km-high) "flyby," what it calls a "slingshot maneuver" to give it the velocity to get to Saturn.

But, says NASA in its Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Cassini mission, if the Cassini probe makes an "inadvertent reentry" into the Earth's atmosphere on the "flyby" and disintegrates dispersing the plutonium, "5 billion of the estimated 7 to 8 billion world population at the time...could receive 99 percent or more of the radiation exposure."

Dr. Ernest Sternglass, professor emeritus of radiological physics at the University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, says that based on NASA's data, 10 to 40 million people could die from exposure to radioactivity from plutonium in the event of such a Cassini disaster.

The NASA Final Environmental Impact Statement actually provides, in the event of a catastrophic Cassini accident, for a "ban" on "future agricultural land uses" and if an "urban" area is involved provision is made to: "Relocate affected population permanently."

Moreover, the plutonium and the lethal danger it poses are unnecessary, stresses the Global Network. The European Space Agency has achieved what it termed a "technology milestone," a "breakthrough" in the development of solar photovoltaic power for deep space probes. "We demand safe solar power be substituted for life-threatening nuclear power on Cassini and other space missions," says Gagnon.

Also, NASA and the U.S. Department of Energy have entered into a "Space Nuclear Power Agreement," said Professor Grossman, providing that if an accident befalls a U.S. nuclear space system like that to be on Cassini and impacts on other nations and people on Earth, the U.S. liability would be limited to a total of \$100 million -- "no matter how many people might end up with cancer, how many nations are exposed to radioactivity," he said.

Further, the Cassini mission is part of a wider U.S. program of nuclear power in space -- with nuclear technology seen by the U.S. as a

power source for space weapons, stresses Global Network Co-Coordinator Bill Sulzman and director of Citizens for Peace in Space.

Recently, the Clinton administration ordered the development of nuclear-propelled rockets for military and civilian uses, he noted. And the the U.S. Air Force last year issued a report, New World Vistas, Air and Space Power for the 21st Century, that declared that "space-based weapons" need "large amounts of power" and thus the Air Force "should continue" developing nuclear power in space. "We don't want weapons, we don't want nuclear power in space," said Sulzman. "The motto of the U.S. Space Command is 'master of space.' The Pentagon seeks to attain what it terms the 'ultimate high ground' and with space weapons 'control' the Earth below. This is unacceptable to the U.S. people. It is unacceptable to the people of the world."

Among the Global Network events during the 10 days in Europe will be:

- * A two-day conference in Darmstadt, Germany Thursday, March 20 and Friday, March 21 held with support of the Germany-based Campaign Against the Use of Plutonium in Space. (For further info call Martin Koppold at 49-71-12255 for info on this.)

- * Meetings throughout the U.K. including presentations in Leeds and Otley, along with the London event, with support of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, the Menwith Hill Women's Peace Camp and other peace and anti-nuclear groups.

- * A press conference with the World Information Service on Energy on Saturday, March 15 in Amsterdam, The Netherlands. (Call Peer de Rijk at WISE at +31-20-612 6368 for info.)

- * A press conference in Brussels, Belgium Wednesday, March 19 with the organization For Mother Earth and meetings Monday, March 24. (Call Tom Keunen at +32 +9 233 49 24 for further info on press conference.)

The fiery descent of the Russian Mars space probe with a half-pound of plutonium onboard November 16 on Chile and Bolivia made "real and imaginable" to the people of the world an accident involving a

nuclear-fueled space device," said Gagnon, also coordinator of the Florida Coalition for Peace and Justice. "Now NASA this October 6 wants to launch a space device with 150 times that amount of plutonium. This," said Gagnon, "is sheer and utter madness -- and we will stop it."

From kgrossman@hamptons.com Wed Feb 26 14:49:09 1997
Date: Wed, 26 Feb 1997 08:20:30 -0800 (PST)
From: Karl Grossman <kgrossman@hamptons.com>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

For further info call:

Bruce Gagnon (352) 468-3295 <fcpj@afn.org>
Bill Sulzman (719) 389-0644 <lwirbel@aol.com>
Karl Grossman (516) 725-2858

<kgrossman@hamptons.com>

(In U.K.) Anna Rehin 01273 476358 or 0171 700 2349

MEETINGS, PRESS CONFERENCES IN EUROPE TO CHALLENGE
CASSINI SPACE MISSION WITH RECORD AMOUNT OF PLUTONIUM

in United Kingdom, Germany, Netherlands, Belgium

Citizens for Peace and Space and the Global Network Against Weapons & Nuclear Power In Space will be holding a series of meetings and press conferences in Europe for a 10-day period between Saturday, March 15 and Monday, March 24 to challenge U.S. plans to launch the Cassini space probe this October with 72.3 pounds of deadly plutonium -- more plutonium than has ever been used on a space device.

A press conference in London is set for 6 p.m. Tuesday evening, March 18 at Conway Hall on Red Lion Square (near the Holborn Tube). (Individual interviews can be arranged for media who cannot attend the press conference by reaching the telephone numbers or the E-mail addresses above.)

There will be a public presentation after the press conference with speakers including Bruce Gagnon, co-coordinator of the Global Network, and Professor Karl Grossman whose book on the use of nuclear power and weapons in space, *The Wrong Stuff*, is soon to be published and whose journalism on the issue is being cited by Project Censored, a U.S. media monitoring program, as involving the most "under-reported" story in the U.S. in 1996.

In October, NASA plans to launch the Cassini space probe with 72.3 pounds of plutonium. Not only could there be a disastrous accident on launch releasing plutonium, NASA admits. But then it intends to have the Cassini probe hurtle back at the Earth for a low-level (500 km-high) "flyby," what it calls a "slingshot maneuver" to give it the velocity to get to Saturn.

But, says NASA in its Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Cassini mission, if the Cassini probe makes an "inadvertent reentry" into the Earth's atmosphere on the "flyby" and disintegrates dispersing the plutonium, "5 billion of the estimated 7 to 8 billion world population at the time...could receive 99 percent or more of the radiation exposure."

Dr. Ernest Sternglass, professor emeritus of radiological physics at the University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, says that based on NASA's data, 10 to 40 million people could die from exposure to radioactivity from plutonium in the event of such a Cassini disaster.

The NASA Final Environmental Impact Statement actually provides, in the event of a catastrophic Cassini accident, for a "ban" on "future agricultural land uses" and if an "urban" area is involved provision is made to: "Relocate affected population permanently."

Moreover, the plutonium and the lethal danger it poses are unnecessary, stresses the Global Network. The European Space Agency has achieved what it termed a "technology milestone," a "breakthrough" in the development of solar photovoltaic power for deep space probes. "We demand safe solar power be substituted for life-threatening nuclear power on Cassini and other space missions," says Gagnon.

Also, NASA and the U.S. Department of Energy have entered into a "Space Nuclear Power Agreement," said Professor Grossman, providing that if an accident befalls a U.S. nuclear space system like that to be on Cassini and impacts on other nations and people on Earth, the U.S. liability would be limited to a total of \$100 million -- "no matter how many people might end up with cancer, how many nations are exposed to radioactivity," he said.

Further, the Cassini mission is part of a wider U.S. program of nuclear power in space -- with nuclear technology seen by the U.S. as a

power source for space weapons, stresses Global Network Co-Coordinator Bill Sulzman and director of Citizens for Peace in Space.

Recently, the Clinton administration ordered the development of nuclear-propelled rockets for military and civilian uses, he noted. And the the U.S. Air Force last year issued a report, New World Vistas, Air and Space Power for the 21st Century, that declared that "space-based weapons" need "large amounts of power" and thus the Air Force "should continue" developing nuclear power in space. "We don't want weapons, we don't want nuclear power in space," said Sulzman. "The motto of the U.S. Space Command is 'master of space.' The Pentagon seeks to attain what it terms the 'ultimate high ground' and with space weapons 'control' the Earth below. This is unacceptable to the U.S. people. It is unacceptable to the people of the world."

Among the Global Network events during the 10 days in Europe will be:

- * A two-day conference in Darmstadt, Germany Thursday, March 20 and Friday, March 21 held with support of the Germany-based Campaign Against the Use of Plutonium in Space. (For further info call Martin Koppold at 49-71-12255 for info on this.)

- * Meetings throughout the U.K. including presentations in Leeds and Otley, along with the London event, with support of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, the Menwith Hill Women's Peace Camp and other peace and anti-nuclear groups.

- * A press conference with the World Information Service on Energy on Saturday, March 15 in Amsterdam, The Netherlands. (Call Peer de Rijk at WISE at +31-20-612 6368 for info.)

- * A press conference in Brussels, Belgium Wednesday, March 19 with the organization For Mother Earth and meetings Monday, March 24. (Call Tom Keunen at +32 +9 233 49 24 for further info on press conference.)

The fiery descent of the Russian Mars space probe with a half-pound of plutonium onboard November 16 on Chile and Bolivia made "real and imaginable" to the people of the world an accident involving a

nuclear-fueled space device," said Gagnon, also coordinator of the Florida Coalition for Peace and Justice. "Now NASA this October 6 wants to launch a space device with 150 times that amount of plutonium. This," said Gagnon, "is sheer and utter madness -- and we will stop it."

From ipb@gn.apc.org Wed Feb 26 14:49:09 1997
Date: Tue, 25 Feb 1997 22:31:19 -0100
From: International Peace Bureau <ipb@gn.apc.org>
To: 'National Steering Ctte Nuclear Free Local Authorities'
<nfznscc@gn.apc.org>
Cc: "'Heffermehl, Fredrik'" <fredpax@sn.no>,
'Weiss, Cora'" <srfnyusa@IGC.APC.ORG>
Subject: RE: Cities Declaration

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

From: National Steering Ctte Nuclear Free Local
Authorities[SMTP:nfznscc@gn.apc.org]
Sent: lundi, 24. février 1997 22:07
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org; geowcpuk@gn.apc.org
Subject: Re: Cities Declaration

Dear abolitionists

Surely the main issue is whether people, organisations, local governments pledge themselves to the central plank of the Abolition 2000 campaign - a commitment by the nuclear weapons states to a time bound framework for nuclear weapon abolition by the year 2000. Tailoring the Abolition Statement to country specific circumstances isn't going to preclude anyone from being counted amongst Ab2000 supporters surely?

Sincere good wishes to you all.

Stewart Kemp

Isn't it about time we grasped the nettle - that we are creating - and indeed should be creating - (at least) two lists of supporters: those who support the Basic Demand, and a smaller list (currently around 700) of those who support the full A2000 statement. The first list of organisations should before long be in the tens of thousands if we get the snowball moving. There may be those who want to collect other, more specific, declarations - eg local/regional councils (remember not everyone lives in "cities") - or to pick out certain categories from the "Basic" or "A2000" lists - such as governments, or religious groups, or

other sectors, in order to recruit more supporters within their particular spheres.

It's great that there's an electronic petition (via the PGS website), but the task of collecting individual handwritten signatures en masse is a mammoth one. Some organisations have already started petitions as part of their public outreach. Will they catch on like the Declarations of Public Conscience (World Court Project)?? An open question. But we should be clear, if we do start this process on a grand scale, whether we are collecting for the Basic Demand or the A2000 statement.

At the moment my sense is that the Basic Demand by organisations should be the priority.

I'm against altering the A2000 Statement to suit "country-specific circumstances". This is Pandora's box. But I would say that any organisation, local council, trade union, etc can pass a resolution with its own wording, and so long as it contains the Basic Demand it can be counted with the other tens of thousands.

Colin Archer
International Peace Bureau

From disarmament@igc.org Wed Feb 26 14:49:09 1997
Date: Wed, 26 Feb 1997 08:47:56 -0800 (PST)
From: disarmament@igc.org
To: ctb-followers@igc.org
Subject: Feeling Safe?

U.S. News 2/10/97: Is World War III just a false alarm away?

Sorry to be so late in posting this - It is still on the U.S. News Website - where you can respond/discuss/interact in true internet fashion: <http://www.usnews.com> Also letters to U.S. News would be timely with the upcoming Helsinki Summit.

WORLD REPORT

Just when you thought you were safe . . . Could a false alarm still start a nuclear war?
by TIM ZIMMERMANN

You are the Russian president. The cold war is over, but Russia is chaotic and vulnerable. Your health is not what it should be, and there is a certain fog hanging over your brain as you go about your morning business. Suddenly, for the first time in your experience as president, the warning light on the nuclear "briefcase" that an aide always keeps nearby starts blinking. The case is flipped open to reveal a display that is tracking a ballistic missile rising into the skies over the Norwegian Sea. Your eyes stray to the row of buttons that authorize a range of retaliatory strike options for your 4,700 nuclear warheads on

alert. If it's a false alarm and you give the launch order, you have just started World War III. If you don't, and an American nuclear warhead detonates over Russia, your ability to retaliate may be crippled. You have four minutes to decide.

This would be a diverting war-game scenario if not for the disturbing fact that it is exactly the situation Russian President Boris Yeltsin faced on Jan. 25, 1995. Perhaps Yeltsin did not even come close to panicking under the intense time pressure. If he had, Armageddon would have been triggered by a meteorological rocket fired from Norway to gather information about the aurora borealis.

The doomsday machine.

During the cold war the hair trigger was a deliberate creation: If you could fire your missiles before an attack landed, an adversary would have little incentive to launch a surprise strike. But five years after the end of the intense confrontation that was used to justify such readiness, U.S. and Russian nuclear doctrine continues to rely on extraordinarily rapid decision making. As President Clinton contemplates his arms control agenda for a second term, a growing number of military experts argue that this hair trigger--combined with the "x factor" of human error--creates a possibility for miscalculation that surpasses the threat of a surprise attack as the most clear and present nuclear danger.

Human error is more than a theoretical concern. In the Norwegian case, Moscow had been notified in advance of the launch, but no one thought to pass word to senior military officials. In more than one instance, real launch orders have been transmitted by mistake during American nuclear training exercises. And in 1979, the inadvertent introduction of training data into the NORAD early warning system computer mimicked a large Soviet attack. Soviet leaders got the same treatment in 1983, as a solar storm duped early warning satellites into indicating a massive U.S. attack. "The danger is if we have such mistakes simultaneously with another crisis. If you have time, you can correct mistakes," says Fred Ikle, a defense analyst.

Ikle, who was an under secretary of defense in the Reagan administration, is not your usual arms-controlnik. Neither is retired Gen. George Lee Butler, who plunged into the debate late last year--joined by 60 retired generals and admirals from nuclear states around the world--by publicly calling for the negotiated abolition of all nuclear weapons. From 1991 to 1994, Butler was the commander responsible for the plans and operations of the entire U.S. strategic nuclear arsenal. Today, he would like the United States to take its arms control focus beyond the START reduction process that has shrunk U.S. and Russian arsenals from about 10,000 strategic warheads in 1992 to the current 7,000 apiece. START II, which has been ratified by the U.S. Senate but remains stalled in the Russian Duma, would further reduce each side's arsenal to 3,500 by 2003, but it does nothing to alter

alert postures. "As opposed to this sort of mechanical, lockstep, phased-down, numbers-driven arms control process we've been in most of my life, we need to pursue practical, verifiable, and I think immediately achievable steps--such as standing weapons down off alert, separating the warheads, and putting them in centralized monitored storage," Butler argues.

The Bush administration took a step in this direction in 1991 by taking long-range nuclear bombers off alert, and the Clinton administration followed in 1994 by making the oceans instead of Russia the standby aim points for U.S. intercontinental ballistic missiles on alert. Yet Washington still has more than 3,000 strategic warheads on land- and submarine-based missiles that can be launched within minutes. It is roughly the same for Russia. And "detargeting," which is unverifiable in any case, can be reversed in a matter of seconds for both American and Russian missiles.

Paging Dr. Strangelove.

Clinton administration officials defend the status quo with the cold logic of the cold war. "To talk about it in this climate is almost surreal, but we believe the way you get stability is to ensure that there are no first-strike incentives," says a senior White House aide. "De-mating warheads and storing them sounds superficially attractive. But if you put all your eggs in one basket, you increase those incentives."

Yet political and economic chaos in Russia may yet make de-mating warheads, or other schemes to mitigate the dispersed and launch-ready posture of Russia's nuclear forces, an increasingly attractive option. A classified CIA report last September concluded that command and control over Russian nuclear forces is deteriorating and referred to incidents of insubordination in nuclear units in Russia's Far East. While President Yeltsin has the legal authority to launch nuclear weapons, members of the Russian general staff have technical control over the arsenal. Another worry: Many of Russia's important early warning radars now lie outside Russian territory, and its military reconnaissance satellite program is a shambles--further raising the danger of false alarms or misinterpretation.

Ironically, reductions under START II could actually make the threat of miscalculation worse. Current U.S. nuclear war plans aim for about 80 percent destruction of some 2,500 targets, almost all in Russia. With fewer warheads in their arsenal, U.S. commanders will face greater pressure to make every weapon count. "To increase stability under START II we need new presidential guidance that drastically cuts the target list and the requirements for damage," says Bruce Blair, an expert on nuclear command and control at the Brookings Institution in Washington. "Otherwise our forces will rely more than ever on rapid alerting in a crisis and launch on warning."

What's more dangerous in the post-cold-war era, a premeditated

first strike or an inadvertent first strike? It's another tough exercise. But the president needs to decide.

Forbes (02/24/97) Commentary
By Caspar W. Weinberger
NATO ENLARGEMENT-OUR HIGHEST PRIORITY

SHORTLY AFTER the U.S. won the Cold War, many of the Eastern European nations that had been under the Soviets' heel for nearly 50 years turned to the West, hoping the end of communism would mean peace and freedom.

Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic made great, quick strides toward establishing democratic and comparatively free-market regimes. All urgently sought and are still seeking membership in NATO. It is a natural fit: NATO is the quickest and safest way for these newly free countries to seal their fledgling friendships with the U.S. and the West. And NATO needs the additional defensive strength the East European nations would bring to blocking any westward thrust that an already unstable Russia might try. Those Russians who cannot admit that they lost the Cold War and that their dreadful economic condition precludes their again being a superpower for years to come, object violently to the idea of their old "colonies" joining NATO.

The Clinton Administration, dominated by Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott (a Russophile since his student days, during which time he cemented his friendship with the President), incredibly supported Russia and turned its back on these nations. In January 1994 President Clinton described their new aspirations as merely an attempt to "draw a new line through Europe, just a little further east." Forgetting Russia's century-old moves to secure ever-widening "buffer zones" to protect its borders, Mr. Clinton used his typical approach: We would not exactly say no to the requests to join NATO; instead, we would offer them a "Partnership for Peace," which anyone, including Russia, could join.

This was another Clinton charade designed to remove a controversy from the headlines. The big "prize" of the Partnership for Peace was that the "partners" could "consult with NATO." The East European nations may have been just emerging, but they were not stupid; they renewed their pleas for full NATO membership.

With Russia still objecting and making crude threats, Talbott insisted that if NATO enlargement were approved at this July's summit in Madrid, there would still have to be a two-year delay to settle technical details. No such delay was required when we begged Spain to join NATO in the 1980s.

But far worse than this delay are the ways in which we are still trying to appease Russia and buy its wholly unnecessary support.

We have offered:

A charter for Russia that will give it a "real voice" in the security issues NATO acts on. According to outgoing Defense Secretary William Perry, this goes further. Russia will share in NATO decision making.

A possible new START III agreement, apparently forgetting that Russia has not yet ratified START II.

To put Russian observers in all major NATO posts.
A promise that no matter what future military situations might require, we will put neither military bases nor nuclear weapons in any new NATO nations.

Nothing will change Russia's opposition. Victor Ilyukhin, a communist member of the Duma, has said that Russia will deploy nuclear weapons if NATO enlargement proceeds. The only way to satisfy Russia is to agree to make NATO impotent - Russia's goal since 1949. But why do we have to satisfy Russia?

The West should help Russia economically, as it has. Unfortunately, we have refused to link our aid to, at the least, Russia's signing treaties it has agreed to and its not selling modern weapons to China and other enemies of the West. Helping Russia recover from 70 years of communism emphatically does not mean that we should endanger the security of our NATO allies or ourselves. As Henry Kissinger said, "NATO's enlargement represents above all an overriding American political interest [because] our security is inextricably linked with Europe's," and NATO is the instrument which provides that security.

If Secretary of State Albright can persuade the President to abandon allowing Russia to have a veto over our policies and, instead, to support alliances with our real friends, she will have performed an invaluable service.

RTw 02/26 0854 India has no money to meet defence needs--analysts

By Jawed Naqvi

NEW DELHI, Feb 26 (Reuter) - India does not have enough money to provide badly needed weaponry to its defence forces, putting the country at risk against neighbours Pakistan and China, defence analysts said on Wednesday.

They said New Delhi might have to consider going nuclear to beef up its defences in the short term to stem the erosion in the defence budget, estimated last year to be 2.26 percent of gross domestic product (GDP).

"In the 1980s it used to be around three percent of GDP but since 1987 the budget has hovered a little above two percent," Jasjit Singh, director of the state-funded Institute of Defence

Studies and Analyses, told Reuters.

Finance Minister P. Chidambaram will unveil the budget for fiscal 1997/98 (April-March) on Friday, including allocations for the armed forces.

"Everyone knows, and no one better than the army, that the money has not been coming forth to modernise ageing weaponry," Jasjit Singh said. "The navy recently retired an aircraft carrier and will lose another one in three or four years. The navy badly needs new submarines too."

He said the Indian Air Force was losing an average of 24 aircraft annually in crashes, and needed a complement of at least 350 combat planes in the next 10 years.

According to Defence Ministry sources India now has 22 squadrons of some 440 ground attack aircraft and 20 squadrons of 375 interceptor fighter planes.

The army was coping with old Soviet-supplied tanks and needed new 155-mm field guns.

"Where is all the money going to come from?" Jasjit Singh asked. "The nuclear option looks even more compelling under the circumstances, at least until the conventional forces can be beefed up."

"It is beyond the pale of the United Front government to adequately answer the challenges of today's defence budget-making," said former finance minister Jaswant Singh.

Jaswant Singh's rightwing Hindu nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) is regarded as hawkish on India's defence preparedness and advocates the development of nuclear weapons, which New Delhi says it can build but does not want to for now.

India, which exploded a nuclear device in 1974, says its nuclear programme is peaceful.

Jaswant Singh's views on Prime Minister H.D. Deve Gowda's United Front coalition were echoed by defence ministry officials.

They criticised Deve Gowda for providing hefty subsidies to farmers at the expense of what they said were more important needs of the military.

They said India's quest for improved relations with China and Pakistan should not be at the expense of the defence force.

China, with whom India fought a brief border war in 1962, is one of the world's five declared nuclear weapons states.

India's military budget is keenly watched by neighbouring Pakistan. The neighbours have fought three wars since independence from British rule in 1947.

Indian officials say Pakistan has developed nuclear weapons, a claim backed by U.S. intelligence reports. Islamabad denies it has a nuclear weapons programme.

Chidambaram last year raised the budget outlay on defence to 277.98 billion rupees (\$7.7 billion) from 268.79 billion.

Jasjit Singh said he expected Chidambaram to raise the budget outlay by about 16 percent over last year's planned expenditure to keep this year's allocation at par with last year's.

"If you take into account inflation and GDP growth, that's the least we would expect," he said.

REU

APO 02/26 0832 Rivals To Build Subs Together

NEWPORT NEWS, Va. (AP) -- The nation's two submarine makers -- Newport News Shipbuilding and General Dynamics' Electric Boat Corp. -- agreed to work together to build the Navy's next generation of nuclear submarines.

At the urging of the Navy, each shipyard will build parts of four submarines. Each shipyard originally was scheduled to build two submarines.

Electric Boat, in Groton, Conn., will continue its role as lead design yard for the new attack submarines.

"This is a forward-looking approach to the challenges of post-Cold War shipbuilding," John Welch, president of Electric Boat, a division of General Dynamics Corp., said Tuesday when the agreement was announced.

Each submarine is expected to cost \$1.5 billion to build.

Electric Boat originally had hoped to build all of the new submarines.

However, last year Congress mandated that Newport News be allowed to compete with Electric Boat for construction contracts.

Electric Boat will assemble, test and deliver the first and third submarines, while Newport News shipyard will deliver the second and fourth submarines.

Electric Boat will build the engine room and the command and control portions of the subs. Newport News will build the living quarters, the top-side sail that houses the periscope and the auxiliary machinery rooms.

APO 02/25 1829 Clinton Pushes for Pena Vote

By RON FOURNIER
Associated Press Writer

WASHINGTON (AP) -- Trying to break the logjam over President Clinton's nomination for energy secretary, chief of staff Erskine Bowles and Sen. Frank Murkowski met at the White House Tuesday, with no immediate resolution to the standoff.

A Senate Energy Committee vote on Federico Pena's confirmation has been delayed while the panel battles the White House over a proposed interim storage site for nuclear waste in Nevada.

The administration is opposed to temporarily storing the waste.

Bowles met with the Murkowski, R-Alaska, trying to ease the senator's concerns with the administration's position -- or at least separate Pena's confirmation vote from the waste dispute. Murkowski chairs the Energy panel.

Aides close to the senator and Bowles said there was no immediate breakthrough, though both men expected to talk again. The meeting took place one day after the Energy panel postponed for a second time a vote on Pena's confirmation.

"I don't know that any views were changed, but it was a good opportunity for us to hear the senator's thinking on the issue,

for perhaps the senator to hear a little more about administration policy on the matter," presidential spokesman secretary Mike McCurry said.

White House aides and an official close to the committee said they expect the nomination will eventually be put to a vote. The White House believes the former transportation secretary will be easily confirmed once a vote is taken. . . .

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005
Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 Fax: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>
From kgrossman@hamptons.com Wed Feb 26 14:49:09 1997
Date: Wed, 26 Feb 1997 08:24:27 -0800 (PST)
From: Karl Grossman <kgrossman@hamptons.com>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

For further info call:
Bruce Gagnon (352) 468-3295 <fcpj@afn.org>
Bill Sulzman (719) 389-0644 <lwirbel@aol.com>
Karl Grossman (516) 725-2858

<kgrossman@hamptons.com>
(In U.K.) Anna Rehin 01273 476358 or 0171 700 2349

MEETINGS, PRESS CONFERENCES IN EUROPE TO CHALLENGE
CASSINI SPACE MISSION WITH RECORD AMOUNT OF PLUTONIUM

Events in United Kingdom, Germany, Netherlands, Belgium

Citizens for Peace and Space and the Global Network Against Weapons & Nuclear Power In Space will be holding a series of meetings and press conferences in Europe for a 10-day period between Saturday, March 15 and Monday, March 24 to challenge U.S. plans to launch the Cassini space probe this October with 72.3 pounds of deadly plutonium -- more plutonium than has ever been used on a space device.

A press conference in London is set for 6 p.m. Tuesday evening, March 18 at Conway Hall on Red Lion Square (near the Holborn Tube). (Individual interviews can be arranged for media who cannot attend the press conference by reaching the telephone numbers or the E-mail addresses above.)

There will be a public presentation after the press conference with speakers including Bruce Gagnon, co-coordinator of the Global Network, and Professor Karl Grossman whose book on the use of nuclear power and weapons in space, *The Wrong Stuff*, is soon to be published and whose journalism on

the issue is being cited by Project Censored, a U.S. media monitoring program, as involving the most "under-reported" story in the U.S. in 1996.

In October, NASA plans to launch the Cassini space probe with 72.3 pounds of plutonium. Not only could there be a disastrous accident on launch releasing plutonium, NASA admits. But then it intends to have the Cassini probe hurtle back at the Earth for a low-level (500 km-high) "flyby," what it calls a "slingshot maneuver" to give it the velocity to get to Saturn.

But, says NASA in its Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Cassini mission, if the Cassini probe makes an "inadvertent reentry" into the Earth's atmosphere on the "flyby" and disintegrates dispersing the plutonium, "5 billion of the estimated 7 to 8 billion world population at the time...could receive 99 percent or more of the radiation exposure."

Dr. Ernest Sternglass, professor emeritus of radiological physics at the University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, says that based on NASA's data, 10 to 40 million people could die from exposure to radioactivity from plutonium in the event of such a Cassini disaster.

The NASA Final Environmental Impact Statement actually provides, in the event of a catastrophic Cassini accident, for a "ban" on "future agricultural land uses" and if an "urban" area is involved provision is made to: "Relocate affected population permanently."

Moreover, the plutonium and the lethal danger it poses are unnecessary, stresses the Global Network. The European Space Agency has achieved what it termed a "technology milestone," a "breakthrough" in the development of solar photovoltaic power for deep space probes. "We demand safe solar power be substituted for life-threatening nuclear power on Cassini and other space missions," says Gagnon.

Also, NASA and the U.S. Department of Energy have entered into a "Space Nuclear Power Agreement," said Professor Grossman, providing that if an accident befalls a U.S. nuclear space system like that to be on Cassini and impacts on other nations and people on Earth, the U.S. liability would be limited to a total of \$100 million -- "no matter how many people might end up with cancer, how many nations are exposed to radioactivity," he said.

Further, the Cassini mission is part of a wider U.S. program of nuclear power in space -- with nuclear technology seen by the U.S. as a power source for space weapons, stresses Global Network Co-Coordinator Bill Sulzman and director of Citizens for Peace in Space.

Recently, the Clinton administration ordered the development of nuclear-propelled rockets for military and civilian uses, he noted. And the U.S. Air Force last year issued a report, New World Vistas, Air and Space Power for the 21st Century, that declared that "space-based weapons" need "large amounts of power" and thus the Air Force "should continue" developing nuclear power in space. "We don't want weapons, we don't want nuclear power in space," said Sulzman. "The motto of the U.S. Space Command is 'master of space.' The Pentagon seeks to attain what it terms the 'ultimate high ground' and with space weapons 'control' the Earth below. This is unacceptable to the U.S. people. It is unacceptable to the people of the world."

Among the Global Network events during the 10 days in Europe will be:

- * A two-day conference in Darmstadt, Germany Thursday, March 20 and Friday, March 21 held with support of the Germany-based Campaign Against the Use of Plutonium in Space. (For further info call Martin Koppold at 49-71-12255 for info on this.)

- * Meetings throughout the U.K. including presentations in Leeds and Otley, along with the London event, with support of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, the Menwith Hill Women's Peace Camp and other peace and anti-nuclear groups.

- * A press conference with the World Information Service on Energy on Saturday, March 15 in Amsterdam, The Netherlands. (Call Peer de Rijk at WISE at +31-20-612 6368 for info.)

- * A press conference in Brussels, Belgium Wednesday, March 19 with the organization For Mother Earth and meetings Monday, March 24. (Call Tom Keunen at +32 +9 233 49 24 for further info on press conference.)

The fiery descent of the Russian Mars space probe with a half-pound

of plutonium onboard November 16 on Chile and Bolivia made "real and imaginable" to the people of the world an accident involving a nuclear-fueled space device," said Gagnon, also coordinator of the Florida Coalition for Peace and Justice. "Now NASA this October 6 wants to launch a space device with 150 times that amount of plutonium. This," said Gagnon, "is sheer and utter madness -- and we will stop it."

From kgrossman@hamptons.com Wed Feb 26 14:49:09 1997
Date: Wed, 26 Feb 1997 08:20:30 -0800 (PST)
From: Karl Grossman <kgrossman@hamptons.com>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

For further info call:

Bruce Gagnon (352) 468-3295 <fcpj@afn.org>
Bill Sulzman (719) 389-0644 <lwirbel@aol.com>
Karl Grossman (516) 725-2858

<kgrossman@hamptons.com>

(In U.K.) Anna Rehin 01273 476358 or 0171 700 2349

MEETINGS, PRESS CONFERENCES IN EUROPE TO CHALLENGE
CASSINI SPACE MISSION WITH RECORD AMOUNT OF PLUTONIUM

in United Kingdom, Germany, Netherlands, Belgium

Citizens for Peace and Space and the Global Network Against Weapons & Nuclear Power In Space will be holding a series of meetings and press conferences in Europe for a 10-day period between Saturday, March 15 and Monday, March 24 to challenge U.S. plans to launch the Cassini space probe this October with 72.3 pounds of deadly plutonium -- more plutonium than has ever been used on a space device.

A press conference in London is set for 6 p.m. Tuesday evening, March 18 at Conway Hall on Red Lion Square (near the Holborn Tube). (Individual interviews can be arranged for media who cannot attend the press conference by reaching the telephone numbers or the E-mail addresses above.)

There will be a public presentation after the press conference with speakers including Bruce Gagnon, co-coordinator of the Global Network, and Professor Karl Grossman whose book on the use of nuclear power and weapons in space, *The Wrong Stuff*, is soon to be published and whose journalism on the issue is being cited by Project Censored, a U.S. media monitoring

program, as involving the most "under-reported" story in the U.S. in 1996.

In October, NASA plans to launch the Cassini space probe with 72.3 pounds of plutonium. Not only could there be a disastrous accident on launch releasing plutonium, NASA admits. But then it intends to have the Cassini probe hurtle back at the Earth for a low-level (500 km-high) "flyby," what it calls a "slingshot maneuver" to give it the velocity to get to Saturn.

But, says NASA in its Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Cassini mission, if the Cassini probe makes an "inadvertent reentry" into the Earth's atmosphere on the "flyby" and disintegrates dispersing the plutonium, "5 billion of the estimated 7 to 8 billion world population at the time...could receive 99 percent or more of the radiation exposure."

Dr. Ernest Sternglass, professor emeritus of radiological physics at the University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, says that based on NASA's data, 10 to 40 million people could die from exposure to radioactivity from plutonium in the event of such a Cassini disaster.

The NASA Final Environmental Impact Statement actually provides, in the event of a catastrophic Cassini accident, for a "ban" on "future agricultural land uses" and if an "urban" area is involved provision is made to: "Relocate affected population permanently."

Moreover, the plutonium and the lethal danger it poses are unnecessary, stresses the Global Network. The European Space Agency has achieved what it termed a "technology milestone," a "breakthrough" in the development of solar photovoltaic power for deep space probes. "We demand safe solar power be substituted for life-threatening nuclear power on Cassini and other space missions," says Gagnon.

Also, NASA and the U.S. Department of Energy have entered into a "Space Nuclear Power Agreement," said Professor Grossman, providing that if an accident befalls a U.S. nuclear space system like that to be on Cassini and impacts on other nations and people on Earth, the U.S. liability would be limited to a total of \$100 million -- "no matter how many people might end up with cancer, how many nations are exposed to radioactivity," he said.

Further, the Cassini mission is part of a wider U.S. program of nuclear power in space -- with nuclear technology seen by the U.S. as a power source for space weapons, stresses Global Network Co-Coordinator Bill Sulzman and director of Citizens for Peace in Space.

Recently, the Clinton administration ordered the development of nuclear-propelled rockets for military and civilian uses, he noted. And the U.S. Air Force last year issued a report, New World Vistas, Air and Space Power for the 21st Century, that declared that "space-based weapons" need "large amounts of power" and thus the Air Force "should continue" developing nuclear power in space. "We don't want weapons, we don't want nuclear power in space," said Sulzman. "The motto of the U.S. Space Command is 'master of space.' The Pentagon seeks to attain what it terms the 'ultimate high ground' and with space weapons 'control' the Earth below. This is unacceptable to the U.S. people. It is unacceptable to the people of the world."

Among the Global Network events during the 10 days in Europe will be:

- * A two-day conference in Darmstadt, Germany Thursday, March 20 and Friday, March 21 held with support of the Germany-based Campaign Against the Use of Plutonium in Space. (For further info call Martin Koppold at 49-71-12255 for info on this.)

- * Meetings throughout the U.K. including presentations in Leeds and Otley, along with the London event, with support of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, the Menwith Hill Women's Peace Camp and other peace and anti-nuclear groups.

- * A press conference with the World Information Service on Energy on Saturday, March 15 in Amsterdam, The Netherlands. (Call Peer de Rijk at WISE at +31-20-612 6368 for info.)

- * A press conference in Brussels, Belgium Wednesday, March 19 with the organization For Mother Earth and meetings Monday, March 24. (Call Tom Keunen at +32 +9 233 49 24 for further info on press conference.)

The fiery descent of the Russian Mars space probe with a half-pound of plutonium onboard November 16 on Chile and Bolivia made "real and

imaginable" to the people of the world an accident involving a nuclear-fueled space device," said Gagnon, also coordinator of the Florida Coalition for Peace and Justice. "Now NASA this October 6 wants to launch a space device with 150 times that amount of plutonium. This," said Gagnon, "is sheer and utter madness -- and we will stop it."

From disarmament@igc.org Thu Feb 27 04:56:02 1997
Date: Wed, 26 Feb 1997 14:23:49 -0800 (PST)
From: disarmament@igc.org
To: ctb-followers@igc.org
Subject: Whining, Warning, Slamming, Hurling

RTos 02/26 1650 Yeltsin Tells Defense Minister to Stop Whining
MOSCOW (Reuter) - Russian President Boris Yeltsin ordered his defense minister Wednesday to stop "whining" and get down to military reforms, fueling speculation that he will fire him in a government reshuffle.

Yeltsin, asserting his authority following heart surgery and a bout of pneumonia, criticized the government Monday and Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin responded by saying he was planning a reshuffle early next month.

A liberal newspaper said Chernomyrdin's own job was on the line. The heat was also on Defense Minister Igor Rodionov over a series of unrestrained appeals for more defense spending and a bitter outburst against a Yeltsin defense aide Sunday.

"The President of the Russian Federation does not approve of remarks made by the defense minister on February 23," said a Kremlin statement, read to reporters in the Kremlin by presidential press secretary Sergei Yastrzhembsky.

"The president knows how difficult it is now for the people in epaulettes. But whining will not help matters, concrete actions are needed."

Rodionov said Sunday that Yuri Baturin, a loyal Yeltsin aide and secretary of the advisory Defense Council, was misleading the public by playing down the army's problems.

The Kremlin statement said Rodionov and Baturin should map out military reforms together. "Only military reform can radically improve the situation," is said.

The army, once a source of Moscow's former status as a superpower is now underfunded, demoralized and delapidated.

Rodionov has questioned the reliability of its nuclear weapons command system and cautioned that the situation in the armed forces could become "uncontrollable."

But reforms have barely got off the ground and a blueprint for change has still not been agreed on. Baturin says reforms should be based on the government's spending plans but Rodionov says the government must provide more funding.

The liberal newspaper Izvestia predicted that Rodionov would be dismissed.

But military experts said Yeltsin could opt to keep on both Baturin and Rodionov because firing the defense minister would mean another destabilizing shake-up of the military top brass less than a year after he was appointed.

These experts doubt the army would stage a mutiny but say more upheaval in its ranks could further delay reform.

Izvestia said Chernomyrdin could also be a scapegoat over his unpopular government's failure to pay pensions and wages in the state sector, in some cases for several months.

Asked to comment on the rumors over the reshuffle, Yastrzhembsky said he did not know who might go.

"I have no information confirming that any dismissal is planned of anyone occupying an important post in the government," he said. "I think best of all would be to be patient and wait."

Chernomyrdin, 58, is viewed in financial circles and abroad as a guarantor of Russia's economic reform course. He has also proved a loyal ally for Yeltsin and is an obvious candidate for the president to groom as an eventual successor.

Yeltsin, 66, has not said who might be fired. His actions appear designed to show he is now firmly in charge following the heart problems and then pneumonia which kept him out of the Krmelin for most of the last eight months.

Yeltsin approved the 1997 budget Wednesday, another action underlining his comeback. Passing the budget opens the door to the International Monetary Fund agreeing to a 1997 economic program with Russia under a \$10 billion three-year loan.

PA 02/26 1840 MINISTER WARNS ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS REDUCTIONS CALLS

By Andrew Evans, Lords Staff, PA News

The Government warned tonight that it would be "foolhardy" to reduce nuclear defences amid fears of worldwide instability.

Foreign Office Minister of State Baroness Chalker was urged by Tory former Cabinet Minister Lord Tebbit to "remain mindful of the threat which comes from less stable powers possibly within Russia, in the Middle East, and of course in the rising power of China.

"It would seem inopportune to render ourselves defenceless when others are increasing their capacity for nuclear war."

Lady Chalker replied: "It's not simply the former Soviet Union to which one must be mindful. The Middle East remains an unstable area. There are those whom we believe to have a nuclear capacity there. There are also those in South Asia, let alone China herself."

The minister said the most effective way to achieve nuclear reductions was through the strategic arms reduction talks process and participants were still waiting for Russia to ratify START2. "I don't believe we will be going forward as fast as we would like."

Former Chief of the Defence Staff Field Marshal Lord Carver commented: "The world would be a much safer place if it was possible to persuade the nuclear weapons states, both declared and undeclared, that -- pending reductions -- they should remove all their nuclear weapons from alert status and separate the warheads from the delivery vehicles."

Lady Chalker replied: "What I doubt is that all the nuclear weapons-holding states would actually do that. For some, mainly the West, to reduce their defences at a time when others are not reducing theirs would be foolhardy."

RTw 02/26 1620 Senator slams delayed vote on energy nominee Pena

WASHINGTON, Feb 26 (Reuter) - U.S. Sen. Dale Bumpers, an Arkansas Democrat, on Wednesday said Senate Energy Committee Republicans should stop delaying a vote on the nomination of Federico Pena to be secretary of energy.

The committee has twice postponed the vote, which was first scheduled to take place on February 12.

"I am very worried (about the delay)," said Bumpers, the top Democrat on the energy committee.

Democrats say the committee chairman, Sen. Frank Murkowski from Alaska, is holding up Pena's nomination to force President Bill Clinton to reverse his opposition to building a temporary storage facility for spent fuel from nuclear power plants.

"It's...unfair to hold a perfectly good man hostage to a particular issue," Bumpers told reporters after speaking at an energy industry luncheon.

While denying that the two issues were linked, energy committee Republicans had scheduled votes on Pena and a nuclear waste storage bill at the same time, and put off both.

Bumpers said even if Clinton were forced to propose someone else to be energy secretary, "it is not going to be somebody who disagrees with the president on nuclear waste."

Murkowski met with White House Chief of Staff Erskine Bowles Tuesday to discuss the nuclear waste problem.

An energy committee spokesman said this week that Pena's confirmation was being held up partly because the panel was still checking information on him.

A Coast Guard employee raised questions about Pena's role in awarding some Transportation Department contracts, but Republicans have dropped their concerns about the contracts.

REUTER

RTw 02/26 1510 Anti-nuclear activists hurl egg at German minister

(Updates with activists throwing eggs, tomatoes, adds government statement due in 9th paragraph)

By Ralf Bode

LUECHOW, Germany, Feb 26 (Reuter) - Anti-nuclear activists hurled tomatoes and eggs at Environment Minister Angela Merkel on Wednesday after she said she could not call off a shipment of nuclear waste to a north German dump.

Hundreds of demonstrators waving placards reading "Piss off nuclear waste!" and "Merkel, life will punish those who come too late" scuffled with police as Merkel arrived in the northern town of Luechow.

Merkel met representatives of a local action group, the church, police and the local community, who all want an end to the transport of nuclear waste through the country.

Merkel said she took their concerns seriously, but activists said she had come too late and were angered by her refusal to call off the transport.

The anti-nuclear protest has heated up ahead of a shipment of nuclear waste due to arrive in the next week at the medium-term nuclear storage site at Gorleben, east of Hanover, a

favourite target of campaigners.

In recent weeks, suspected activists have sabotaged rail lines, smashed windows of public buildings in Hamburg and daubed walls with anti-nuclear slogans.

In a sign of widespread local opposition, hundreds of children have occupied school halls to stop them being used to house police drafted in to guard the shipment.

Last year more than 19,000 police and border guards joined the biggest security operation in German peacetime history to get a shipment to the plant and police and politicians fear a repeat of mass demonstrations.

Interior Minister Manfred Kanther is due to explain the government's position on the necessity of the transport of nuclear waste to the lower house of parliament on Thursday.

Merkel said there was no alternative to transporting nuclear waste to medium-term dumps like Gorleben and nothing to be gained from shipping it to other plants like La Hague in France or Sellafield in England.

"Sticking your head in the sand and saying 'to France!' is no solution," she said.

But the head of the German police union, Gerhard Vogler, said this kind of nuclear waste transport was "too dangerous, too expensive and possibly unnecessary."

He said that although it had not been proven, police guarding the shipment could still be affected by radiation.

The environmental group Greenpeace, which is planning protests against the shipment, said rail workers, police, demonstrators and journalists likely to come close to the waste could all be at risk from radiation.

"Merkel should investigate the dangers of the shipment rather than justifying her energy policies by talking to the citizens of Gorleben," Greenpeace nuclear expert Helmut Hirsch said in a statement. . . .

From: Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005

Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 Fax: 202 898 0172

<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

From worldpeace@gn.apc.org Thu Feb 27 04:56:02 1997

Date: Thu, 27 Feb 1997 00:36:04 GMT

From: Housmans Peace Resource Project <worldpeace@gn.apc.org>

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Subject: Are you on the World Peace Database?

26 February 1997

TO: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Dear friends on the abolition caucus mailing list:

I am the editor of the Housmans World Peace Database & Directory, which lists national and international peace groups worldwide (together with the major organisations in related fields such as environmental and human rights campaigning). You probably know of

it - the database includes around 2800 organisations in 150 countries.

I have just been looking at the list of organisations which have signed the Abolition 2000 statement. There are some with names suggesting they are significant national peace-related organisations which are not already on the World Peace Database.

Obviously, the more complete the database is, the more use it is to everyone in the peace movement who uses it. So, if you are a national or international organisation and you think you're not already included - please get in touch. (You will know if you are included, because your office will get a directory information update form sent to it each year ... even if you don't always remember to fill it in and send it back!)

If sending information, please include your organisation's name and postal address, together with phone, fax, and e-mail details - and basic information about what you do. Many thanks.

Also, if you're not already familiar with the World Peace Database and want more information about it, please ask.

PLEASE REPLY TO ME AT:

Housmans Peace Resource Project, 5 Caledonian Road, Kings Cross, London N1, UK (tel +44-171-278 4474; fax +44-171-278 0444; e-mail worldpeace@gn.apc.org).

Best wishes

Albert Beale

Editor, Housmans World Peace Database and Directory
From jparachini@stimson.org Thu Feb 27 04:56:02 1997
Date: Wed, 26 Feb 1997 22:30:08 -0500
From: John Parachini <jparachini@stimson.org>
To: "'mupj@igc.apc.org'" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Howard Hallman--Rev. Billy Graham

ACDA asked me whether we have any contacts with his part of the christian community. Since I have never been able to figure out what his part is, I could answer the question. What guidance can you render?

Regards,

John Parachini

From int@fme.knooppunt.be Thu Feb 27 04:56:02 1997
Date: Thu, 27 Feb 1997 02:17:03
From: Pol D'Huyvetter <int@fme.knooppunt.be>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Info on Ecorates for movement events (fwd)

International meetings more accessible with use of eco-rates

Dear abolitionists,

Last year we announced a For Mother Earth event and 'Chernobyl 10+ video' through abolition-caucus. Following our announcement some people informed with us about the 'eco-rate' which we mentioned as a way to contribute financially.

At all our events we use the eco-rate, which was initiated in the European ecological movement. It makes international activities more accessible to people from 'poorer' countries (i.e. Central and Eastern Europe). And it works!! People from i.e. Belarus who own on average less then 100 US dollars/month can join our events (i.e. seminars, walks, peace-camps, ...) or buy an interesting video.

We are aware it is not perfect system. It does for example not take into account class-differences within a country. But it does 'some' justice. It also could be further developed so one day it might also take into account North-South differences.

Today I received the introduction and more background info to the ECO-system from Roel van den Bosch from EYFA (European Youth for Action). EYFA has developed this system and works with it since many years.

Today I only forward the short introduction and the latest ECO rates.

If you wish the complete document, please ask me or Roel van den Bosch <gimmes@antenna.nl>.

I wish this system will inspire you and your organisation, so that a growing number of international meetings and gatherings may become accessible for more people.

As example you could calculate how much different people would pay

- * at the international peacecamp : they'll all pay 15 ECO/day
- * our Chernobyl 11+ video costs 25 ECO.

Good luck !!

Pol D'Huyvetter
For Mother Earth

FORWARDED MAIL -----

From: gimmes@antenna.nl
Date: 25 Feb 97

Originally To: Int@fme.knooppunt.be

Ecorates are a system to calculate the exchange rates between valuta in Europe and USA in a way which is fairer as the exchange rates which are used by the banks. The intention of the rates is to make/calculate the participation fees for events, organised by environmental organisations and others bearable for people from all European countries.

The Ecorates are published in the EYFA newsletter: the Verge. Several times a year they are updated. The normal updating process is that we start with asking all national coordinators to tell us the prices of a "basket" of products which are used on a camp like Ecotopia (EYFA's yearly environmental summer camp). The sum of the prices of this basket is about 15 DM in Germany and therefore 15 Eco's in every other country, as 1 DM = 1 ECO.

The basket normally consists of:
0.5 kilo of bread, 1 liter of milk, 1 kilo of potatoes, 0.5 liter of beer, 1 cheap meal in a restaurant, 1 coffee/tea in a cafe, 1 condom, 1 busride in town, 1 trainride over 100 km, 1 copy (a4), 1 stamp for a letter in Europe, 1 local telephone call (5 minutes). Some of the prices are divided by a factor.

ECORATES January 1997

Country	Currency	Bankrate	Ecorate	
Albania	Lek	67,6	20	29,59%
Austria	Schilling	7,035	7	99,50%
Belgium	Franc	20,62	21	101,84%
Belarus	Rubel	16969,1	1700	10,02%
Bosnia				10,00%
Bulgaria	Leva	471,19	24	5,09%
Croatia	Kuna	3,58	1	27,93%
Czech Republic	Crown Ck	16,98	5	29,45%
Denmark	Crown Dk	3,813	3,8	99,66%
Estonia	Crown Ek	8	3,3	41,25%
Finland	Mark	2,941	3	102,01%
France	Franc	3,373	3,4	100,80%
Germany	DM	1	1	100,00%
Greece	Drachme	155,7	130	83,49%
Hungary	Forint	103,31	32	30,97%
Ireland	Pound	0,38	0,35	92,11%
Italy	Lira	971,1	1000	102,98%
Latvia	Lat	0,35	0,07	20,00%
Lithuania	Litas	2,46	0,6	24,39%

Luxembourg	Franc	20,62	21	101,84%
Macedonia	Denar	26,69	8	29,97%
Netherlands	Gulden	1,123	1,12	99,73%
Norway	Crown Nok	3,985	4	100,38%
Poland	Zloty	1,82	0,65	35,71%
Portugal	Escudos	99,64	70	70,25%
Romania	Lei	3372,3	500	14,83%
Russia	Rubel	3456,7	700	20,25%
Slovakia	Crown Sk	19,88	5,5	27,67%
Slovenia	Tolar	90,88	45	49,52%
Spain	Peseta	83,59	70	83,74%
Sweden	Crown	4,36	4,5	103,21%
Switzerland	Swiss Franc	0,871	0,9	103,33%
Turkey	Lira	70094	23000	32,81%
Ukraine	Coupons	1,09	0,3	27,52%
United Kingdom	Pound	0,37	0,35	94,59%
US	Dollar	0,616	0,7	113,64%
Yugoslavia	Dinar	3,14	1	31,85%

Roel van den Bosch
Postbus 566, 6130 AN SITTARD, The Netherlands

From danfine@igc.org Thu Feb 27 04:56:02 1997
Date: Thu, 27 Feb 1997 00:21:13 -0600
From: Daniel Fine <danfine@igc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Pittsburgh City Council Resolution

Abolitionists: The text of the Pittsburgh, (PA, U.S.) Resolution calling for elimination of nuclear weapons by treaty concluded by 2000, was adopted here September 24, 1996, to coincide with the public rally in Pittsburgh Market Square, to mark the CTB signing as the first step to abolition. The wording is not perfect, not what we proposed, and was established by the sponsoring City Councilman. We consider it to support ABOLITION 2000 and use it to promote our grass roots campaign and other city council resolutions etc for ABOLITION 2000. We were gratified because it was the second abolition resolution passed by Pittsburgh (the first with Hiroshima 50th) and because it was one of the first in the U.S. Let's keep our eye on the prize and build the cumulative peoples demand to abolish nuclear weapons that cannot be resisted by our governments. Dan Fine, PSR-Pittsburgh and W PA Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons*****

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PITTSBURGH

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the advent of the nuclear age has brought with it a time of potential destruction to humankind that is greater than the world has ever known, and

WHEREAS, radioactive contamination caused by the production and testing of nuclear weapons has poisoned large areas of the earth and sea; and

WHEREAS, the U.S. expenditure of \$3.9 trillion for nuclear weapons over 5 decades, and the annual expenditure of over \$30 billion for nuclear arms, has contributed to record budget deficits, while essential community programs are being eliminated; and

WHEREAS, on Tuesday September 24, 1996, President Clinton, along with heads of state from France and the United Kingdom, is expected to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; and

WHEREAS, the completion of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty by the nuclear powers will provide the first steps toward permanently banning all nuclear test explosion world-wide, whether in earth, sea, atmosphere or space.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Council of the City of Pittsburgh commends President Clinton for signing tile Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty;; and

BE, IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Council of the City of Pittsburgh supports prompt ratification by the United States Senate of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Council of the City of Pittsburgh encourages all Pittsburghers to call on our government and all other nuclear weapon states to promptly initiate negotiation of a treaty to totally eliminate nuclear weapons by the year 2000.

ADOPTED, IN COUNCIL, SEPTEMBER 24, 1996

end end end*****

From 102464.1110@CompuServe.COMThu Feb 27 15:53:05 1997
Date: 27 Feb 97 07:44:21 EST
From: Dietrich Fischer <102464.1110@CompuServe.COM>
To: Daniel Fine <danfine@igc.org>
Cc: abolition-caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Pittsburgh City Council Resolution

Dear Dan,

 Congratulations on your good and successful work to help Pittsburgh pass a resolution calling for negotiations to abolish nuclear weapons! I hope other cities will follow. It is important to let city council members have an input in formulating resolutions, so that they "own" them. The exact wording is less important than winning overwhelming support for our ultimate goal, abolition. We certainly should not criticize people who agree with our goal, just for not using our own wording. That would only split and weaken our movement.

 With best regards, Dietrich Fischer, TRANSCEND

From wagingpeace@napf.org Fri Feb 28 05:40:14 1997
Date: Thu, 27 Feb 1997 14:37:35 -0800
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Resolution for College Campuses

We have modified the Abolition 2000 Resolution for Municipalities for use on college campuses. This resolution is aimed at U.S. college campuses, but by revising the last "Calls for" statement, it could be made applicable to campuses throughout the world. The General Butler quote could also be replaced by a quote from the statement on nuclear weapons by 58 international generals and admirals: "We have been presented with a challenge of the highest possible historic importance: the creation of a nuclear-weapons-free world. The end of the Cold War makes it possible. The dangers of proliferation, terrorism, and new nuclear arms race render it necessary."

We have an intern (Noey Turk) working on this project who can be reached at the Foundation's e-mail address. We would appreciate any help from abolition caucus members in promoting this resolution.

David Krieger

ABOLITION 2000 RESOLUTION FOR COLLEGE CAMPUSES

Whereas the billions of dollars spent on nuclear weapons each year could be reallocated to help fund educational programs and other social needs;

Whereas the research and development of nuclear weapons, which has involved many of our universities, fosters a culture of secrecy which is in direct opposition to the principles of democracy;

Whereas the intellectual resources currently devoted to the development and maintenance of our nuclear arsenals could be far more productively used for research into environmentally sound technologies;

Whereas the International Court of Justice ruled unanimously in July 1996,
"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";

Whereas retired U.S. General Lee Butler, once responsible for all U.S. strategic nuclear forces, has called nuclear weapons "inherently dangerous, hugely expensive, militarily inefficient, and morally indefensible";

Whereas the residual effects of nuclear warfare would have a lasting impact on present and future generations, posing a constant threat to the health and peace of mind of the world's citizens;

Whereas it is in the direct interest of young people to support the sustainability of life on this planet in order that they may have a healthy place to live in which to pursue their dreams and aspirations;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Student Council of _____:

Declares itself a Nuclear Weapon Free Zone and supports the further development of Nuclear Weapon Free Zones throughout the world;

Calls for all nuclear weapons to be taken off alert status, for all nuclear warheads to be separated from their delivery vehicles, and for the nuclear weapons states to agree to unconditional no first use of these weapons;

Calls upon the governments of all nuclear weapons states to begin negotiations immediately on a Nuclear Weapons Convention to prohibit and eliminate all nuclear weapons early in the next century, and to complete these negotiations by the year 2000;

Calls for copies of this resolution to be distributed among the student body, faculty, and administration, as well as local government leaders,

U.S. Representative(s), U.S. Senators, and the President.

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

Web Site: <http://www.napf.org>

From prop1@prop1.org Fri Feb 28 05:40:14 1997

Date: Fri, 28 Feb 1997 02:46:05 -0500 (EST)
From: peace through reason <prop1@prop1.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Success! Thanks for your help!

Dear friends,

On February 25, 1997, DC's Congresswoman, Eleanor Holmes Norton, re-introduced the Nuclear Disarmament and Economic Conversion Act as HR-827 (formerly HR-1647, and before that HR-3750). We'll forward her statement, which she says is in the mail.

Thanks for all you did to encourage her! Hope you'll put some pressure on your own congresspeople now. She's asked us for widespread, bipartisan support.

Ms. Norton's NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT / ECONOMIC CONVERSION ACT could also put more teeth in the Cities Resolution project. City Resolutions which contain statements supporting the Disarmament/Conversion Act would increase pressure to make the Bill the Law ... furthering the goal of the Abolition 2000 Founding Statement.

Ellen Thomas
Proposition One Committee
P.O. Box 272107, Washington DC 20038
202-462-0757
<http://prop1.org> -- prop1@prop1.org
From nfznscc@gn.apc.org Fri Feb 28 05:40:14 1997
Date: Fri, 28 Feb 1997 11:05:02 GMT
From: Stewart Kemp <nfznscc@gn.apc.org>
To: nfla.news@conf.gn.apc.org
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: UK Nuclear News 26-27 February 1997

>From: GMR@MCR1.poptel.org.uk
>Date: Thu, 27 Feb 1997 12:19:37 GMT
>Subject: NPU 27 Feb
>To: nfznscc@gn.apc.org
>
>DAILY INFORMATION BULLETIN - NUCLEAR POLICY
>
>Thurs 27 Feb 1997
>
>97-8211 MoD rules out compensation for victims of Gulf war illnesses:
> Soames admits misleading Commons but blames officials. All
>

>Weds 26 Feb 1997
>
>97-8202 Greenham Common free from radioactive contamination, says
> survey for district council: but scientists find
radioactivity
> round nearly Aldermaston AWE, and urge further tests.
G,Ind,DT
>97-8203 Russia sidesteps US export controls and obtains
supercomputer
> `to simulate n/tests': US fears machine could help Russia
> design new n/weapons. T
>97-8204 German n/activists plan attacks on rail network to draw
> attention to its use for transporting n/waste. T
>97-8205 Tests suggest that n/waste can be safely buried at sea.
T
>97-8206 Optimism growing that Russia will accept deal on Nato
> expansion. DT
>97-8207 MoD in bid to shift blame for misleading Commons over Gulf
war
> illnesses to civil servants and servicemen. G
>
>GM Research, Metropolitan House, Hobson Street, Oldham, OL1 1QD.
>Tel: 0161-911 4179. Fax: 0161-627 1736.
>Internet: gmr@mcr1.poptel.org.uk
>
>

Stewart Kemp (nfzns@gn.apc.org)

From aslater@igc.apc.org Sat Mar 1 06:02:50 1997
Date: Fri, 28 Feb 1997 07:42:01 -0800 (PST)
From: alice slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>
To: warpeace@interport.net, falvo@nymc.edu, myriamm@aol.com,
sfraser@igc.org,
cmtinnitus@aol.com, jklotz@ibm.net, wrl@igc.org,
paintl@igc.org,
metropeace@aol.com, worldfed@igc.org, crramey@igc.org,
wedo@igc.org,
psrnyc@igc.org, esrmetro@aol.com, disarmtimes@igc.org,
ptasso@pipeline.com, tovish@aol.com, lcnp@aol.com,
srfnyusa@igc.org,
kcantw9473@aol.com, jem@igc.org, johanne@c+converge.com,
gkarlsson@igc.org, peggy_kerry@pipeline.com, paz4juf@aol.com,
afscnatl@igc.org, nypaxchristi@igc.org, aslater@igc.org
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: NPT Working Group Minutes, February 28, 1997

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

ABOLITION 2000 NPT WORKING GROUP

MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 27, 1997

ATTENDING REPRESENTATIVES: Anne Marie Corominas (LCNP), Jane Miliken, Sonya Ostrom (Peace Action), Mary Ellen Singsen (Scarsdale Campaign for Peace through Common Security), Alice Slater, Chris Ho, Grace Lofar (GRACE), Roger Smith (NGO Committee on Disarmament), Hannah Wasserman (Peacelinks), Selma Brackman (War & Peace Foundation), Pauline Cantwell (Peace Action), Gail Karlsson (Metropolitan Solar Energy), John Klotz (Sierra Club), Doris Miller (Professionals Network for Social Responsibility/Psychologists for Social Responsibility), Melba Smith (United Methodist Office for the UN), Pam Ransom (Womens Environment and Development Organisation), Paula Tasso (Womens International League for Peace and Freedom), Cora Weiss (Peace Action/IPB)

AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:

1. HOUSING

Sonya reported that Pax Christi will offer accommodation (at least 2 places).

Hannah will call the Fellowship for Reconciliation and will put up signs at

the UN calling for accommodation

Pam will speak to Big Apple Greeters and will coordinate with Selma who will call Ruth Messinger for support

2. PARLIAMENTARIANS LETTER URGING ACTION ON NWC AT PREPCOMM

Selma will pass on a disk to John with the list of Abolition 2000 members to be contacted about the Parliamentarians for Global Action mailing to 90 parliamentarians seeking their support for a petition prepared by Senator Cranston for abolition and asking them to enlist their governments, when attending the NPT PrepComm, to require the nuclear powers to begin negotiations for a NWC in 1997 and to implement the Canberra recommendations in 1997. Alice will meet with John about what is to be sent out to Abolition 2000 organizations to follow-up on the mailing to the Parliamentarians in their individual countries.

3. PANELS

Roger reported on a new panel, The Nuclear Fuel Cycle in a Nuclear Weapons Free World, to be held Thursday April 10, 5-7pm at the UN Library Auditorium with Zia Mian, Arjun Makhijani, Paul Leventhal.

Cora is coordinating the NATO meeting, NATO & Nuclear Weapons: Expansion or Abolition? to be held Sat, April 12. She needs to confirm a room on the second floor of the Church Center. The Co chairs are Cora and David Cortwright. The speakers are Solange Fermex, Gene Carroll, Sharon Riddle, Doug Roche. Everyone will be on the lookout for a Russian/East European NGO speaker to discuss NATO issues. Pauline will call Greenpeace Washington, Selma will also contact a Chernobyl group who may be able to suggest a Russian speaker. Anyone wanting to investigate other possibilities will report back to Cora.

The Chair of the World Federalist Movement has called a meeting following this event, to discuss strategies for the peace movement and NPT organizations to work on the NATO issue. Admiral Gene Carroll also wants to call a strategy meeting at this time with David Cortwright.

Abolition workshops will follow the NATO meeting, 2.30-4pm; the building closes at 4pm. We will order in box lunches after the NATO panel and will

collect for the cost of the lunch.

A save the date announcement will be posted:

Selma and Sonya will mail out to Peace Action and others on the NGO list

Paula will publicize the event at the WILPF meeting for Int. Womens Day,

March 8

Doris will publicize the event on her calendar

Other panels on (1)Health and Waste, (2) NWC convention, (3)CSD/A2000 Energy, (4)Beyond the CTB will also be publicized.

Health and Waste Panel: Pam and Alice will discuss speakers. Helen Caldicott and Bella Abzug were suggested speakers. Cathy Falvo of PSR was

to contact Pamela Meidell and report back on possible speakers from Abolition 2000 Health Working Group. Paula would give Alice Evelyn Moss

number from PSR. Gabriel Tetiahari from Tahiti will have a medical study to

report on and Tricia from Hanford are possible speakers as well.

On waste

issues, Mary Olson or Michael Marriott of NIRS, were also suggested.

Cora reported that the UNA was doing a speaking tour with an IAEA representative and that it was difficult to find a speaker for our side who

was fully informed on both nuclear power and nuclear weapons issues.

Alice

suggested Arjun Makhijani.

4. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT REPORT

Gail reported that an NGO speaker was needed for the IAEA meeting on the

9th. She will suggest Mary Olson from NIRS. Gail is exploring speakers for

the joint CSD/2000 alternate energy panel on April 8th. She will contact

Amory Lovins for his participation and for suggestions.

Pauline reported back from the meeting of Review of Rio +5. She succeeded

in having a peace page inserted into the series of NGO position statements.

5. NEW YORK TIMES AD

Selma will distribute a sample ad to the working group concerning US control

over the UN, perhaps to be published in the NY Times.

6. DISPLAYS AT THE UN

Hannah will follow up on creating displays in the entrance areas such as one

for Tools of Disarmament, suggested by John Burroughs. (ie, World Court Decision, Malaysian Resolution, Statements of the Generals, Canberra Recommendations, etc.) The artists community was to be contacted for ideas by Bobby Linfield.

7. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ambassador Hasmy will speak about the NPT at our next steering committee meeting, March 6th, 9.30am. Paula will contact the Finnish Ambassador about a spokesperson for a future meeting.

Bill Epstein, from Disarmament Times will give an NPT overview at noon on the same day, at the Church Center.

Jonathan Dean, Former Ambassador, Adviser on Arms Control and International Security, speaking on Chemical and Nuclear Weapons Bans: Hope or Impasse? Sun, March 16th, 2pm, at Will Library, 1500 Central Park Ave, Yonkers, NY. Tel. 337-1500

Conference on the Anniversary of the Catastrophe at Chernobyl, Sat April 26th, 10am-1pm, at Association of the Bar of the City of New York, 42 W 44th St. Call Babette Linfield, PNSR, 212-382-1331

8. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will take place at 9am on March 6th, at the Church Center, 777 UN Plaza. It will be listed as the NPT meeting on the notice board.

Anne Marie Corominas will facilitate. Ambassador Hamsy of Malaysia will speak. PLEASE BE ON TIME AT 9AM.

From acronym@gn.apc.org Sat Mar 1 06:02:50 1997

Date: Fri, 28 Feb 1997 18:29:43 GMT

From: Rebecca Johnson <acronym@gn.apc.org>

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Subject: CD report part 2

It appears that the abolition caucus server did not transmit this report, sent out on February 4, because it was too long for it. I apologise to all of you, and will send it in two parts. Best wishes, rebecca

to DISARMAMENT INTELLIGENCE RECEIVERS
1997 DisInt Report # 1 part 2

February 4, 1997

LANDMINES

US calls for CD negotiations

While Canada presented a report on the Ottawa Process to ban landmines by the end of 1997, the United States kicked off the year with a statement from the White House calling on the CD to 'initiate negotiations on a worldwide treaty banning the use, production, stockpiling and transfer of anti-personnel landmines.' This followed the overwhelming vote in favour of such a ban by 155 countries in the United Nations General Assembly in December 1996, with no votes against and only 10 abstentions (UNGA resolution 51/45 S). The resolution did not specify venue, since some states favoured setting up a separate Conference, as initiated in Ottawa, while others preferred negotiations in the CD. The White House said that 'after extensive consultations with many countries', President Clinton had decided that the CD offered 'the most practical and effective forum for achieving our aim of a ban that is global.'

The US announcement took many by surprise. Some, such as the United Kingdom and France, gave immediate support, while others stepped back to consider the implications. Canada, Austria and Belgium had already taken the lead in an alternative 'fast-track' approach, while others, such as Mexico, had made their opposition to the CD as the venue for landmines negotiations abundantly clear in the United Nations. One group, including Russia, China, Cuba, Pakistan, Syria, Israel, South and North Korea, Turkey and Belarus, who all abstained on the UNGA resolution, are not yet convinced of the need for a total ban on AP mines. These countries had joined consensus in the UN General Assembly in support of strengthening the CCW. They considered that before a ban could be addressed, attention should be paid to making the CCW universal and for full implementation of the new Protocol II, agreed as part of the Review Process to the 1980 treaty. Protocol II expands the scope of the CCW to include internal armed conflicts. It also

requires that mines should be detectable, to facilitate mine clearance and that all remotely delivered AP mines are equipped with self-destruct or self-neutralising features. Mines not equipped with this technology would have to be confined to marked and monitored areas.

While Protocol II may be an improvement on the original scope, it is a long way from a total landmines ban, as called for in the UNGA resolution. Since a landmines ban has been so firmly put in the spotlight, the Hobson's choice for those who are reluctant is between the Ottawa process, which is not legally binding on them and which they could boycott; or the CD process, in which their participation as members would be assumed if a mandate were adopted, but over which they could exercise some power, such as slowing down the pace or blocking consensus. While a number of states welcomed the US initiative, a significant number were anxious (for diametrically opposed reasons) that negotiations in the CD could cut across initiatives already under way, either slowing down or speeding up accomplishment of a total global ban.

Canada had sponsored a meeting in Ottawa, October 3-5, which brought together 50 pro-ban governments and 24 observer states. The Ottawa Conference initiated a process aimed at achieving a treaty banning the production, export and stockpiling of AP mines by December 1997. Although there had been growing talk in 1995-6 of putting landmines on the CD agenda, commencement of the Ottawa process had seemed to satisfy many advocates of a ban that the issue would be addressed with the seriousness and urgency it required. However, Russia and China, which are two of the most significant mine producers, had refused to participate in the Ottawa process. Officials from the US, Australia and others had voiced their concerns at the time of the debate in the UN First Committee in November 1996, that the absence of key countries from the process for negotiating a landmines ban was an

undesirable consequence of the Ottawa process and could result in an agreement just among the 'virtuous'. The US announcement concluded weeks of inter-agency discussion in Washington, which reportedly focused particularly how to bring Russia, China and the other abstaining countries on board.

France and UK back US initiative

On January 23, Ambassador Joelle Bourgois said that France endorsed President Clinton's call for a landmines ban to be negotiated in the CD.

She said that following its decisions to stop exporting and producing AP

mines, announced in 1993 and 1995 respectively, France had decided on

October 2, 1996, to renounce their use, except in the case of

'extreme

circumstances of necessity for the security of [France's] forces, and only

with the express authorisation of the government.' She reminded delegates

that the European Union had adopted a 'Joint Action' on AP mines on October

1, 1996. France advocated a phased approach towards a step by step agreement, said Bourgois, noting the need to overcome four types of

difficulties: i) that some regarded mines as a humanitarian problem, focusing on opposition to their indiscriminate use; ii) concern that the CD

could not cope with two negotiations in parallel; iii) the view that

implementing Protocol II and universalising the CCW should be accomplished

first; and concern that negotiations in the CD would clash with an alternative, faster approach.

Bourgois argued that because mines were a weapon with a legitimate role in

defence, banning them was an issue of disarmament, negotiations for which

would have to take into account local and regional issues. Pointing to the

fact that Geneva delegations had concurrently negotiated the CTBT and

Protocol II of the CCW, she dismissed the second concern. On the third, she

argued that though universalising and implementing the CCW, especially

Protocol II, was an estimable objective in its own right, the UN General

Assembly had desired to go much further, to achieve a total ban. France's

view with regard to the final difficulty was that it was better to get an effective treaty, even if it took a long time, than to conclude a quick agreement that proved useless. Therefore, France advocated establishing an ad hoc committee on anti-personnel mines as part of a step-by-step approach.

On January 30, Australia's foreign minister, Alexander Downer, endorsed the US approach, arguing that 'only the Conference on Disarmament... has the expertise, the experience and the standing' to deliver an effective landmines ban. He was succeeded by Britain's Ambassador, Sir Michael Weston, who upped the ante by tabling a mandate for a CD ad hoc committee to negotiate a landmines ban. Welcoming the US initiative and fully endorsing the points made by France the previous week, Weston said that 'the reckless and indiscriminate use of [AP mines] causes appalling and quite pointless suffering'. Arguing that the CD had 'clear advantages as an international forum for tackling the roots of this problem and achieving agreement on a worldwide ban', Weston said that 'an international agreement must include the countries of real concern: the major producers and exporters and those countries which use landmines indiscriminately.'

Britain's draft mandate built on the UNGA resolution 51/45 S, making clear that the ultimate objective was a total ban. However, it proposed as a 'vital first step' that the CD should first negotiate a ban on the export and transfer of mines. In a noted twist from the UK position regarding target dates for nuclear disarmament measures, Weston said that though 'the United Kingdom is always hesitant about setting deadlines or even target dates...we do believe that it should be possible to complete the first step -- that is, the ban on exports -- and identify the next steps on the road to a total and universal ban by the end of the current CD session in September.'

The mandate proposed by the UK is as follows:

=====

" The Conference on Disarmament decides to establish an ad hoc Committee under item [X] of its agenda on a 'Ban on Anti-Personnel Landmines' to negotiate, for conclusion at the earliest possible date, a universal, effectively verifiable and legally binding international agreement to ban the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel landmines.

As a vital first step the Conference directs the ad hoc Committee to negotiate intensively a universal, effectively verifiable and legally-binding international agreement to ban totally the export, import or transfer of all anti-personnel landmines, as well as of their components and of anti-personnel landmine technology.

The Conference further directs the ad hoc Committee to consider and make recommendations on the further steps necessary to achieve the goal of a universal, effectively verifiable and legally binding international agreement to ban totally the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel landmines.

Pursuant to its mandate, the ad hoc Committee will take into account the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects, in particular the amended Protocol II, as well as all relevant existing proposals and future initiatives.

The Conference requests the ad hoc Committee to report to the Conference on Disarmament on the progress of its work before the conclusion of the 1997 session."

=====

Ambassador Hisami Kurokochi of Japan welcomed the US announcement and endorsed the British-French view of a phased approach, beginning with a ban on exports, noting that 'virtually all of the landmines in most of the worst affected nations were provided by foreign sources'. She said Japan supported negotiations in the CD but regarded both the CD and the Ottawa process as 'complementary and not mutually exclusive approaches'

to achieving a ban. Kurokochi also argued the necessity for strengthening international restrictions on landmines, cooperating in mine clearance and the development of technologies for clearance and detection, and providing assistance for the victims of mines.

Twin track with Ottawa

Others echoed Japan's view that the CD and Ottawa could proceed on parallel

tracks, although not everyone seemed fully convinced. Speaking on January

21, Canadian Ambassador Mark Moher did not explicitly oppose taking landmines up in the CD, but argued that 'if the CD is to deal with this

problem, it should move quickly, with clarity of purpose and determination.'

He presented a report on the Ottawa Process, providing a summary of progress

on negotiating a text and also on regional and international initiatives to

build political support for the proposed AP Mine Ban. In particular, it was

noted that Austria would be hosting an expert meeting in February 1997 to

develop a treaty text, which would be followed by a meeting to review progress towards a ban, to be held in Brussels in June. As well as regional

meetings of experts in the security and humanitarian areas, Japan was

hosting a conference in Tokyo on demining and assistance to mine victims on

March 6-7 and the International Campaign to Ban Landmines would hold its

Fourth annual Conference in Mozambique on February 25-28.

Austria's representative in the CD, Ambassador Harald Kreid, followed two

days later with an update on the Vienna meeting, scheduled February 12-14.

Characterising the progress in the Review process of the CCW as 'very limited', Kreid said that 'Austria sees the urgent need for a separate effective legally-binding international agreement to ban the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel landmines.'

Indirectly addressing the US initiative for negotiations in the CD, Kreid

said that the Vienna meeting would neither discuss nor prejudge the question

of form and forum for the landmines ban. However, in an unmistakable sideswipe, he emphasised that the urgency 'that means life or death or being

maimed for 25,000 people a year, does not allow us to sit with crossed

arms

until every organizational and procedural detail for future negotiations is hammered out.'

Declaring that Germany had unconditionally renounced the use of AP mines in

April 1996, Ambassador Wolfgang Hoffmann congratulated the Canadian government on its initiative, but also said that the CD 'should be made

fully use of' in concluding a total ban on AP mines. Advocating that the CD

should immediately start 'substantial negotiations' on both the fissban and

an AP mine ban, Hoffmann warned that any failure by the CD to reach agreement on banning landmines 'would not only disappoint the international

community... it could also raise questions about the [CD's] effectiveness...and put its future role at risk by emerging alternative

procedures.'

Belgium's new Ambassador, Carl Peters, spoke of the 'broad consensus' on a

global ban on AP mines, which should be the clear objective, whichever route

was chosen. He said Belgium was actively involved in the Ottawa process but

could also 'go along' with the CD approach providing that both were seen to

be mutually supportive and not in conflict. Warning that work on one

process should not hamper progress within the other, he suggested that the

CD could complement the Ottawa process by developing a verification system.

Clear landmines first

A number of delegations from the G-21 group of non-aligned states addressed

the subject of landmines in their plenary presentations, although they

prioritised discussion of nuclear issues. Egypt's Ambassador Mounir Zahran

pointed out that his country was one of the most heavily mined in the world,

with about 23 million mines left over from the second world war. Saying

that the cost of clearing these mines should be borne by the 'foreign powers

which planted them', Zahran said that measures to curb landmines should be

accompanied by 'serious and concrete steps' towards mine clearance.

He

raised two main objections to negotiating a landmines ban in the CD: that national security concerns and self defence should be taken into account -- especially with regard to drug smuggling across borders; and that the issue should not be used to overshadow nuclear disarmament, which Zahran affirmed should remain the CD's priority.

Ambassador Sirous Nasserri acknowledged the 'growing mood' that progress in the CCW context had been inadequate, but emphasised Iran's view that this remains a humanitarian issue. He also argued for a 'firm, solid and binding commitment' to remove the vast number of mines already planted and commented that 'a large number of countries consider the military aspects of landmines as indispensable'. He said they were 'not prepared or able to do away with these weapons without suitable alternatives in place.'

Pakistan's Ambassador Munir Akram posed the question: 'what are the best means of ameliorating and eliminating the suffering and danger posed by anti-personnel mines?' He suggested a three step process: i) to secure the widest possible adherence to the new Protocol II of the CCW; ii) intensified mine clearance programmes; and iii) a special coordinator in the CD to 'explore...the further measures' that might be undertaken.

Ambassador Bernard Goonetilleke said that Sri Lanka was flexible on whether a proposed landmines ban was negotiated within the CD or outside, 'our cardinal consideration being the substance of an agreement rather than its negotiating forum.' However, like the UK's turnaround on target dates, Sri Lanka reversed the usual G-21 support for timetables (where nuclear disarmament is concerned) by arguing that 'setting a deadline [for a landmine ban] would run the risk of being counter-productive'. Mexico, which supported the UNGA resolution on a landmines ban argued at the time 'any other forum but not the CD!' It is presently one of the strongest opponents of the US initiative. Although Mexico has not yet spoken in the CD plenary, it is reportedly concerned that putting landmines into

the CD could be a ploy by the Western nuclear powers to squeeze out nuclear disarmament negotiations and, moreover, that the CD would be a sure way to kill all hope of an early landmines ban.

Russia and China

Neither Russia nor China have yet made plenary speeches, although both

argued during the UN First Committee discussions that a landmines ban was

premature. Both point to their long borders with neighbouring countries and

the necessity for these to be guarded by mines, including anti-personnel

mines. Both regard the CCW as the appropriate forum in which to continue

discussing the issue. China said that it supported 'reasonable restrictions'

but that landmines were a legitimate means of military defence.

On November

7, Russian Ambassador Grigori Berdennikov argued that mine clearance efforts

should be intensified and that the moratoria on exporting AP mines should be

imposed and maintained. However, he raised the spectre of vulnerable borders and nuclear facilities, warning of the risk of a black-market or

situation when mafia and terrorists could have a monopoly on mines but

legitimate government enforcers are denied their use. Berdennikov also cast

doubt on the feasibility of verifying a total ban on mines, wondering whether this would be 'much more cumbersome, costly and intrusive' than the

verification established for the CWC, while at the same time arguing that 'a

simple and inexpensive verification of a so complicated ban is totally

inconceivable.'

China is presently considering the US initiative and has given no open

indication of its position, although it is unlikely that it would veto

establishment of a landmines committee in the CD if there were general consensus. Despite its deep reservations about a ban, Russia has indicated

in the Eastern European group that it would not block consensus on negotiations opening in the CD. There appeared to be concern that Russia

might insist on the Ottawa process being dropped as a condition for this,

although Russia has given no indication that it would issue such

an ultimatum. Russia seems to hold the view that the two approaches are on a collision course, and does not seem too concerned that one or other (or both) might become derailed as a consequence. Advocates of both the CD and the Ottawa Process are maintaining that the 'twin track' approach is feasible and compatible. Whether they believe this or not, it is certain that Ottawa supporters would not agree to drop their initiative at this point, whether or not it were made a condition for pursuing negotiations in the CD.

FISSBAN

In his statement of January 17, US President Clinton named a ban on the production of fissile materials for use in nuclear explosives as a priority for the CD. In this regard, Clinton declared that 'effectively cutting off the spigot for more nuclear weapons is a necessary step toward, and would greatly contribute to, the ultimate goal of nuclear disarmament.'

This call was echoed in turn by many others. France reminded delegates that a mandate had been agreed by the CD in March 1995 and endorsed by all the states parties to the NPT in May of that year. She noted that France no longer produced fissile materials for weapons, having halted production of weapons grade plutonium at Marcoule from 1992 and ceased production of highly enriched uranium (HEU) at Pierrelatte in 1996. President Jacques Chirac had announced in 1996 that these facilities would be closed. She argued that a multilaterally negotiated 'cut-off' would be an 'indispensable element' towards achieving nuclear disarmament, and that it would cap the quantitative arms race as a CTBT had capped the qualitative arms race, as well as imposing new constraints on the nuclear-weapon states.

Agreeing with the G-21 that nuclear disarmament issues should continue to be at the heart of CD work, Bourgois called for the immediate commencement and early conclusion of a fissile cut-off.

Likewise US Ambassador Stephen Ledogar argued that a ban on fissile materials production would be 'another major step forward in the continuum of actions that has been underway for some time now to make progress toward the ultimate goal of the elimination of nuclear weapons'. Britain called the fissban 'a complementary measure to the CTBT', adding that it 'is certainly impossible to envisage the achievement of nuclear disarmament without an FMCT [fissile materials cut-off treaty]'. Countering the argument from several quarters that a basic cut-off is unnecessary now that the nuclear weapon states are no longer producing, Weston said that it was necessary to formalise and verify a ban and put constraints on non-parties to the NPT. Furthermore he argued that nuclear disarmament could not be achieved without verification arrangements on all the key facilities capable of producing fissile materials 'suitable for use in nuclear explosives'. Canada, Australia, Germany, Japan and others also emphasised the importance of immediately getting negotiations underway on the basis of the Shannon mandate of March 1995. Although the Western group members reject any strategy or overt linking of a fissban with other issues, Japan argued for establishment in the CD of 'some kind of forum, not necessarily an ad hoc Committee' to 'explore what role the CD could play for the promotion of nuclear disarmament....[and] exchange views from a wider perspective on how we can best advance nuclear disarmament in the future.'

Akram declared that, if it were part of a wider context of nuclear disarmament measures, Pakistan was prepared to start work on the fissban in accordance with Shannon's report 'which reflected the understanding that the scope of the proposed treaty would be further considered' in the ad hoc Committee. Furthermore, Pakistan wanted explicit assurance that unequal stockpiles would be addressed, or 'this treaty too will be another measure for non-proliferation only...[and] would not contribute at all to nuclear

disarmament'. Sri Lanka also argued for a fissban committee, saying that it should take account of existing stocks. Zahran went even further, arguing that 'a ban on the production of fissile materials which leaves out past production... would be a half measure of non proliferation and stops short of being another step towards nuclear disarmament.'

Pakistan argued that in addition to a fissban, the CD could secure a legally binding commitment by all states to the objective of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and negotiate a protocol to the CTBT designed to halt the qualitative development of nuclear weapons. Zahran agreed with Pakistan on the linkage between a fissban and nuclear disarmament, saying that a fissban could be negotiated in a nuclear disarmament committee, as advocated by the G-21. Sri Lanka also appeared to endorse linkage when Goonetilleke said that although his country has 'no difficulty in agreeing to commence work of the ad hoc committee immediately, we realise that there should be an understanding on the full range of items to be dealt with by this body in 1997.' These were the statements in the CD plenary. Outside, non-aligned diplomats were considerably more blunt: no fissban negotiations without a nuclear disarmament committee.

NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

Malaysia's Ambassador to the United Nations in New York, Ambassador Hasmy Agam, kicked off the debate on nuclear disarmament with a strong statement on January 21. Malaysia had been the prime mover of the UNGA resolution which endorsed the opinion of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in July 1996 and called for negotiations leading to a nuclear weapon convention to commence in 1997 (UNGA 51/45 M). Although not a member of the CD (a problem Agam also addressed), Malaysia considered it important to follow up the resolution, which had been adopted by 115 states, with 22 against and 32 abstentions. Among its supporters, Agam recalled, were a nuclear

weapon power and a few developed western states. He strongly urged the CD to establish an ad hoc Committee on nuclear disarmament, to consider the various aspects of nuclear disarmament already on its agenda and to address further aspects. Agam declared that the ICJ opinion and strong support for UNGA 51/45 M were 'an unambiguous message for the nuclear weapon states to adopt a more serious approach in fulfilling their Treaty commitment to embark on serious negotiations on nuclear disarmament leading to their ultimate elimination'. Malaysia also gave its backing to prompt negotiations and conclusion of a fissile materials ban.

Iran warned that 'nuclear disarmament is not the private and exclusive domain for the two or five nuclear-weapon states. All states are concerned...affected...[and] have the right to be involved...'
The G-21 have long been calling for an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament, although there is no consensus on what it should do. Egypt and Pakistan put forward the case of several G-21 states who want the nuclear disarmament committee to begin negotiating, in accordance with the timetable put forward in August 1996 by 28 of the 30 non-aligned countries in the G-21 (see Disarmament Diplomacy 8). The western nuclear powers have unequivocally rejected this, citing the 'unacceptable' demand for a negotiating mandate as justification for their refusal to allow a nuclear disarmament committee to be established.

Among the G-21 there are delegations which view the G-28 programme as just one among several studies or approaches to nuclear disarmament. They would prefer the nuclear disarmament committee to consider all aspects of the nuclear weapons issue as fully as possible, taking account of the Canberra Commission, the advisory opinion of the ICJ and different studies on the processes of verified nuclear reductions and elimination. Such deliberation, they argue, would lay the groundwork for establishing a negotiating mandate at some time in the future, either for a nuclear weapon

convention or some interim measure appropriate for multilateral negotiations.

Chile, South Africa and Morocco have all expressed reservations about the G-28 programme if it is intended as a basis for negotiations. Chile's Ambassador Jorge Berguno spoke on January 30 against this 'utopian search for timetables, linkages and stages...' Chile, which rejected the programme of action last year, opposed this 'utopian' view with the 'pragmatic' approach based on the 'astute management of available opportunities'. Beyond those poles, Berguno maintained, was a 'relevant utopia' deriving from steps in a 'positive and dynamic concept of the disarmament process', taking into account reduction of forces, global and regional balances and the overall system of collective security. In this regard, Chile called for 'the establishment of a broad, flexible mechanism for the review and monitoring of all nuclear disarmament issues', a convention on the cut-off of fissile materials, a convention or protocol to prevent the weaponisation of outer space, negative security assurances, and development of a mandate for a ban on 'the use, production, stockpiling and particularly the transfer' of AP mines.

In his address on January 30, the Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs formally presented to the CD the report of the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons. Downer described the Commission as 'a body of independent experts and eminent persons commissioned by the Australian government to address the fundamental questions of whether a nuclear weapon free world is feasible and, if so, the measures which could be taken to achieve that objective.' He highlighted several of the Commission's recommendations. The 'first and central requirement' he said was for 'a political commitment by the nuclear weapon states to the elimination of nuclear weapons.' He then summarised the six 'immediate steps' which the

Commission recommended:

- * taking nuclear forces off alert
- * removal of warheads from delivery vehicles
- * ending the deployment of non-strategic nuclear weapons

- * ending nuclear testing
 - * initiating negotiations to reduce further US and Russian nuclear arsenals
 - * a no first use agreed among the NWS and a non-use undertaking by the NWS
- in relation to the NNWS.

Further 'reinforcing steps' were identified: action to prevent more horizontal proliferation; the development of verification arrangements for a nuclear weapon free world; and cessation of the production of fissile material for explosive purposes. Providing copies of the full report to all delegations, Australia urged 'careful consideration' of the Canberra Commission's findings by all governments.

CONCLUSION

The CD has a growing number of issues on its plate, from nuclear disarmament to landmines. Fundamental divisions of purpose and objective will make it difficult to agree its agenda and negotiating priorities unless and until the Conference can develop the criteria and decision-making structures appropriate for the multi-polar security environment that has replaced the cold war. This will present a formidable challenge, but one that the CD must not shy away from.

ends

=====

Disarmament Intelligence Review
24, Colvestone Crescent
London E8 2LH
England
Tel/fax: +44 171 241 4691

email: acronym@gn.apc.org

=====

From acronym@gn.apc.org Sat Mar 1 06:02:50 1997
Date: Fri, 28 Feb 1997 18:29:30 GMT
From: Rebecca Johnson <acronym@gn.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: CD report part I

It appears that the abolition caucus server did not transmit this report, sent out on February 4, because it was too long for it. I apologise to all of you, and will send it in two parts.
Best wishes, rebecca

February 4, 1997

FISSBAN AND LANDMINES VIE IN THE CD: NO AGENDA AGREED

SUMMARY

The 61-member Conference on Disarmament (CD) opened on January 21, 1997, with renewed demands for negotiations to begin immediately on prohibiting the production of fissile materials for explosive purposes and a dramatic call by the United States for the CD to take on negotiations to ban the export, production and stockpiling of anti-personnel landmines. Despite appeals from the new Secretary-General of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, who spoke to the CD on January 30, no agreement on either the agenda or the programme of work had been reached by the end of January. Many delegations expressed doubt that the CD would be able to get negotiations underway on anything before June, if at all this year.

Several proposals for the CD's future work are being floated. There is mounting pressure, especially from the Western states, for negotiations to get underway on a fissile materials ban (fissban). However, bowing to pressure from the nuclear weapon states and in view of the reluctance of India and Israel, they consider that the first step 'cut-off' negotiations should seek to avoid the politically charged issue of existing stocks of fissile materials. They point to the verification complexities, resistance by the nuclear powers and lack of clarity over whether 'stocks' refers to just the plutonium and highly enriched uranium (HEU) in 'excess' stockpiles or the fissile material in the weapons themselves. While most non-aligned countries would be willing to go ahead with a basic cut-off, at the very least they want a nuclear disarmament committee as well.

Egypt and Pakistan opened the year with reiterations of their position that stocks should be counted and that a fissban should proceed only in

the context of negotiations on a timetable for nuclear disarmament. India, which has long resisted any attempts to address past production (stockpiles), made clear in late 1996 that it would consider fissile material negotiations -- with or without stocks -- only as part of a timetable for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. While some of the G-21 group of non-aligned states appear to demand that a nuclear disarmament committee should start negotiating nuclear disarmament measures in accordance with the timetable set out in the programme of action endorsed by 28 of the 30 countries in the G-21 last August, a great many more have indicated that they would accept a deliberative role in the first instance. In their view, a nuclear disarmament committee could initially discuss various approaches to nuclear disarmament and consider what role the CD and multilateral negotiations might play towards the elimination of nuclear weapons.

Maintaining the impossibility of ceding to demands for timetables and negotiations, the western nuclear powers, Britain, France and the United States, are still publicly adamant that any ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament is out of the question. Privately, however, cracks are beginning to show. With growing pressure from their allies to make some concrete concessions towards the G-21 demands, the western nuclear powers would find it hard to continue to reject establishment of a committee or working group with a deliberative rather than negotiating mandate as a first step. Whether this would satisfy the G-21 hard-liners is not certain. Nevertheless, there is little prospect of getting any agenda or committees agreed in the CD without a nuclear disarmament body of some kind, so the stalemate will have to be broken somehow.

Following the US announcement that it wanted the CD to pursue a landmine ban, opinion is divided over whether this will accelerate or impede progress towards a total ban on the production, transfer and stockpiling of anti-personnel landmines (AP mines). The US, France, Britain and

Australia are the foremost advocates of negotiations in the CD. They argue that the CD has the best resources to negotiate and that the involvement of the major mine producers may make the process slower but would ensure a more effective and universal agreement in the end. With the stated objective of a total ban, France and Britain have proposed a phased, step by step approach in the CD, starting with a ban on exports and transfers. No delegation has yet said that it would veto consensus on establishing landmine negotiations in the CD, but several countries are less than happy. Foremost among these is Mexico, concerned that this is a ploy to avoid negotiating further nuclear disarmament measures. Mexico is joined by several others who participated in the Ottawa Conference in October 1996, which initiated a process intended to achieve a total ban by the end of 1997. Although cynical about US motives and strategy, countries such as Canada, Austria, Sweden and Belgium have decided not to oppose putting landmines on the CD agenda. Instead, they have publicly endorsed the US view that a twin-track approach -- Ottawa and the CD -- can be complementary and mutually reinforcing.

Privately, many advocates of a landmines ban doubt that the CD will be able to deliver the goods. Among those who want a ban, as well as those who do not, several are inclined to share Russia's view that the two approaches are on collision course. Nevertheless, the US has spoken, and few will openly oppose. They will watch to see if the CD manages to get negotiations off the ground. Whether or not it does, the Ottawa Process will see how far it can take the issue, and how many countries it can carry with it. If the CD does convene a committee with a negotiating mandate, it is likely to work first on an export ban. If the Ottawa process has meanwhile concluded a total ban, there is no legal reason why countries cannot sign both, while continuing to work on a universal ban through the CD. Though not

mutually exclusive in concept, however, the different approaches may prove incompatible in reality. Some negotiators have already warned that signing a total ban this year could leave them in a 'weakened' position to negotiate the phases towards such a ban with reluctant states like China and Russia.

Rather than a very complicated, expensive and intrusive verification regime, the Ottawa process is likely to favour conclusion of a political instrument with some authority to track back to producers from the point of known use, reinforced with sanctions against violators. With Russia taking a hard line on the necessity of providing cast iron verification for a landmines ban, negotiations in the CD may well have to focus intensively on technology, definitions and verification. For those who want to rid the world of these 'weapons of mass destruction in slow motion' the choice of approach will be determined by politics, pace and the pressure of public opinion. The Ottawa process may achieve a political instrument within a year, laying the foundations for establishing a moral norm, but at least at the beginning it will lack some very important mine producers and users and may have few teeth. It will have to rely on intensifying public and international pressure to bring the important hold-outs on board. The CD will involve all the relevant states in a step by step process, but subject to their different agendas may become bogged down in technicalities. The very fact that negotiations are in process may reinforce the moratoria on landmines and begin to embed a moral norm.

The future of the CD may hinge on how soon and how effectively it is able to decide on its next programme of work. It could decide to agree to negotiations on just one issue, as it did with the CTBT, while continuing consultations on the rest. The political differences and lack of overwhelming commitment to any of the choices makes this option unlikely. Given the push from the US, the CD may try to achieve balance with two

simultaneous negotiations, if resources can be stretched sufficiently -- a potential problem especially for smaller delegations. Agreeing to a nuclear disarmament committee may be the best key to release the deadlock.

For that, the nuclear weapon states would have really to want negotiations on a fissile materials ban or landmines to happen.

UN Secretary General's statement to the CD

In his first address to the CD since becoming UN Secretary-General, Kofi Annan touched on the dilemmas before the Conference and urged that negotiations on a fissile materials ban should be started as soon as possible. He also endorsed a role for the CD in achieving a ban on landmines, while not specifying whether he believed the CD should be given sole or primary responsibility for negotiating such an agreement.

Annan declared that the peoples of the world were looking to the CD to 'press ahead with the global disarmament agenda'. They wanted the CD to bring 'the twin threats of weapons of mass destruction and the world's growing stockpile of conventional weapons under control.' Reiterating that the CD had a 'heavy responsibility' as the sole international forum for negotiating arms regulation and disarmament, Annan said that 'nuclear disarmament must remain a priority for the international community.' Acknowledging that a ban on fissile material production posed 'enormous technical and political difficulties', Annan urged the CD to 'start talking' or it would never move forwards. Bypassing the central fudge of the March 1995 mandate over whether or not fissile stocks were to be considered, Annan gave his view that the mandate was 'inclusive of the positions of all states'.

Turning to conventional weapons, the Secretary-General said that the increase in local and regional conflicts had made this issue more urgent and important: 'these are the weapons which are actually killing combatants and civilians in their tens of thousands every year.' He commended the courage

and devotion of UN peace-keepers and others who 'face the daily threat posed by millions of indiscriminately laid anti-personnel landmines', which had become 'weapons of terror'. Annan urged all states to ratify and implement amended Protocol II of the 1980 Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects (CCW). He then went much further, welcoming the 'growing movement' and 'commitment of more and more states to negotiate an effective and legally binding total ban' on AP mines. He added that 'while it is for the international community to decide the best venue for the negotiating process, it would seem logical for the Conference on Disarmament to play a role.'

Annan also urged full ratification of the 1993 Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), especially by the United States and Russian Federation. He supported efforts to reinforce and verify the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention (BWC). He also considered that the CD could usefully re-examine how security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon states against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons could be strengthened. The Secretary General proclaimed the need for 'a new international security agenda...which takes account of our rapidly changing world'. Praising the CD's expansion and 'proud record of endeavour and of lasting achievement', he also nudged the controversy over CD consensus, arguing that the 'consensus approach' was an important instrument for problem solving. He ended on a note of optimism, saying that 'there is no institution of earth better qualified than your Conference to translate the world's constant yearning for peace into practical, negotiated measures for enhancing international understanding and the security of all nations.'

AGENDA

Several delegations focused part of their plenary statements on the CD's problems agreeing a new agenda after completing the CTBT. The basic framework for CD work for nearly 20 years has been the 'decatalogue', a ten point programme adopted in 1978 by the first UN Special Session on Disarmament. (footnote: this was identified incorrectly in Disarmament Diplomacy 8, which reproduced a recent 10-point agenda rather than the 1978 decatalogue. This confusion appears to have been shared by some of the CD delegations themselves who considered that the decatalogue and the CD's agenda were (or should be) identical, with only the programme of work changing annually. However, that has not been the case for many years, although the agenda follows the basic pattern of the decatalogue.) The 1978 decatalogue is as follows:

- I Nuclear weapons in all aspects;
- II Chemical weapons;
- III Other weapons of mass destruction;
- IV Conventional weapons;
- V Reduction of military budgets;
- VI Reduction of armed forces;
- VII Disarmament and development;
- VIII Disarmament and international security;
- IX Collateral measures, confidence building measures; effective verification measures in relation to appropriate disarmament measures, acceptable to all parties concerned;
- X Comprehensive programme of disarmament leading to general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

Each year the CD aims to adopt an agenda and a concrete programme of work, although it is not clear why this division of role developed, or whether it is necessary. Using the 1978 decatalogue as a basic framework, the agenda lists several items, not all of which will be prioritised for negotiations or deliberations in the CD's programme of work for the year. The programme of work is meant to be more specific, determining which ad hoc committees or coordinators will be established. For the past two years the CD was unable to agree an agenda, but proceeded with a programme of work consisting solely of negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty (CTBT).

With the CTBT now signed, the CD cannot float on the other issues any longer. It has to decide its new priorities for work. The central difficulty concerns the balance between nuclear and conventional issues. The major obstacle is the apparently outright rejection by the three western nuclear powers of the demand by the G-21 for an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament. In 1995 the demand for a nuclear disarmament committee was linked first with agreement on renewing the committee on transparency in armaments (TIA) and then with the committee charged with negotiating a fissban.

During the intersessional period from the CD's closure on September 13 1996 to its reopening in 1997, the Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament, Vladimir Petrovsky worked with the outgoing President, Ambassador Ludwik Dembinski of Poland and the incoming President, Ambassador Joun Yung Sun of the Republic of Korea, to try to achieve a balanced agenda and programme of work capable of getting consensus in the CD in 1997. Aiming to get around the 'linkage deadlock' and balance conventional and nuclear issues, the CD President proposed the following agenda in early January, without intending prejudice as to the order of priority for work:

1. Nuclear disarmament
2. Prohibition of the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices
3. Effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon states against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons
4. Transparency in armaments
5. Prevention of an arms race in outer space
6. Anti-personnel landmines
7. Regional aspects of conventional disarmament
8. Consideration and adoption of the annual report and any other report, as appropriate to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Since this was not agreed, the CD President announced that informal plenaries would begin on January 30. These closed sessions would enable all CD delegations to participate directly in the discussions on the agenda and

programme of work, which had hitherto been conducted in the President's Bureau and transmitted by group coordinators for circulation among the three groups.

Various delegations have also made suggestions for the CD's future work.

The US statement was a clear call for ad hoc committees to negotiate both a fissile cut off and a landmines ban, with other issues either dropped or given little priority. The G-21 is united in wanting an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament, but differs over whether it should have a negotiating mandate or (at least in the beginning) be a deliberative committee.

Many western and eastern European countries also consider that it is time for the CD to consider wider issues of nuclear disarmament, though most say that it would be premature to set up multilateral negotiations until the fissban has been concluded and the nuclear-weapon states have accomplished greater reductions in their arsenals by other means.

Canada made a concrete proposal for work under two principal headings: weapons of mass destruction/nuclear disarmament (covering fissban negotiations and some work on security assurances, though not necessarily negotiations); and conventional disarmament, covering transparency in armaments and conventional arms transfers. Additionally, Canada proposed that the CD should consider work on a legally binding instrument to prevent the weaponization of outer space, an issue that has continued to be of considerable importance to the G-21 and Russia, although western countries have tended to join the US, UK and France in arguing that this issue is obsolete.

Chile endorsed Canada's proposal for some kind of convention or protocol to the Space Treaty. In addition to this, Chile's proposal for the CD's programme of work included: the establishment of a 'broad flexible mechanism for the review and monitoring of all nuclear disarmament issues', fissban

negotiations, a 'straightforward mandate' for negotiating 'operational procedures to ban the use, production, stockpiling and particularly the transfer' of AP mines, and a convention on binding security assurances. Sri Lanka argued for ad hoc committees to negotiate a fissile materials ban, security assurances, and also a convention to maintain outer space as a weapons free environment, while remaining open on whether the CD should negotiate on landmines. Egypt also argued that UNGA resolution 51/45 M required the convening of negotiations in the CD towards a nuclear weapon convention.

Two views of structure are emerging. According to one, only two ad hoc committees would be established: on nuclear disarmament and on conventional disarmament. The nuclear disarmament committee could establish several working groups, including one with a mandate to negotiate a fissile materials ban and another to consider wider issues of nuclear disarmament. The latter could either include issues such as security assurances or a third working group could be set up specifically for NSA. (There is a growing view, recently given public emphasis by Chile, that the NPT process could be a more fruitful forum for negotiating a legally binding instrument on security assurances, if that is still a priority for the non-nuclear weapon states.) The conventional disarmament committee could also convene different working groups. Thus one could be given a mandate to negotiate a ban on landmines while another took the brief of deliberating on transparency, and so on. It is argued that this might be a more comfortable way for the United States to get over its ideological (and domestic) difficulties with the concept of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament. Negotiating a fissile materials ban under this committee would also set a precedent, holding out the possibility of negotiating other nuclear disarmament measures when the time is deemed ripe.

An alternative model would be for several ad hoc committees to be established, although some would have negotiating mandates, while others would be deliberative. This was the structure in 1994, when the CTBT was

being negotiated. At that time, three other committees were set up, covering transparency, outer space, and security assurances. Little time was devoted to the deliberative committees, however, and it was reported that they were unproductive and acrimonious. This is a danger with a two-tier structure, when priority of attention and resources would inevitably go to the committees or working groups set up for actual negotiations.

part 2 follows

=====
Disarmament Intelligence Review
24, Colvestone Crescent
London E8 2LH
England
Tel/fax: +44 171 241 4691

email: acronym@gn.apc.org

=====
From gdaniell@wt.com.au Sat Mar 1 06:02:50 1997
Date: Sat, 1 Mar 1997 05:56:01 +0800 (WST)
From: Graham Daniell <gdaniell@wt.com.au>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Three Mile Island

Hi,

A couple of days ago there was a news report on public radio here about a recently concluded Three Mile Island follow up study. It showed increased health problems downwind if the site were far higher than that expected for the amount of radioactivity "officially" released. eg: lung cancer was up 500 - 600 percent). The study was carried out by America's Institute of Environmental Health Scientists I believe.

I have not heard any re regarding this since. Can anyone confirm this report and can you indicate where I can get authoritative information about it?

Towards a nuclear-free millennium,
Graham Daniell
Perth, Western Australia
gdaniell@wt.com.au

From wagingpeace@napf.org Sat Mar 1 06:02:50 1997

Date: Fri, 28 Feb 1997 15:26:03 -0800
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
To: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: RE: Resolution for College Campuses

Dear Ross,

I think that we have a fundamental disagreement about how to mobilize and motivate people to become involved in the Abolition 2000 movement. I think it is enough if people sign on to a resolution or statement that includes the central goal of the Abolition 2000 movement, that is, agreement by the year 2000 on a Treaty that calls for the prohibition of nuclear weapons and their elimination within a time-bound framework. I believe that it is too difficult to get large numbers of people or city councils, for example, to agree with everything contained in the Abolition 2000 Statement.

I find it strange that you are suggesting that there is something proprietary about the Abolition 2000 name, and that there are explicit rules for its use. In my view, Abolition 2000 binds together a large and hopefully growing group of people throughout the world who are working for the elimination of all nuclear weapons from Earth within a reasonable period of time (as opposed to Abolition 3000).

I would see the purpose of the Abolition 2000 Statement (which I wholeheartedly endorse and which I was instrumental in drafting) as being to give coherence and direction to the Abolition 2000 Global Network. Not every municipality or campus will want to engage in the work of the Network, and that is all right. Most will not want to do so, although perhaps some will. Those that want to can be more active. Those that are unlikely to be more active can help toward achieving the goal of a nuclear weapons free world by adding their endorsement to the main goal of Abolition 2000.

I hope that you can agree with me, and pull back from trying to

impose rules that are more rigid than need be or are useful. I believe that the Resolution for College Campuses can be quite valuable in involving young people in achieving our common goal. I hope that you will support the distribution and use of the Resolution.

With regards,

David Krieger

At 08:43 AM 2/28/97 -0500, you wrote:

>

>Dear David,

>

>Your new College Campus Resolution contains some admirable points but it is deficient like the first City Declaration you made in an important area. The recent email discussion about Abolition 2000 priorities does not seem to have been noted.

>

>The point that you seem to have overlooked is that use of the name Abolition 2000 implies support for Abolition 2000 principles. I find your promotions deficient through lack of a clear statement of support of the Abolition 2000 Statement and the lack of comment about publicly endorsing it.

>

>I consider that use of the Abolition 2000 name for a Declaration or Resolution implies full support and endorsement of the Abolition 2000 Statement and this should be clearly stated in the text of subsequent Declarations and Resolutions and put into effect by public endorsement.

>

>It seems to me that to make proposals as you are doing with this deficiency is to introduce double standards into the movement.

>

>I will be pleased if you will amend the statements you have made to bring them into line with basic Abolition 2000 procedure and to further update those who have already signed on to them so that they will hopefully choose

to endorse the Abolition 2000 Statement.

>

>With this proviso, I welcome your proposals and extensions suitable for Schools, Cites, Regions and Nations, provided that they meet and remain in line with the basic Abolition 2000 criteria.

>

>With respect and appreciation for the good work you are doing,

>

>Ross Wilcock

>rwilcock@web.net

><http://web.net.pgs/~pgs/>

>

>

>-----Original Message-----

>From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation [SMTP:wagingpeace@napf.org]

>Sent: 27 February, 1997 17:38

>To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

>Subject: Resolution for College Campuses

>

>We have modified the Abolition 2000 Resolution for Municipalities for use

on college campuses. This resolution is aimed at U.S. college campuses, but

by revising the last "Calls for" statement, it could be made applicable to

campuses throughout the world. The General Butler to pursue their dreams

and aspirations;

>Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Student Council of

>_____:

>

>Declares itself a Nuclear Weapon Free Zone and supports the further development of Nuclear Weapon Free Zones throughout the world;

>Calls for all nuclear weapons to be taken off alert status, for all nuclear

warheads to be separated from their delivery vehicles, and for the nuclear

weapons states to agree to unconditional no first use of these weapons;

>Calls upon the governments of all nuclear weapons states to begin negotiations immediately on a Nuclear Weapons Convention to prohibit and

eliminate all nuclear weapons early in the next century, and to complete

these negotiations by the year 2000;

>Calls for copies of this resolution to be distributed among the student

body, faculty, and administration, as well as local government leaders,

U.S. Representative(s), U.S. Senators, and the President.

>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
>Web Site: <http://www.napf.org>

>
>

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
Web Site: <http://www.napf.org>

From magoo@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in Sat Mar 1 06:02:50 1997
Date: Sat, 01 Mar 1997 08:03:31 -0800
From: Vijai K Nair <magoo@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in>
To: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
Cc: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: Resolution for College Campuses

Nuclear Age Peace Foundation wrote:

>

> Dear Ross,

>

> I think that we have a fundamental disagreement about how
> to

> mobilize and motivate people to become involved in the Abolition
> 2000

> movement. I think it is enough if people sign on to a resolution
> or

> statement that includes the central goal of the Abolition 2000
> movement,

> that is, agreement by the year 2000 on a Treaty that calls for
> the

> prohibition of nuclear weapons and their elimination within a
> time-bound

> framework. I believe that it is too difficult to get large numbers
> of

> people or city councils, for example, to agree with everything
> contained in

> the Abolition 2000 Statement.

>

> I find it strange that you are suggesting that there is
> something

> proprietary about the Abolition 2000 name, and that there are
> explicit rules

> for its use. In my view, Abolition 2000 binds together a large
> and

> hopefully growing group of people throughout the world who are
> working for

> the elimination of all nuclear weapons from Earth within a
> reasonable period

> of time (as opposed to Abolition 3000).
>
> I would see the purpose of the Abolition 2000 Statement
(which I
> wholeheartedly endorse and which I was instrumental in drafting)
as being to
> give coherence and direction to the Abolition 2000 Global Network.
Not
> every municipality or campus will want to engage in the work of
the Network,
> and that is all right. Most will not want to do so, although perhaps
some
> will. Those that want to can be more active. Those that are
unlikely to be
> more active can help toward achieving the goal of a nuclear weapons
free
> world by adding their endorsement to the main goal of Abolition
2000.
>
> I hope that you can agree with me, and pull back from trying
to
> impose rules that are more rigid than need be or are useful. I
believe that
> the Resolution for College Campuses can be quite valuable in
involving young
> people in achieving our common goal. I hope that you will support
the
> distribution and use of the Resolution.
>
> With regards,
>
> David Krieger
>
> At 08:43 AM 2/28/97 -0500, you wrote:
> >
> >Dear David,
> >
> >Your new College Campus Resolution contains some admirable points
but it is
> deficient like the first City Declaration you made in an important
area. The
> recent email discussion about Abolition 2000 priorities does not
seem to
> have been noted.
> >
> >The point that you seem to have overlooked is that use of the
name
> Abolition 2000 implies support for Abolition 2000 principles. I
find your
> promotions deficient through lack of a clear statement of support
of the
> Abolition 2000 Statement and the lack of comment about publicly
endorsing it.
> >

> >I consider that use of the Abolition 2000 name for a Declaration
or
> Resolution implies full support and endorsement of the Abolition
2000
> Statement and this should be clearly stated in the text of subsequent
> Declarations and Resolutions and put into effect by public
endorsement.
> >
> >Is seems to me that to make proposals as you are doing with this
deficiency
> is to introduce double standards into the movement.
> >
> >I will be pleased if you will amend the statements you have made
to bring
> them into line with basic Abolition 2000 procedure and to further
to update
> those who have already signed on to them so that they will hopefully
choose
> to endorse the Abolition 2000 Statement.
> >
> >With this proviso, I welcome your proposals and extensions suitable
for
> Schools, Cites, Regions and Nations, provided that they meet and
remain in
> line with the basic Abolition 2000 criteria.
> >
> >With respect and appreciation for the good work you are doing,
> >
> >Ross Wilcock
> >rwilcock@web.net
> ><http://web.net.pgs/~pgs/>
> >
> >
> >-----Original Message-----
> >From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation [SMTP:wagingpeace@napf.org]
> >Sent: 27 February, 1997 17:38
> >To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
> >Subject: Resolution for College Campuses
> >
> >We have modified the Abolition 2000 Resolution for Municipalities
for use
> on college campuses. This resolution is aimed at U.S. college
campuses, but
> by revising the last "Calls for" statement, it could be made
applicable to
> campuses throughout the world. The General Butler to pursue their
dreams
> and aspirations;
> >Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Student Council of
> >_____:
> >
> >Declares itself a Nuclear Weapon Free Zone and supports the further
> development of Nuclear Weapon Free Zones throughout the world;
> >Calls for all nuclear weapons to be taken off alert status, for

all nuclear
> warheads to be separated from their delivery vehicles, and for
the nuclear
> weapons states to agree to unconditional no first use of these
weapons;
> >Calls upon the governments of all nuclear weapons states to begin
> negotiations immediately on a Nuclear Weapons Convention to
prohibit and
> eliminate all nuclear weapons early in the next century, and to
complete
> these negotiations by the year 2000;
> >Calls for copies of this resolution to be distributed among the
student
> body, faculty, and administration, as well as local government
leaders,
> U.S. Representative(s), U.S. Senators, and the President.
> >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
> >Web Site: <http://www.napf.org>
> >
> >
> 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
> Web Site:
<http://www.napf.org>*****

Dear David,

I agree with you. Some of the debate one reads appears to generate
avoidable
frictional losses. We should concentrate our efforts to the goal
and not to
the highway we are traversing.

Warm regards

Vijai

From TracyMM@aol.com Mon Mar 3 16:53:46 1997
Date: Sat, 1 Mar 1997 13:04:22 -0500 (EST)
From: TracyMM@aol.com
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: Three Mile Island

Dear Graham and Abolitionists,

I heard a Three Mile Island report on public radio as well, but here in the US. I am working on getting a written transcript of the report and can provide it to anyone who is interested.

National Public Radio (US) has a Web site which gave the following synopsis of the report:

"Patricia Neighmond reports on a new study that contradicts the official findings after the Three Mile Island accident 18 years ago. The original reports say there was minimal radiation exposure to the surrounding area, but an article published in the journal "Environmental Health Perspectives," cites increased incidents of leukemia and other cancers in local residents. Other researchers are extremely skeptical of the new study." (3:55)

The full report is available in audio form on the National Public Radio Web site: <http://www.realaudio.com/content/npr/nb7f24.html>

The Environmental Health Perspectives Web site has a database of articles, but I could not find the Chernobyl one. Perhaps it has not yet been posted.
<http://ehpnet1.niehs.nih.gov/AbsSearch.html>

I found the NPR site through a Web page with many international media links which some of you may find useful:
<http://www.trib.com/NEWS/APwire.html>

Cheers,

Tracy Moavero

Tracy Moavero
5041 Sandy Hook Dr.
Parma, OH 44134
USA
+1-216-845-1405
tracymm@aol.com

In a message dated 97-02-28 17:33:46 EST, you write:

<< Subj: Three Mile Island
Date: 97-02-28 17:33:46 EST
From: gdaniell@wt.com.au (Graham Daniell)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Hi,

A couple of days ago there was a news report on public radio here about a recently concluded Three Mile Island follow up study. It showed increased health problems downwind if the site were far higher than that expected for the amount of radioactivity "officially" released. eg: lung cancer was up 500 - 600 percent). The study was carried out by America's Institute of Environmental Health Scientists I believe.

I have not heard any re regarding this since. Can anyone confirm this report and can you indicate where I can get authoritative information about it?

Towards a nuclear-free millennium,
Graham Daniell
Perth, Western Australia
gdaniell@wt.com.au
>>

From: prop1@prop1.org
Date: Sun, 2 Mar 1997 15:30:33 -0500 (EST)
From: peace through reason <prop1@prop1.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: NPT Strategy -- Anonymous FTP

At 08:04 AM 2/14/97 -0800, ALICE SLATER wrote:

>Fact sheets are available if we need good information to use in our lobbying

efforts. We need an accessible bulletin board to post our documents for
>easy referral. (such as abolition statement, Moorea declaration,
>resolutions, fact sheets, etc.) ANY SUGGESTIONS?

On 20 Feb 1997 07:18:12 -0500 peace through reason wrote:

Yes, check out: <<http://www.prop1.org/prop1/nas.htm>>.

Although it's not exactly a "bulletin board," many of the specific documents Alice refers to have been at that web site, available to download, for some time. E.g., <<http://prop1.org/2000/abolintr.htm>>

ON February 21st ALICE wrote:

>Thanks for the offer but we already have a web site. I was thinking of
>people who are not on the web. But perhaps it's not necessary.
Regards.

REGET that it's taken so long to get back to you on this.

I believe harmony in pursuit of a common goal (i.e., the abolition of nuclear weapons) is best achieved when the choir is all on the same sheet of music. Please, Help me get on your sheet. After some discussion with various colleagues, I'm still not sure exactly what you mean by a "Bulletin Board."

I think I have a general idea: A "site (were) people who are not on the web" might download Abolition 2000 documents.

Necessary? Definately not. Useful? Perhaps.

One option would be an anonymous FTP site, with a listing of the available documents.

Such an arrangement would work something like this:

1. All files must be an ascii text format
2. A catalog of the documents must be an ascii text file called index.txt.
An information seeker would first download the index.txt file to discover the file name(s) of the specific document(s) desired.)
3. The ascii text file may be emailed as 'zipped' attachment to

flprop1@gate.net

4. Alternatively, files could be snail mailed on diskette to the Syop's address.

5. To prevent manipulation of files and insure security, files may not be uploaded directly to the anonymous FTP site.

6. The Syop will place files in a directory called abolition2000.

7. To facilitate understanding, we've taken the liberty of creating a sample

Files may be downloaded by anyone on the internet by ftp'ing to:

```
ftp.gate.net
login:      anonymous
password:   (their email address)
```

```
then change directories to:
/ftp/pub/users/flprop1/abolition2000
```

A number of interested individuals took the liberty of pooling their thoughts and resources, devising an experiment to determine whether something along the lines you envision can be accomplished. To participate

in this experiment: Follow the above directions and download ONPTStra

If this isn't what you had in mind, do you think it might be modified to

become what you want?

From int@fme.knooppunt.be Mon Mar 3 16:53:46 1997

Date: Sun, 02 Mar 1997 21:41:31

From: Pol D'Huyvetter <int@fme.knooppunt.be>

To: acronym@gn.apc.org, aslater@igc.apc.org,

jburroughs@igc.apc.org,

abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Subject: Re: NPT PrepComm

Hello John and fellow abolitionists,

>Hi Rebecca - Because Western States has received inquiries from states

>regarding ideas to push at the prep com, we would URGENTLY like to

>know what NGOs have been proposing in addition to the Abolition 2000

>and Parliamentarians for Global Action proposal to focus on 1)

>commencement of negotiations on an abolition convention and 2)

>implementation of the Canberra Commission immediate measures (taking

>nuclear forces off alert etc.). Thanks - John

I might have missed some of the previous mail on the NPT PrepComm, but it seems to me that the review of art. 4 (promotion of nuclear energy) and creation of UN Sustainable Energy Agency is vital in our

counter proliferation work, especially in preparation of the NPT Review PrepComm.

Is it correct that the work is so far mostly focussed on NPT - Art. 6 ??

Nuclear energy is the 'only' energy source actively promoted by the UN, while today from the many Western nuclear advocates only France continues to built NPP in the West. We all have learned many lessons in the past. However the mighty nuclear industry continues to use the UN's IAEA to spread lies (i.e. Chernobyl), and to promote and built new NPP in Central and Eastern Europe, and the Southern Hemisphere (cfr. Vietnam, Thailand, Maleisia, Peru, ...). Do we not all know the world will not be a safer place as long as the UN promotes the dangerous and expensive 'peaceful use of the atom', and proliferates the technology and materials to make the bomb.

With For Mother Earth we sincerely hope that the review of NPT's art. 4 (and reform of IAEA) will receive particular attention from NGO's at the upcoming NPT Review PrepComm.

Sincerely,

Pol D'Huyvetter

* For Mother Earth International office

* Lange Steenstraat 16/D, 9000 Gent, Belgium

* Phone/fax +32-9-233 84 39

* E-mail: int@fme.knooppunt.be

* WWW:<http://www.knooppunt.be/~fme>

* Postal account : 000-1618561-19

* For Mother Earth is member of Abolition 2000 - a global

network to eliminate nuclear weapons, the International Peace
* Bureau (IPB) and World Information Service on Energy (WISE)

*****-

For Mother Earth has offices in Belgium, Slovakia, Sri Lanka,
* USA,aswell as active members/groups in Belarus, Finland,

*

* Germany, Netherlands, Rumania and Ukraine

*

*****-

From okamoto@shudo-u.ac.jp Mon Mar 3 16:53:46 1997
Date: Mon, 03 Mar 1997 07:29:54 +0900
From: okamoto mitsuo <okamoto@shudo-u.ac.jp>
To: Pol D'Huyvetter <int@fme.knooppunt.be>, abolition-caucus@igc-.apc.org
Subject: Re: NPT PrepComm

[The following text is in the "ISO-2022-JP" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

Dear Pol:

I would like to commend and endorse your concern about UN's active promotion of nuclear energy. I hope many NGOs will take your warning seriously. There is one point in your mail which should be corrected. You say, "only France continues to build NPP in the West". You are right if "the West" means only the Western countries in Europe and North America. However, economically, and to a certain extent politically as well, Japan has become involved so deeply in the activities of the West that it is difficult to exclude her from the nuclear imperium. And unfortunately, Japan, in a sense more enthusiastically than France, continues to build nuclear power plants and her influence in Asia is enormous. There is even a report that Japan is intending to export NPP to other Asian countries. You can get more information about Japan's nuclear policy from the office of Dr. Junzaburo Takagi in Tokyo. I'm sorry I don't have his email address on hand. But, if I remember correctly, he wrote a mail in this mailing list some months ago and his staff seem to watch the traffic of Abolition 2000. So, I

hope his staff will read my message and get in touch with you (I may be too optimistic). There may be others who know their email address.

Sincerely,

Mitsuo
Mitsuo Okamoto
Professor
Hiroshima Shudo University
1717 Ozuka, Numata-cho
Hiroshima 731-31
Tel +81-82-830-1287
Fax +81-82-848-7788
From cnic-jp@po.iiijnet.or.jp Mon Mar 3 16:53:46 1997
Date: Mon, 3 Mar 1997 11:57:36 +0900
From: Citizens' Nuclear Information Center
<cnic-jp@po.iiijnet.or.jp>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: An update on the MOX Utilization Policy in Japan

[The following text is in the "ISO-2022-JP" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

An Update on The Japanese Government's MOX Utilization Policy, from
The Citizens' Nuclear Information Center

3 March 1997

Background

After the Monju accident on 8 December 1995, the Japanese government's plutonium program stalled. Since then the government has been emphasizing the use of mixed-oxide (MOX) fuel in light water reactors. In response to the accident, on 23 January 1996, Governors Yukio Kurita, Eisaku Sato and Ikuo Hirayama of Fukui, Fukushima and Niigata Prefectures respectively, where some 60 percent of Japan's reactors are located, sent their well-known proposal to the central government. The proposal called for a thorough review of the nation's nuclear energy policy, including MOX utilization, and greater public consensus in nuclear policy decision-making. During the course of last year, in response to the outcry from the public and NGOs over the government's handling of the accident, the Atomic Energy Commission of Japan (AECJ) held a series of Roundtable talks. The talks were held between 25 April and 18 September and resulted

in a commitment from the government to make public most of the nuclear policy decision-making meetings of its relevant ministries and agencies. In the intervening weeks since that decision, there have been some important developments.

Recent Developments

20 January

The Nuclear Energy Sub-committee of the Advisory Committee on Energy, which advises the International Trade and Industry Minister, Mr. Shinji Sato, released a report that recommended giving the green light for MOX utilization and plutonium recycling. While it was a recommendation and not legally binding, the advice of the Committee is taken very seriously by the Minister. The report was subsequently submitted to the Cabinet for consideration.

31 January

The AECJ announced that it was formally adopting the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Energy's Nuclear Energy Sub-Committee. MOX use in LWRs was seen as being part of the process of developing a fully fledged FBR program. The commission called for all power utilities to implement MOX use in at least one LWR each by the year 2010.

4 February

The Cabinet gave its consent for the MOX utilization plan, making it government policy. It should be noted that it is highly unusual for such a matter to be brought to the Cabinet level to get consent. That such high level support was deemed necessary to strengthen the plan may be an indication of exactly how weak it really is.

6 February

The head of Federation of Electric Power Companies (FEPCO), Mr. Hiroshi Araki, met separately, with Mr. Yasuhiro Kato, head of the STA's Atomic Energy Bureau, and Minister Shinji Sato of MITI. Mr. Kato explained the AEC's decision of 31 January. He urged Mr. Araki to accept the plan and encourage the power companies to negotiate with local government

for the
go-ahead for MOX use. Mr. Araki agreed to do so.

14 February

The central government asked the governors of Fukui, Fukushima and Niigata Prefectures to Tokyo to meet with the Minister of Science and Technology, Mr. Riichiro Chikaoka, and the Minister for International Trade and Industry to discuss whether they would accept the new MOX utilization policy. Implementation of the policy depended on gaining the approval of these governors, in whose prefectures the relevant reactors are sited. None of the governors gave a definite answer at the meeting.

21 February

The head of FEPCO held a press conference to announce the power utilities' plan for the immediate future. Initially, the plan is for four reactors to be fueled with MOX by 2000. Two in 1999 and two more in 2000. The first two reactors would be a boiling water reactor (BWR) owned by the Tokyo Electric Power Co. (TEPCO) and a pressurized water reactor (PWR) owned by the Kansai Electric Power Co. (KEPCO). The companies would then fuel another BWR and PWR respectively, in 2000. Thereafter another five reactors would be using MOX fuel by the early 2000s and a total of 16-18 reactors by the year 2010 (A table of the planned schedule can be found at the end of this update). While no definitive decision has been made on which two reactors will be first to use MOX fuel, TEPCO's Fukushima I and KEPCO's Takahama are considered possible sites.

26 February

In a remarkable development Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto himself invited the three governors to a meeting to discuss the government's nuclear fuel cycle policy. Such a step is unprecedented in the history of Japan's long-term nuclear plan and is a powerful indication of its precarious position.

At the meeting the Prime Minister asked for a consensus on the policy from the three governors. The governors stated that the policy

needs

a national consensus and that it is the responsibility of the national government to reach that consensus with the public.

27 February

Representatives of both the STA and MITI attended a meeting of Tsuruga City Assembly in Fukui Prefecture to explain the MOX utilization policy to the members and get their understanding for it. The Assembly rejected the explanation saying it was inadequate. It also said that, despite the claims of the STA and MITI that there was almost no difference between the safety of MOX fuel and conventional uranium fuel, the issue of safety was still uncertain. In reaching these conclusions the Assembly used the information gathered and presented by the Citizens' Nuclear Information Center (CNIC) in its on-going International MOX Assessment (IMA) Project.

Finally, the Assembly stated that the policy must be explained more thoroughly to the public if a true consensus was to be reached.

The STA undertook to have its Nuclear Safety Bureau conduct further tests into the safety of MOX fuel use in LWRs.

On his return from the meeting with Prime Minister Hashimoto, the governor of Fukushima held a press conference at the Fukushima Prefectural Assembly. He called for the government to seek greater consensus from the public before proceeding with the MOX utilization policy. A network of local citizens' groups urged the governor not to agree to policy.

Prefectural and Local Consensus

At this time, the position of the three governors on the government's plan does vary. The Fukui Governor is the most critical of it and he has expressed the opinion that the consent of the Cabinet is not the consent of the public. The Fukushima Governor is more cautious but takes the position that more discussion of the plan, greater public understanding of MOX use and a definite spent fuel policy is needed before he can give his approval. The Niigata Governor has since given his provisional consent for the policy but linked it to greater economic development of the region.

Below the prefectural level, at the level of local

government,
there is also little consensus about the government's plan. For
example,
the mayor of Kashiwazaki city, Fukushima Prefecture, site of six
nuclear
reactors, has expressed concern and an unwillingness to accept MOX
use in
his jurisdiction. How long this sort of position will be maintained
is hard
to judge but such opposition is widespread and is still a hinderance
to the
implementation of the government's policy.

International Developments

There have also been some very important, international
developments in the government's MOX utilization plan. Recently,
CNIC
received copies of diplomatic memoranda, dated 10 February 1997,
that were
exchanged by the governments of Japan and Belgium, in the persons
of Mr.
Yukihiko Ikeda, Japan's Minister of Foreign Affairs and Mr. Christian
Verdonck, Belgium's Charge d'Affaires ad interim. This exchange of
memoranda constitutes formal arrangements for the fabrication of
MOX fuel
in Belgium, for Japanese utilities, using Japanese owned plutonium
and
uranium. Under the terms of those arrangements 483kg of Japanese
plutonium
will be transferred from the reprocessing facilities at La Hague,
France to
the fabrication facilities of Belgonucleaire and Franco-Belge de
Fabrication de Combustible International (FBFC-International) in
Dessel,
Belgium. Of the 483kg, 221kg is to be transferred between the date
the
arrangements came into effect, 10 February 1997, and September 1997
and the
remaining 262kg between March 1997 and July 1998.

The uranium necessary for the MOX fuel fabrication is to
be
transferred from Japanese sources (possibly from uranium already
in France,
though it is not yet known for sure) and amounts to 3,088kg. It is
to be
transferred in two equal shipments within the same time frame as
the
plutonium. It will consist of natural uranium and uranium that has
been
recovered from reprocessing and then enriched above natural levels
but to
less than 10 percent. After fabrication the MOX fuel will be returned
to La
Hague, France and from there will be returned to Japan.

From aslater@igc.apc.org Mon Mar 3 16:53:46 1997
Date: Mon, 3 Mar 1997 09:04:06 -0800 (PST)
From: ALICE SLATER <aslater@igc.apc.org>
To: Graham Daniell <gdaniell@wt.com.au>
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: Three Mile Island

Graham--That is accurate and you can get more information from Michael Marriotte or Mary Olson at NIRS (Nuclear Information and Resource Service)
nirsnet@igc.apc.org

At 05:56 AM 3/1/97 +0800, you wrote:

>Hi,

>

>A couple of days ago there was a news report on public radio here about a

>recently concluded Three Mile Island follow up study. It showed increased

>health problems downwind if the site were far higher than that expected for

>the amount of radioactivity "officially" released. eg: lung cancer was up 500

>- 600 percent). The study was carried out by America's Institute of

>Environmental Health Scientists I believe.

>

>I have not heard any re regarding this since. Can anyone confirm this

>report and can you indicate where I can get authoritative information about it?

>

>Towards a nuclear-free millennium,

>Graham Daniell

>Perth, Western Australia

>gdaniell@wt.com.au

>

>

>

Alice Slater

GRACE

Global Resource Action Center for the Environment

15 East 26 St., Room 915

New York, NY 10010

212-726-9161 (tel)

212-726-9160 (fax)

aslater@igc.apc.org <email>

From nfzpsc@gn.apc.org Mon Mar 3 16:53:46 1997

Date: Mon, 3 Mar 1997 20:30:32 GMT

From: Stewart Kemp <nfzpsc@gn.apc.org>

To: nfla.news@conf.gn.apc.org

Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Subject: UK Nuclear News 1-3 March 1997

>From: GMR@MCR1.poptel.org.uk
>Date: Mon, 03 Mar 1997 14:23:11 GMT
>Subject: NPU Bulletin 3 Mar
>To: nfznsc@gn.apc.org
>
>DAILY INFORMATION BULLETIN - NUCLEAR POLICY
>
>Mon 3 Mar 1997
>
>97-8229 German farmers use their tractors to block rail route of
> n/waste shipment. G,Ind
>97-8230 UK's #5m study into defences against missile attacks by
rogue
> Middle Eastern states still `on hold'. Ind
>
>Sun 2 Mar 1997
>
>97-8223 MoD plans laser curtain against missile attacks from Libya,
> Iran and Syria. STimes
>97-8224 Labour will reopen official investigations into causes of
Gulf
> war illnesses. SInd
>97-8225 Tories back calls for compensation for victims of Gulf war
> illnesses. STimes
>97-8226 Claims that ministers were not aware that organophosphates
were
> used in Gulf war are `ridiculous', says expert. Obs
>
>Sat 1 Mar 1997
>
>97-8219 Mass civil disobedience in Germany as authorities attempt
to
> move n/waste by train. G,T,DT
>97-8220 Slow progress in Nato expansion talks as reluctant Russia
digs
> in its heels. G,Ind,DT
>
>
>GM Research, Metropolitan House, Hobson Street, Oldham, OL1 1QD.
>Tel: 0161-911 4179. Fax: 0161-627 1736.
>Internet: gmr@mcr1.poptel.org.uk
>
>

Stewart Kemp (nfznsc@gn.apc.org)
From nfznsc@gn.apc.org Mon Mar 3 16:53:46 1997
Date: Mon, 3 Mar 1997 19:56:33 GMT
From: Stewart Kemp <nfznsc@gn.apc.org>
To: nfla.news@conf.gn.apc.org
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: UK Nuclear News 28 February 1997

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]

[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

>From: GMR@MCR1.poptel.org.uk
>Date: Fri, 28 Feb 1997 15:04:57 GMT
>Subject: npu bulletin
>To: nfznsnc@gn.apc.org

>

>rz

>**B000000000000000

>**B06000000000cd85

>**B0800000000022d

>**B0800000000022d

>OO

>Fri 28 Feb 1997

>

>97-8215 German police protecting spent fuel shipment braced for

> large-scale anti-nuclear protests Eur,DT

>

>

>

>

Stewart Kemp (nfznsnc@gn.apc.org)
From smillieb@the.link.ca Mon Mar 3 16:53:46 1997
Date: Mon, 3 Mar 1997 14:25:54 -0600
From: smillieb@the.link.ca
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Getting of the Network

Attention Abolition 2000 Caucus.
About three months ago I got onto the Abolition network. While it has been interesting I find the plethora of information is too much and I cannot possibly read it all. I find it is also jammiong up my E mail messages. I have tried different unsubscribe formula but like the "Sorcerers Apprentice" I cannot turn off the tap. Please please someone help me get off the net. I find the Canadian Project Ploughshares is enough reading on peace news. Thank you.

Ben Smillie, smillieb@the.link.ca

From MAILER-DAEMON@igc.org Tue Mar 4 14:49:26 1997
Date: Mon, 3 Mar 1997 17:15:23 -0800 (PST)
From: Mail Delivery Subsystem <MAILER-DAEMON@igc.org>
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Returned mail: User unknown

The original message was received at Mon, 3 Mar 1997 17:15:23 -0800 (PST)
from mupj

----- The following addresses had permanent fatal errors -----
The@igc.apc.org

----- Transcript of session follows -----
550 The@igc.apc.org... User unknown

[Part 2: "Included Message"]

Reporting-MTA: dns; igc6.igc.org
Arrival-Date: Mon, 3 Mar 1997 17:15:23 -0800 (PST)

Final-Recipient: RFC822; the@igc6.igc.org
Action: failed
Status: 5.1.1
Last-Attempt-Date: Mon, 3 Mar 1997 17:15:24 -0800 (PST)

[Part 3: "Included Message"]

Date: Mon, 3 Mar 1997 17:15:22 -0800 (PST)
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
To: The@igc.apc.org

Greetings!

Our e-mail address is mupj@igc.apc.org. Our fax is 301 896-0013.

With best regards,

Howard
From DGracie@afsc.org Tue Mar 4 14:49:26 1997
Date: Mon, 03 Mar 1997 17:04:54 -0500
From: David Gracie <DGracie@afsc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Report from Tahiti

My narrative report to AFSC about the Abolition 2000 meeting in

Moorea/Tahiti is now on the AFSC web page. Direct address to the index is:
<<http://www.afsc.org/mooreaix.htm>>. The report will stay on our "what's
new?" section for about a month.

From LANLaction@aol.com Tue Mar 4 14:49:26 1997

Date: Mon, 3 Mar 1997 17:22:59 -0500 (EST)

From: LANLaction@aol.com

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Subject: TO ALL: NEW E-MAIL ADDRESS

TO: ALL ABOLITION WATCHERS

FROM: PEGGY PRINCE

RE: E-MAIL LIST

Some of your groups may have my e-mail address on your own organizational
lists. I would like to continue to receive your missives, but would you
please do the following:

unsubscribe: PRINCELASG@AOL.COM

subscribe: LANLaction@aol.com

Sorry I don't know the formal way to do this, and thanks in advance for
taking care of this request (PRINCELASG..... will disappear in a few
days.)

Peace, solidarity and disarmament. Peggy Prince - Los Alamos Action Network

From hgw@scruznet.com Tue Mar 4 14:49:26 1997

Date: Mon, 3 Mar 1997 15:18:51 -0800 (PST)

From: Healing Global Wounds <hgw@scruznet.com>

To: drfrank@well.com, ien@igc.apc.org, lcnp@aol.com, davidmcr@aol.com,
shundahi@intermind.net, psrcasf@igc.apc.org, jones@admin.unr.edu,
sfraser@igc.org, lcapt@efn.org, pbergel@igc.apc.org,
godesstempl@igc.apc.org, wsdp@igc.apc.org, hadder@chem.unr.edu,
vsixkilo@cruzio.com, lmkai@igc.apc.org, LANLaction@aol.com,
madair@aol.com, nfpc@phil.gn.apc.org, opw@teleport.com,
a.malten@net.HCC.nl, hip@teleport.com, tchuang@prairienet.org,
wilpfnatl@igc.apc.org, jbarshak@mail.coffeenet.net,
cloudflowers@igc.org

Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Subject: UPDATE ON SPRING NEVADA TEST SITE GATHERING

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]

[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]

[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

Monday, March 03, 1997

Dear fellow activists:

The momentum to end the nuclear age is building force world-wide as we approach on April 6th the final 1,000 days before the next millennium.

On Feb. 22, the West Coast regional group of the Abolition 2000 network met to advance goals and strategies formed at the international Abolition 2000 conference in French Occupied Polynesia 3 weeks earlier.

Two days ago, March 1st, 15,000 people gathered in Lueneburg, Germany to protest the transport of 6 high-level nuclear waste casks, and continue to block the route to Gorleben. More than 25,000 police, the largest German police force since WW II, have been mobilized to escort the casks to this interim destination.

In the U.S., efforts are escalating to stop Senate Bill 104, which would begin similar transportation in the United States of high-level spent fuel to interim storage at Yucca Mt., within the Nevada Test Site and Western Shoshone sovereign lands.

Healing Global Wounds is working hard to live up to the challenge of providing the most productive and informative event possible for the 1997 Spring Gathering at the Nevada Test Site, now less than a month away. The Shundahai Network in Las Vegas, in addition to providing much logistical support for this gathering, is also organizing a week of blockades and actions immediately following it, to prevent the resumption of sub-critical testing and shipments of low-level waste already pouring into the Test Site every day.

HEALING GLOBAL WOUNDS EVENT SCHEDULE:

THURSDAY, MARCH 27th: 9:00 am-1:30 pm, Nonviolence and Peacekeeper Trainings.
2:30-5:00 pm, Presentations and Updates from Hibakusha delegation from Japan, Western Shoshone Defense Project, Big Mountain Relocation Resistance

FRIDAY, MARCH 28th: 9:00 am-5:00 pm, Alliance Building in a Multi-Cultural World. To protect our shared planet, it is now more imperative than ever for activists of all cultural, economic, age, and gender-identified groups to work together. Yet, we rarely take the time to understand each other. Explore alliance-building in a safe and creative setting for one full day with the help of three skilled professional trainers.

2:00 pm, NDE Good Friday Service, Stations of the Nuclear Cross.

SATURDAY, MARCH 29th: 9:00-1:30, Nuclear Waste: Generation, Transportation & Storage:

Corbin Harney (Western Shoshone spiritual leader and Director of Shundahai Ntwk)

Lea Fouchee (Prairie Island Coalition and Indigenous Womens Network)

Dallas Gudgell (Snake River Alliance and Military Production Network)

2:30-3:30 pm, Indigenous Delegation from Taiwan & Mongolia
3:30-5:00, International Roundtable on Abolition 2000 Movement
8:00 pm, Ceremony at the Goddess Temple, led by Starhawk;
Easter Vigil Mass at NTS

EASTER SUNDAY, MARCH 30th: Raffle Drawing to support Corbin Harneys speaking tours

11:00 am: Circle of Rebirth Ceremony and Direct Action at NTS,
led by Corbin Harney & Starhawk

2:30 Nonviolence Training in preparation for ANA! actions, March 31-April 4.

MONDAY, MARCH 31st: Critical Mass Action to Shut the Test Site Down!

There are a lot of wonderful forces coming together at this years event, from many diverse groups. We are expecting the largest international community ever, including a chartered bus of indigenous people from Taiwan and Mongolia. With this kind of unity, well have them shut down in no time at all!

In addition to the HGW Gathering, many related and interlocking events have been scheduled.

Nuclear Free Newe Sogobia Gathering for Native peoples, near Yucca Mt.. In support of the Western Shoshone National Councils resolution that their nation is a Nuclear Free Zone. March 21-23. Contact Virginia Sanchez at Citizen Alert Native American Program for more information: (702) 863-0258.

Lenten Desert Experience, Holy Week Walk and Easter weekend services. Lenten retreats at the Nevada Test Site. Holy Week Walk leaves DOE headquarters in Las Vegas on March 23rd, Palm Sunday, arriving at the Test Site Friday, March 28th. Contact NDE at (702) 646-4814 or nde@igc.apc.org.

Action Training Camp on Alliance for Atomic Veterans land, March 23-March 26th. Organizing, Media, and Nonviolence trainings to prepare for ANA actions to follow, and build skills for community organizing at home. Contact Shundahai Network at (702) 647-3095 or shundahi@intermind.net.

Council of Women to End the Nuclear Age, March 26-27 at the Sekhmet Temple in Cactus Springs, NV. International womens conference focusing on women organizing women for a nuclear-free planet. Contact Feminists for a Compassionate Society at (612) 447-6222 or nukemuse@igc.org.

Action For Nuclear Abolition! Camp, March 31-April 4 at the NTS. Five days of creative nonviolent direct action to shut the Test Site down. April 1: Nuclear Fools Day of Action, a parade in Las Vegas leading to an action at the DOE headquarters, with the life-size mock nuclear waste cask, giant puppets and other creative effects. Contact Shundahai Network at (702) 647-3095 or shundahi@intermind.net.

In order to come together with respect and joy, We are implementing a Village format for Peace Camp, so everyone can join a community comfortable to them. Designated camping areas are provided for Healing Global Wounds,

surrounding the Native ceremonial grounds; Action for Nuclear Abolition!, including the Action Support Tent; Nevada Desert Experience; and the Council of Women. Central and shared facilities include the Kitchen, Registration, First Aid, Main Meeting Tent, Community Cafe and Evening Campfire. Daily Sunrise Ceremonies will be led by Corbin Harney, and Sweatlodges will be led before dinner each day, open to all.

We have every indication that this years Gathering will be the largest and most dynamic in many years. We hope that your group can join us at this important time and engage in shutting the Nevada Test Site down! Please bring your own table and literature to share with everyone about your groups activities. Some shuttles are available from the Las Vegas Airport, through Shundahai Network. HGW is asking for a donation of \$25 per person for registration, to help cover the costs of invited speakers, meals, water and toilets. ANA is asking for a separate registration fee of \$25 for the Direct Action Camp, March 31-April 4. No one will be turned away. In addition, if you are able to bring bulk food donations for the kitchen, and volunteer for tasks to keep the camp running smoothly, it will be greatly appreciated. It would be very helpful to let the office know how you plan to assist ahead of time.

Also, our raffle to support the ongoing speaking tours of Corbin Harney is the only financial support we give him. Raffle prizes are always greatly appreciated, and are a good way to publicize your groups video or T-shirt. Last year, we were able to raise nearly \$700. This year, we expect a larger group of people, so with inspiring raffle prizes, we should be able to raise \$1,000, enough to completely support his travels for one month.

This office will not be staffed from March 21 through April 6th, as we will be in Nevada. Inquiries can be directed to the Shundahai Network office in Las Vegas, at (702) 647-3095, during that time.

SEPARATE FLYER :

ALLIANCE BUILDING IN A MULTI-CULTURAL WORLD

Friday, March 28, 1997, 9:00 am-5:00 pm
Nevada Test Site, HGW Spring Gathering

AN ALL-DAY WORKSHOP FOR SOCIAL ACTIVISTS OFFERED BY HEALING GLOBAL WOUNDS

Effective alliance-building to protect our shared planet and dwindling natural resources from mega-ravaging by multi-national corporations and collusive governments now involves reaching across social barriers more than

ever before. As we enter the final 1,000 days before the next millennium, it is imperative for activists of all cultural, economic, age and gender-identified groups to work together. However, we rarely take the time to look up from our issue-driven work to learn more about each other.

Too often, the unique gifts and particular protocols of individual groups are not honored in the stampede to get things done. Many white activists struggling against the strictures of family, community and government are not aware of how many beliefs and protocols they retain from the dominant society, and how this impacts their interaction with others. Minority groups with gentler communication methods are often overshadowed and uncomfortable about speaking out. The cycle continues, and everyone pays the price.

Healing Global Wounds is pleased to offer an opportunity at the 97 Nevada Test Site Spring Gathering to explore alliance-building in a safe and creative setting for one full day, with the help of three skilled professional trainers. All interested people are encouraged to join us from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm. This training is made possible by a grant from the Environmental Support Center.

Tools For Change Trained Facilitators:

Margo Adair: Founder of Tools For Change, an adult education institute providing training in personal transformation, communications skills and social change work. Author of *Working Inside Out*, political activist, facilitator and mediator.

Bill Aal: Anti-racist and profeminist environmental activist. Facilitator of mens caucuses in Bioregional movement; leader of activist and mens support groups.

Dallas Gudgell: Sioux activist, lobbyist and environmental consultant. Board member of the Snake River Alliance and member of the Military Production Networks Legislative Action Coordinating Committee.

For the liberation of all life from the nuclear nightmare,

Jennifer Olaranna Viereck
Healing Global Wounds
e-mail- hgw@scruznet.com
Phone- 408-338-0147
Fax- 408-338-6408
PO Box 13, Boulder Creek, CA 95006, USA

A member of the Abolition 2000 Network

HGW Spring Gathering at the Nevada Test Site: March 27-31
Action for Nuclear Abolition Camp: March 31-April 4
Ask for an information packet from shundahi@intermind.net

"We think that if the powerful countries would reduce their weapons arsenals, we could have peace. But if we look deeply into the weapons, we see our own minds-- our prejudices, fears, and ignorances. Even if we transport all the bombs to the moon, the roots of war and the roots of bombs will still be here, in our bodies and our minds. Non-violence means we strive to act and speak with love and compassion."

Thik Nhat Hanh

Honor the elders;
Protect the children;
Protect the Earth;
Don't be lazy!

Floyd 'Red Crow' Westerman

From rwilcock@execulink.com Tue Mar 4 14:49:26 1997
Date: Mon, 3 Mar 1997 21:47:20 -0500
From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>
To: "Abolition Caucus List (E-mail)" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>
Cc: "Alice Slater (E-mail)" <aslater@igc.apc.org>
Subject: The Abolition 2000 Database

The Abolition 2000 Endorsers List (<http://www.web.net/~pgs/pages/endorg.html>) currently shows 700 organizations but this is only a part of the story. [This study developed from Alice Slater's query about communicating with endorsers and supporters.]

There is also a database of endorsing organizations "address data" which should correspond with the WWW List but has the following statistics.

Total A2000 WWW List	700
----------------------	-----

Total A2000 database entries	665
------------------------------	-----

Prospects for email and/or fax mailing:

+Email	190	
+Fax, -Email	3	
+Tel, -Fax, -Email	2	
Prospects for Surface Mailing:		
no-(Fax, Eml)	303	
no-(Addr, Tel, Fax, Eml)		94
no-(Person, Addr, Tel, Fax, Eml)		127
no-(Country, Addr, Tel, Fax, Eml)	8	
Usable surface mail addresses (Not checking postal code)		193
Surface mail addresses with pcode	136	
Entries capable of verification:		
Electronically (tel, fax, eml)	190	
By surface mail		193
Total	383	

There is another potential list of individuals who signed the A2000 Petition (<http://www.web.net/~pgs/pages/peta2000.html>) during the last year now comprising 80 names and email signatures.

There are 35 entries on the WWW endorsers list not in the database, and a few database entries are not in the WWW list.

It is possible that address data, particularly fax and email could be outdated in some cases. This study and interpretation is the "best available guess" and comment is invited.

Japan is the only country to my knowledge in which someone has taken the trouble to check all entries and correct omissions and mistakes. Well done Japan!

Ross Wilcock
 rwilcock@web.net
<http://web.net.pgs/~pgs/>

From rwilcock@execulink.com Tue Mar 4 14:49:26 1997
 Date: Mon, 3 Mar 1997 21:17:14 -0500
 From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>
 To: "Abolition Caucus List (E-mail)" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>
 Subject: Bill Gates' New Project?

>From Russian Press Electronic Courier/ Happy Russia!

#Russian rockets will carry the Internet

The Microsoft company plans to use Russian intercontinental ballistic missiles to take 840 satellites to orbit in its project to expand the Internet. The project's financial conditions are currently being discussed. It is supposed to use SS-18 missiles, which are subject to destruction, as the rocket carriers. (Kapital)

Ross Wilcock

rwilcock@web.net

<http://web.net.pgsl/~pgs/>

[Comment: No hint of NATO wrangles here? This is what I call a real conversion/recycling project!]

From cnic-jp@po.ijnet.or.jp Tue Mar 4 14:49:26 1997

Date: Tue, 4 Mar 1997 15:04:51 +0900

From: Citizens' Nuclear Information Center <cnic-jp@po.ijnet.or.jp>

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Cc: nukenet@envirolink.org, Jan.vande.putte@green2.greenpeace.org,
shaun.burnie@green2.greenpeace.org, damon.moglen@green2.greenpeace.org,
amsmith@gol.com

Subject: Re: Error in CNIC's Update on Japan's MOX Utilization Policy

[The following text is in the "ISO-2022-JP" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

MESSAGE TO ALL INTERESTED READERS OF CNIC'S RECENT UPDATE ON JAPAN'S
MOX
UTILIZATION POLICY.

Please note a foolish mistake in the update. On the last page Kashiwazaki City is listed as being in Fukushima Prefecture (Japan's East coast), it is actually in Niigata Prefecture (the West coast).

My apologies for the mistake.

Yours Sincerely,
Harry Sigerson.

Citizens' Nuclear Information Center
1-59-14-302, Higashi-nakano
Nakano-ku, Tokyo 164, JAPAN
phone:81-3-5330-9520, fax:81-3-5330-9530
e-mail:cnic-jp@po.ijnet.or.jp / cnic@kiwi.co.jp

From A.Malten@net.HCC.nlTue Mar 4 14:49:26 1997
Date: Tue, 4 Mar 1997 09:18:59 +0100 (MET)
From: Ak Malten <A.Malten@net.HCC.nl>
To: smillieb@the.link.ca, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: Getting of the Network

Dear Ben Smillie,

you wrote:

> Attention Abolition 2000 Caucus.
>About three months ago I got onto the Abolition network. While it has been
>interesting I find the plethora of information is too much and I cannot
>possibly read it all. I find it is also jammiong up my E mail messages. i
>have tried different unsubscribe formula but like the "Sorcerers Apprentice"
>I cannot turn off the tap.
>Please please someone help me get off the net. I find the Canadian Project
>Ploughshares is enough reading on peace news.
>Thank you.
>Ben Smillie, smillieb@the.link.ca
>
>

I hope the following will help you to unsubscribe.

In the description below items contained in []'s are optional. When providing the item, do not include the []'s around it.

unsubscribe <list> [<address>]

Unsubscribe yourself (or <address> if specified) from the named <list>.

end

Stop processing commands (useful if your mailer adds a signature).

Commands should be sent in the body of an email message to "Majordomo@igc.org".

Commands in the "Subject:" line are NOT processed.

If you have any questions or problems, please contact "Majordomo-Owner@igc.org".

Succes in unsubscribing yourself.

Ak Malten,

GANA.

The Global Anti-Nuclear Alliance (GANA) -- is a member of
The Abolition 2000 Network, A Global Network to Eliminate
Nuclear Weapons

Address: c/o Ak Malten
Irisstraat 134 Tel:+31.70.3608905
2565TP The Hague Fax:+31.70.3608905
The Netherlands E-Mail: A.Malten@net.HCC.nl

GANA's website: <http://www.inter.nl.net/hcc/A.Malten>

The ICJ Advisory Opinion on Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons,
including ALL the Separate Opinions of ALL the Judges,
the Canberra Report and the CTBT Text and Protocol can be
found at:

<http://www.inter.nl.net/hcc/A.Malten/docs.html>

From A.Malten@net.HCC.nl Tue Mar 4 14:49:26 1997
Date: Tue, 4 Mar 1997 10:35:09 +0100 (MET)
From: Ak Malten <A.Malten@net.HCC.nl>
To: LANLaction@aol.com, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: TO ALL: NEW E-MAIL ADDRESS

Dear Peggy,

you wrote:

>TO: ALL ABOLITION WATCHERS

>FROM: PEGGY PRINCE

>RE: E-MAIL LIST

>

>Some of your groups may have my e-mail address on your own organizational

>lists. I would like to continue to receive your missives, but would you

>please do the following:

>

>unsubscribe: PRINCELASG@AOL.COM

>

>subscribe: LANLaction@aol.com

>

>Sorry I don't know the formal way to do this, and thanks in advance for
>taking care of this request (PRINCELASG..... will disappear in a few
>days.)
>
>Peace, solidarity and disarmament. Peggy Prince - Los Alamos Action Network
>
>

I hope the following will help you to unsubscribe AND to subscribe yourself
under a different e-mail address to our listserver.

In the description below items contained in []'s are optional. When
providing the item, do not include the []'s around it.

```
unsubscribe <list> [<OLD address>]  
Unsubscribe yourself (or <OLD address> if specified) from the named  
<list>.
```

```
subscribe <list> [<NEW address>]  
Subscribe yourself (or <NEW address> if specified) to the named  
<list>.
```

```
end  
Stop processing commands (useful if your mailer adds a signature).
```

Commands should be sent in the body of an email message to
"Majordomo@igc.org".

Commands in the "Subject:" line are NOT processed.

If you have any questions or problems, please contact
"Majordomo-Owner@igc.org".

Success in unsubscribing your old address and subscribe yourself to our
e-mail listserver under a new e-mail address.

Ak Malten,

GANNA.

The Global Anti-Nuclear Alliance (GANNA) -- is a member of
The Abolition 2000 Network, A Global Network to Eliminate
Nuclear Weapons

Address: c/o Ak Malten

Irisstraat 134 Tel:+31.70.3608905
2565TP The Hague Fax:+31.70.3608905
The Netherlands E-Mail: A.Malten@net.HCC.nl

GANAs website: <http://www.inter.nl.net/hcc/A.Malten>

The ICJ Advisory Opinion on Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons,
including ALL the Separate Opinions of ALL the Judges,
the Canberra Report and the CTBT Text and Protocol can be
found at:

<http://www.inter.nl.net/hcc/A.Malten/docs.html>

From psrpg@igc.apc.org Tue Mar 4 14:49:26 1997
Date: Tue, 4 Mar 1997 07:32:12 -0800 (PST)
From: Nora Johnson <psrpg@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: the cost of nuclear weapons

Abolitionists:

On Saturday, I am taking part in a workshop sponsored by the Citizens Budget Campaign of Western Pennsylvania. There will be 4 sessions: Cutting the military budget, Privatization: who wins, who loses?, How will welfare cuts impact western PA, and Focusing on inequality.

As part of the session on cutting the military budget, I am collecting information on the cost of the nuclear buildup. I'd like to hear, from anyone who can contribute, where might be the best sources of information on nuclear testing, development and deployment. I'm interested in the total costs since 1945, and also what percentage of our annual budgets in recent years was allocated to the nuclear weapons. I have some materials, but would be most grateful if knowledgeable people could contribute.

Thanks very much! I hope to hear soon!

Nora Johnson
psrpg@igc.apc.org
From abolition@motherearth.knooppunt.be Tue Mar 4 14:49:26 1997
Date: Tue, 4 Mar 97 16:43:52 +0100
From: Motherearth Office Bel <abolition@motherearth.knooppunt.be>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, fme@knooppunt.be
Subject: Good and Bad news

>From : Tom Keunen - For Mother Earth

For : For Mother Earth (fme@knooppunt.be)
Abolition caucus (abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org)

Concerns : * update FME-events
 * Chernobyl 11+ Parade cancelled

Dear friends,

An update from Gent, (Belgium) with good and bad news.

We start with the bad.

The bad news !
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

A couple of months ago we announced the "Parade For Mother Earth", a walk/bike-tour from Brussels to the Mochovce NPP (Slovakia), to oppose the Western nuclear industry moving to Central and Eastern Europe, as almost all plans for new nuclear power plants were cancelled in the West.

Because of organisational challenges and personal issues, I felt compelled to cancel this project. It wasn't an easy decision, and today I wish to send my apology to everybody who invested time in this project and people who were planning to join.

The good news !
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

But with this message we can share info on some other projects which will happen in the upcoming months.

For Mother Earth is preparing :

- * Chernobyl 11+ commemoration on April 26th 1997
- * non-violent blockades of the Temelin NPP (CZ) - July 1997
- * an international peace camp in Belgium (August 1 -11 1997)
 and actions for the abolition of nuclear weapons (August 9th)
- * a uranium tour with Indigenous People through Europe (fall 1997)

* ... and finally a Free Tibet Bike Tour 1999 - fifty years after the Chinese invasion.

Read the attached message for details.

Sincerely,

Tom Keunen
For Mother Earth International collective
Gewad 15, 9000 Gent, Belgium
Phone +32-9-233 49 24
Fax 233 73 02

XX
Upcoming international For Mother Earth events
XX

March 8th - 9th 1997 'Nuclear Weapons Abolition Day' in Gent (B)
First international prep. meeting

Activists from Belgium, Netherlands,
Germany, UK & ... are joining to prepare
this global day of protest, using the
ruling of the International Court of Justice

* info : int@fme.knooppunt.be
Lange Steenstraat 16/d
9000 Gent
Tel:+32+9 233 84 39
Fax:+32+9 233 84 39

April 26th 1997 Chernobyl 11+ commemoration,

could be done linking it to the actual
issues of Temelin, Mochovce, Rovno and
Khmelnitsky NPP's

info : veerle@motherearth.knooppunt.be

For Mother Earth
Gewad 15,
9000 Gent, Belgium
Phone +32-9-233 49 24
Fax 233 73 02

July 6th - 14th 1997 Non-violent blockade Temelin NPP (CZ)
organized by Hnuti Duha (FoE CZ) & PIANO
Five hundred Czechs and 200 internationals
are expected for this action.

info : piano@ecn.cz

PIANO
Chvalova 3/1105
13000 Praha 3
Czech Republic
Tel:+42+2 90000 6109

July 1st - 3rd 1997 International FME meeting at camp near
Temelin NPP (CZ).

info : int@fme.knooppunt.be

August 1st-11th 1997 INTERNATIONAL PEACE CAMP - BELGIUM
The peace camp is set up to support the
international nuclear weapons abolition
days, with actions on Hiroshima and
Nagasaki Days

August 6th 1997 Hiroshima commemoration

Nuclear Weapons Abolition Day with
international newsconference and
non-violent action at NATO HQ in Brussels

August 9th 1997 Nagasaki commemoration

Nuclear Weapons Abolition Day (continued)
with actions at 'places of crime' around
the globe. Activists are called to use
the ruling of the international court in
actions to abolish nuclear weapons at sites with
nuclear weapons (i.e. Belgium, Netherlands,
Germany, UK, Italy, Greece, USA, Russia,
Israel, France....) or at nuclear weapon
labs (i.e. Los Alamos, Burghfield,
Livermore, Aldermaston, ...)

In Belgium the peace camp will move near
the base of Kleine Brogel, the Belgian site
with US B-61 nukes.

If you want to join international peace camp in Belgium, please contact us ahead of time.

info : int@fme.knooppunt.be
tom@motherearth.knooppunt.be

Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days
For Mother Earth
Lange Steenstraat 16/D,
9000 Gent - Belgium

Phone +32-9-233 84 39 (pol)
233 49 24 (tom)
Fax 233 73 02

October 10th 1997 Start European Uranium Speaking Tour in Brussels with Indigenous Peoples representatives and non-violent action, newsconference, etc...

info : rverjauw@dma.be

Uranium Tour
For Mother Earth
Overstraat 80,
3020 Veltem, Belgium

March 10th 1999 Start 'Free Tibet Bike Tour'

50 years after Chinese invasion
40 years after national Tibetan uprising
UN building in Geneva - Switzerland

Note : a base-camp for participants will start end of February !!

October 12th 1999 Planned arrival 'Free Tibet Bike Tour'

International Day of Solidarity
with Indigenous Peoples
end bike-tour at Nepalese - Tibetan
border

info : tibet@motherearth.knooppunt.be

Free Tibet Bike Tour
For Mother Earth
Lange Steenstraat 16/D, 9000 Gent
9000 Gent
Belgium
Tel:+32+9 233 49 24
Fax:+32+9 233 73 02

Yes, you can be a 'busy bee' till the turn of the millenium !!

Get in touch with us if you want more details.

For Mother Earth
International Working Group

Tom Keunen
Gewad 15
9000 Gent
Belgium

Tel: +32+9 233 49 24
Fax: +32+9 233 73 02

E-mail: tom@motherearth.knooppunt.be

or the international office of For Mother Eart

E-mail: int@fme.knooppunt.be

From brucehall@igc.org Tue Mar 4 14:49:27 1997
Date: Tue, 4 Mar 1997 09:24:32 -0800 (PST)
From: Bruce Hall <brucehall@igc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, psrpgh@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: the cost of nuclear weapons

Call Steve Swartz who heads up the U.S. Nuclear Weapons Cost Study Project at 202 797 6003. This guy can crunch numbers all the down to the neutron. They have a web page as well but I've forgotten it.

Also,

Someone gave me a photocopy of a recent "Harper's Index" Enjoy

"Percentage of federal spending on entitlement programs that goes to programs for the poor: 23

Percentage of budget cuts to entitlements made by the 104th Congress

that will come from those programs: 93

Percentage of Americans who believe that Joan of Arc is Noah's wife: 12"

>

> Abolitionists:

>

> On Saturday, I am taking part in a workshop sponsored by the Citizens Budget

> Campaign of Western Pennsylvania. There will be 4 sessions: Cutting the

> military budget, Privatization: who wins, who loses?, How will welfare cuts

> impact western PA, and Focusing on inequality.

>

> As part of the session on cutting the military budget, I am collecting

> information on the cost of the nuclear buildup. I'd like to hear, from

> anyone who can contribute, where might be the best sources of information on

> nuclear testing, development and deployment. I'm interested in the total

> costs since 1945, and also what percentage of our annual budgets in recent

> years was allocated to the nuclear weapons. I have some materials, but

> would be most grateful if knowledgeable people could contribute.

>

> Thanks very much! I hope to hear soon!

>

> Nora Johnson

> psrpg@igc.apc.org

From wandwill@clark.net Tue Mar 4 14:49:27 1997

Date: Tue, 4 Mar 1997 15:25:23 -0500 (EST)

From: WAND/WILL <wandwill@clark.net>

To: wandwill@clark.net

Subject: Frank/Wyden Forum on Budget Trends and Implications on Social Programs

Congress of the United States

Washington, DC 20515

February 14, 1997

Dear Friend,

We invite you to join us in organizing now to wage the most important battle that faces those of us who believe that the federal government has a significant role to play in helping improve the quality of our lives: substantially reducing the national security budget to free up tens of billions of dollars to be used for other important governmental purposes.

Whether one agrees or not, the federal government is now on a path to achieve a zero deficit according to current accounting rules by the year 2002. To reach that goal, the federal government will have to make substantial reductions in discretionary spending. And unless a very

significant amount of those reductions come from wasteful expenditures in the military and intelligence budgets, virtually every other function of the federal government will be decimated.

Those of us who believe we should be doing more to protect our environment, help educate poor children, fulfill our commitment to the nation's elderly, improve our transportation infrastructure, increase our effort to deal with homelessness, aid workers faced with the loss of their current jobs because of technology, improve the quality of life in our cities, and a number of other areas are confronted by a very stark fact: if current budget trends continue, the likelihood is that federal efforts in every one of these areas will be decreased rather than increased, unless we make substantial reductions in the national security budget.

The Clinton administration's budget proposal bears this out -- unacceptable cuts have already been proposed in such important areas as housing for low income and elderly people, and low income home energy assistance. And these are only the beginning of the devastation that will result if current budget trends are carried forward.

We intend to spend much of 1997 trying to change this situation, by proposing alternative budgets and by seeking to reduce military spending. Obviously we cannot achieve all of the reductions we think useful in one year. But we agree with those national security experts who argue that the military budget can be cut on an appropriate schedule by tens of billions of dollars from current level, and we know as a fact that unless this is done, virtually every other government program will suffer grievously. We are therefore inviting you to a day long forum to discuss these issues with Members of Congress and policy experts. The event will take place on March 10, beginning at 9:30 a.m. in room 1100 of the Longworth House Office Building. We hope you will join us in the planning and organizing that will be necessary if we are to succeed in this important task.

If you have questions about this, please call Michael Treisman in Congressman Barney Frank's office at (202) 225-5931 or Steve Jennings in Senator Wyden's office at (202) 224-5244. We look forward to seeing you there.

Signed by Congressman Barney Frank and Senator Ron Wyden

REDEFINING NATIONAL SECURITY:
WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS FOR OUR SOCIAL PROGRAMS

Monday, March 10
1100 Longworth Building

9:30 A.M. - 3:00 P.M.

Schedule

9:30 A.M. - WELCOME PRESS CONFERENCE

Announce grassroots effort and support for properly balancing the federal budget. Unveil alternative defense budget which will free up funds for other national security priorities.

10:00 A.M. - 11:30 A.M. - MILITARY BUDGET PANEL

* Rep. Ron Dellums (D-CA), Ranking Minority Member on the House National Security Committee, speaks about redefining national security strategy and its implications for defense spending and investment

* Panel discussion on the current military budget:
Larry Korb, Brookings Institution
Randi Forsberg, Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies
John Steinbruner, Brookings Institution

11:30 A.M. - 1:00 P.M. - SOCIAL PROGRAMS PANEL

* Panel discussion on social programs further explores our current domestic crisis and the repercussions for not confronting it.

Robert Greenstein, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities
Gerry Shea, AFL-CIO
Max Richtman, National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare
Celinda Lake, Lake Research
Dale Laestina, National Education Association
Gene Karpinski, US PIRG
John Cavanaugh, Institute on Policy Studies

1:00 P.M. - Informal lunch and discussion

2:00 P.M. - 3:00 P.M. - LEGISLATIVE STRATEGY PANEL

Senator Ron Wyden (D-OR) and Congressman Barney Frank (D-MA) lead discussion on the legislative strategy for better balancing military spending against urgent domestic program priorities.

Women's Action for New Directions (WAND)

Deborah Walden, WAND Director of Policy and Programs

Women Legislators' Lobby (WiLL)

Cynthia Campbell, WiLL Washington Director

110 Maryland Avenue, N.E., Suite 205

Washington, D.C. 20002

voice: 202/543-8505

fax: 202/675-6469

e-mail: wandwill@clark.net

WAND's mission is to empower women to act politically to reduce violence and militarism and redirect military resources toward human and environmental needs.

WiLL (the Women Legislator's Lobby) is the only national multi-partisan network of women state legislators working to influence public policy at the federal level, and to ensure that our nation's spending priorities meet human and environmental needs. WiLL includes women legislators from all 50 states, representing millions of constituents. One in three women state legislators is a WiLL member.

From kschultz@mail.cdi.orgTue Mar 4 17:33:12 1997
Date: Tue, 4 Mar 1997 18:30:32 -0500
From: kathryn schultz <kschultz@mail.cdi.org>
To: Nora Johnson <psrpgh@igc.apc.org>
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: the cost of nuclear weapons

Nora,

Two web pages to check out on nuclear weapons cost issues:
<http://www.cdi.org/issues/nukef&f/>
<http://www.brook.edu/FP/PROJECTS/NUCWOST/WEAPONS.HTM>

The majority of work on the subject of the cost of nuclear weapons has been done by Steve Schwartz. He heads up the Nuclear Weapons Cost Study Project at Brookings.

Steve estimates that the United States has incurred costs of about \$3.9 trillion for its nuclear arsenal between 1940 and 1995. About .4 trillion of this is for legacies of the bomb (cleaning up the environmental mess, etc.). Thus, CDI says that the United States spent an estimated \$3.5 Trillion to prepare to fight a nuclear war. Spending did not end with the collapse of the Soviet Union. In FY 1997, I estimate that the U.S. will spend \$24.6 billion to prepare to fight a nuclear war.

Building, operating, and maintaining strategic nuclear weapons:
1997: \$11.3 billion*
97-01: \$56.5 billion**

Operating and maintaining tactical nuclear weapons:
1997: \$1.0 billion ***
97-01: \$5.0 billion

Maintaining and upgrading our Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence capabilities in support of the nuclear arsenal (C3I):
1997: \$7.8 billion ***
97-01: \$39 billion

Stockpile Stewardship:
1997: \$4.0 billion****
97-01: \$20 billion

NMD:
1997: \$.5 billion*****
97-01: \$2.0 billion

TOTAL 1997: \$24.6 billion
TOTAL 97-01: \$122.5 billion

Methodology:

* Includes \$10.9 Billion figure from CBO option for 6,000 deployed strategic warhead option from October 1991 study "The START Treaty and Beyond" + \$.36

Billion for acquisition of addition D-5s from August 1996 CBO study "Reducing the Deficit: Spending and Revenue Options." This number is consistent with Perry's 20 September 1994 assertion (and the adjustments to the U.S. strategic stockpile since) that at the time we were spending \$12.4 billion on strategic nuclear systems.

** All 97-01 figures are derived based on multiplying the 1997 figure by five with the exception of NMD and Stockpile Stewardship.

*** Based on estimates from CBO's October 1991 study.

**** Stockpile stewardship number as widely reported. (It does not include waste management, clean-up, or any of the other positive activities)

***** The National Missile Defense (NMD) portion of Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) activities. It is widely viewed that NMD would be an essential component should the United States actually fight an all-out nuclear war. For breakdown of NMD numbers, see my fact sheet on the web or in The Last 15 Minutes. My numbers are derived from 1997 FYDP as published in Defense Week, 5 March 1996.

This number has steadily decreased from Cold War days. These are the numbers that I have. Remember, there's no line item for this stuff. It's based on comparing numerous line items in the federal budget with various studies and official statements.

1997: \$24.6 Billion to prepare to fight a nuclear war. Still about \$2.2 Billion (the cost of one B-2 bomber) to prevent a nuclear war.
1995: \$27 Billion to prepare to fight a nuclear war. \$2.2 Billion to prevent a nuclear war.
1994: \$31 Billion to prepare to fight a nuclear war.
1993: \$38 Billion.
1990: \$70 Billion.
1984: \$65 Billion.
1983: \$52 Billion.

Hope this answers your questions.

Kathryn

```
=====
Kathryn R. Schultz
Senior Research Analyst
Center for Defense Information
1500 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Suite 24
Washington, DC 20005
202-862-0700 (Phone)
202-862-0708 (Fax)
kschultz@cdi.org (E-mail)
http://www.cdi.org (CDI's home page)
http://www.cdi.org/kschultz (personal home page)
=====
```

From disarmament@igc.org Wed Mar 5 07:42:59 1997
Date: Tue, 4 Mar 1997 18:24:48 -0800 (PST)
From: disarmament@igc.org
To: ctb-followers@igc.org
Subject: New Disarmament Friends and Vehicles

WALL STREET JOURNAL

MARCH 4, 1997

"NO NUKES? NOT YET"

By Ashton Carter & John M. Deutch

What is the purpose of U.S. nuclear weapons? During the Cold War the answer was obvious: to deter Soviet aggression. The number and types of warheads the U.S. needed were determined by the calculus of the Single Integrated Operation Plan, which prescribed a level of damage to be inflicted on Soviet civil and military targets in a hypothetical exchange of strategic weapons.

In December retired Gens. George Lee Butler, former commander of the U.S. Strategic Air Command, and Andrew Goodpaster, former supreme allied commander in Europe, sparked a debate on the future of the U.S. nuclear arsenal with their provocative call for the world-wide elimination of nuclear weapons. While we believe their call for abolition is much too optimistic, they are right to remind us that the U.S. and Russian strategic arsenals have not adapted fast enough to reflect the changed conditions of the post-Cold War world. In particular, the SIOP calculus is no longer the appropriate method of determining the size of the U.S. nuclear force.

The principal purpose of nuclear policy in the new world should be to reduce the risk of nuclear proliferation to other nations and rogue forces, including terrorists. Of particular concern is the possibility that the Soviet Union's disintegration will enable these entities to acquire "loose nukes." The objective of preventing proliferation is served by such global pacts as the recently renewed Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. And the U.S. has been responding to the "loose nukes" problem through the pioneering Nunn-Lugar program, through which the U.S. underwrites disposal of ex-Soviet warheads. Such measures are more important in the new world than negotiated U.S.-Russian reductions of excess Cold War arsenals.

Still, now is the time to chart a path ahead for negotiated arms control. Three years ago, the Department of Defense conducted a Nuclear Posture Review for President Clinton. The review concluded that nuclear weapons play a smaller role in U.S. security than they have at anytime in the nuclear age. In the new era, the risk of nuclear use would arise from parties whose conventional military power could not match ours and who would seek nuclear weapons as "equalizers." Accordingly, the review

urged continued funding for a strong Nunn-Lugar program, and it stressed new nonnuclear capabilities in our defense program, including theater antimissile defenses, to counter proliferation.

The Nuclear Posture Review recognized that a further stage of negotiated arms control would need to follow Start II (the strategic arms reduction treaty that now faces ratification by the Russian Parliament). But it focused on dealing with the immediate consequences of the new world. It recommended that the U.S. not make unilateral reductions in its strategic forces; such reductions would have to wait until Start I became effective and Russia ratified Start II.

The review did, however, recommend further reductions in nonstrategic nuclear forces, which are not covered by Start. It noted that Russia retained 10,000 to 15,000 such weapons, between seven and ten times as many as the U.S. This was more than Russia needed for its defense, and more than it could safely protect from any internal revolution. Some Russians were beginning to look to nuclear weapons as a way of compensating for Russia's economic, political and conventional military weakness - an example of the military "equalizing" tendency we feared.

The Nuclear Posture Review set a course for the period before Start II ratification. President Clinton rightly approved all its recommendations. Today the implementation of Start I is almost complete. Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine are nuclear-free. Spending on Nunn-Lugar approaches \$2 billion. Cooperative programs to safeguard nuclear weapons in Russia are under way; programs for fissile materials are following, but slowly.

It is time to look at the next phase - the first truly post-Soviet phase - of arms reductions, assuming of course that Russia ratifies Start II, which is far from certain. For the new phase, we urge two conceptual departures from past arms control practice.

First, establish a continuous process of negotiating nuclear weapons reductions - call it a Continuous Arms Reduction Talks. Initially these talks would be bilateral. Unlike Start, CART would cover all nuclear weapons, strategic and nonstrategic. The process should lay out a trajectory to reduce total U.S. and Russian holdings drastically from their current levels of many thousands to between 1,500 and 2,500 on each side. Nonstrategic weapons would be included in arms control for the first time, creating new verification challenges. The quantity limited by CART would be a nation's total holdings of nuclear warheads.

Accompanying discussions should take place with other nuclear powers to define a second, multilateral phase of CART in which their nuclear arsenals would be reduced as U.S. and Russian inventories declined below the level achieved in the bilateral phase of CART. With the U.S. nuclear power reduced this much, the arsenals of other states than Russia, and their motivations for

having them, could not be ignored. Reducing nuclear weapons to zero is not practical or desirable until there is assurance that all nations will do so. Accordingly, at this stage, the U.S. would reduce its nuclear arsenal only in proportion to reductions by others.

Second under CART a nuclear warhead would not be removed from accounting when it was removed from the active forces and its delivery system destroyed, as has been the case since the beginning of arms control. It would not be counted as "eliminated" until it was deactivated and dismantled, its fissile material made secure and ready for eventual disposal. Requiring true elimination would require much more openness in the dismantlement process in each country. The operation of the Nunn-Lugar program provides a valuable basis for such openness and cooperation.

Many hoped the end of the Cold War would bring immediate new opportunities for arms control. But the initial effect of the breakup of the Soviet Union was in fact to create new challenges to the realization of the Cold War's Start I and II agreements. If Russia ramifies Start II, the post-Cold War phase of reductions can at last begin. But these talks should reflect the objectives of U.S. nuclear policy in the new era, which revolve around preventing their spread as well as deterring aggression. What follows Start II should differ from its predecessor not just in magnitude, but in kind.

Mr. Carter, a professor of science and international affairs at Harvard's John F. Kennedy School of Government, was formerly assistant secretary of defense for international security policy in the Clinton administration. Mr. Deutch, a professor at MIT, was formerly deputy secretary of defense and director of central intelligence in the Clinton administration.

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005
Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 Fax: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>
From int@fme.knooppunt.be Wed Mar 5 07:42:59 1997
Date: Wed, 05 Mar 1997 02:57:35
From: Pol D'Huyvetter <int@fme.knooppunt.be>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Weekly Uranium Institute News Briefing on Abolition ??

Concerns : To be or not to be forwarded?
That's the question.

Dear Abolitionists,

The pro-nuclear 'Uranium Institute' continues to publish a brief weekly News Briefing (NB) with a collection of interesting

From: 100141.752@CompuServe.COM (Ted Mole)
Date: 04 Mar 97 Originally To: BlindCopyReceiver;;

UI News Briefing 97.09
(for the period 26 February - 4 March 1997)

Prepared by the Uranium Institute Information Service.
All news and views are those of the publications cited.

[NB97.09-1] Germany: About 10 000 protesters and 30 000 riot police greeted a train carrying six 90-tonne containers of spent nuclear fuel (from Neckarwestheim and Gundremmingen) and reprocessed nuclear fuel (from La Hague) as it arrived at Dannenberg on 4 March. Anti-nuclear protesters were expected to disrupt the unloading of the six containers on to the trucks that will take the waste to its final destination at the nuclear waste storage facility at Gorleben, 14 miles away from Dannenberg. The security operations for this shipment of nuclear waste are expected to cost the German government at least 66 million marks (US\$39 million). Discussions are said to be taking place within the German government on a scheme to indefinitely store spent fuel on foreign soil. (Reuters, 4 March; The Independent, 4 March, p8; Associated Press, 3 March; The Guardian, 3 March, p15; Nucleonics Week, 27 February, p5; NuclearFuel, 24 February, p7; see also News Briefing 97.08-13)

[NB97.09-2] The European Union's (EU) Court of First Instance ruled that the Euratom Supply Agency (ESA) is justified in restricting purchases of low-cost Russian uranium by EU utilities. The court case arose from ESA's decision in December 1993 that a contract between Kernkraftwerk Lippe-Ema GmbH (KLE) and British Nuclear Fuels plc (BNFL) could not include CIS-origin material. (FreshFUEL, 3 March, p1; Nucleonics Week, 27 February, p7) While ESA's rights to restrict imports of CIS-origin uranium were being upheld in court, the European Commission and Minatom agreed to set up a working group to examine nuclear trade between Russia and the EU. The issues under discussion include securing a supply of Russian HEU for use in European research reactors and allowing more Russian-origin natural uranium into the European Union. (NuclearFuel, 24 February, p1)

[NB97.09-3] Canada: The federal-provincial panel reviewing Cameco's McArthur River uranium project approved the mining of McArthur River uranium ore and gave 'cautious' approval to the tailings management facility. While the panel supports the proposed in-pit disposal method, it is of the opinion that monitoring will be required for a 'much longer time' than suggested in the environmental impact statement. Cameco was

pleased with the recommendations and acknowledged the panel's view that monitoring requirements, particularly after decommissioning, should not be underestimated. Following the panel's announcement, Bernard Michel, Cameco's chair, president and CEO, announced that McArthur River remains 'on track for construction to begin this summer for a 1999 production startup.' (Cameco, 28 February)

[NB97.09-4] Nuclear generation: France's nuclear park generated 378.2 TWh of electricity in 1996, up 5.4% from 1995. (Bulletin de Liaison, Societe Francaise d'Energie Nucleaire, No 229, February, p1)

[NB97.09-5] Sweden: Bert-Olof Svanholm, who is chairman of Volvo AB and head of the Federation of Swedish Industries, has said that 'any decision to close Barseback will be fought, and we will never accept that the country unnecessarily throws away SEK 20 to 30 billion (US\$2.7 to 4.05 billion) while we chop wood to meet our energy needs.' Svanholm's comments follow last month's decision by the Swedish government to close one unit at Sydkraft's Barseback nuclear power station in 1998. (International Herald Tribune, 28 January, p15)

[NB97.09-6] US: The National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC) has joined the law suit filed by the 46 state agencies that seeks remedies for the US DOE's failure to begin accepting spent fuel by January 1998. A similar suit was filed last month by 33 utilities. Both law suits seek legal authority to let utilities stop paying US\$600 million a year into the US nuclear waste fund and to make the government take away the spent fuel as required by law. (SpentFUEL, 3 March, p1; Reuters, 3 March; see also News Briefing 97.05-2)

[NB97.09-7] Japan's utilities expect to begin using MOX fuel in two reactors by 1999 and in 16 to 18 reactors by 2010, according to the Federation of Electric Power Companies in Japan. Both Tokyo Electric Power Company (Tepco) and Kansai Electric Power Company (Kansai) plan to load MOX fuel into one of their reactors in 1999 and then in a second reactor in 2000. Three more utilities, including Chubu Electric Power Company, Kyushu Electric Power Company and Japan Atomic Power company, are expected to begin using MOX shortly after 2000. (FEPCO, 21 February; SpentFUEL, 3 March, p4) Meanwhile, a trilateral exchange of diplomatic notes between Belgium, Japan and the European Commission has cleared the way for Belgonucleaire to proceed with fabrication of MOX fuel for use in Japanese power reactors. The deal allows an initial amount of Japanese-origin plutonium to be moved from Cogema's La Hague reprocessing facility to Belgonucleaire's Dessel site for fabrication into MOX

fuel rods. The trilateral exchange was necessary because Japan has no nuclear cooperation agreement with Belgium. (NuclearFuel, 24 February, p14)

[NB97.09-8] A consortium comprising SGN-Eurisys Group (France), IVO (Finland) and AEA Technology (UK) and led by SGN has been awarded a contract by the European Commission to improve waste management at the Sosnovy Bor Radon Centre, near St Petersburg, Russia. The contract is part of the EC's Tacis Program for the improvement of nuclear safety in Russia and is worth 600 000 ECU (US\$784 000). (Dewe Rogerson Limited, 26 February)

[NB97.09-9] NAC International announced that it has received a contract from Brookhaven National Laboratory to help Russia develop a prototype transportable storage cask for spent icebreaker fuel now stored on ships in northwestern Russia. The new cask will be designed within 24 months to meet both the licensing requirements of GAN and the IAEA. (Nucleonics Week, 27 February, p17)

[NB97.09-10] Over half of all Japanese citizens have lost confidence in their government's statements concerning the safety of nuclear power, according to the latest survey conducted by the Research Council for Energy and Information Technology in October last year. The figures, which showed that 57% of people surveyed had little or no confidence in government statements on nuclear energy, comprise the lowest vote of confidence since the surveys began. (The Nikkei Weekly, 3 March, p5) Meanwhile, a poll conducted by the BVA Institute in France shows a definite increase in overall public support for France's civil nuclear programme. 70% of the people questioned support the continued operation of France's existing nuclear power plants. (NucNet News, 102/97, 26 February)

[NB97.09-11] Indonesia's parliament approved a nuclear energy law on 26 February that regulates the future development of the country's commercial nuclear energy sector. The decision follows a four-year feasibility study completed last May. MANI, the Indonesian Anti-Nuclear Society, is disappointed with the new law in that it makes no reference to the country's existing laws on environmental protection, electricity generation or industry. MANI also fears that the new law was designed to ensure a nuclear power station would be built without public consultation. (Reuters, 26 February; Australian Associated Press, 26 February; UIC Weekly News, 28 February; see also News Briefing 97.02-8)

[NB97.09-12] Taiwan: The economics ministry has

reinforced Taipower's commitment to ship 200 000 barrels of low-level waste to North Korea, saying that the shipment will follow strict international laws and poses no political or military threat. The comments followed continued opposition to the deal by the US government. Taipower has indicated that it will begin shipping as soon as North Korea submits a final disposal plan. Taipower is believed to be paying North Korea US\$1150 per barrel, which would make the deal worth up to US\$230 million. (Reuters, 27 February)

[NB97.09-13] RTZ-CRA, one of the world's biggest mining companies, has changed its name to Rio Tinto. RTZ-CRA was formed over a year ago when shareholders voted a tie-up between RTZ (Rio Tinto Zinc of the UK) and CRA (Conzinc Riotinto of Australia). (Financial Times, 28 February, p2; see also News Briefing 96.01-5)

[NB97.09-14] India: Proposals from private investors wishing to set up nuclear power plants will be considered on a 'case-by-case' basis, according the minister of science and technology. This decision follows last month's announcement by Prime Minister Deve Gowda that India would allow full foreign ownership of nuclear power plants. (Reuters, 27 February; Power in Asia, 24 February, p4; see also News Briefing 97.06-9)

[NB97.09-15] Russia circumvented US export controls and acquired a supercomputer to simulate nuclear tests through a European 'middleman', according to Minatom. Russian officials insist the computer is needed to maintain the reliability of their stockpile, but American officials are worried that the new computer could help Russia design new nuclear weapons. The computer, an IBM RS/6000 SP, was purchased for US\$7 million. (International Herald Tribune, 26 February, p1)

[NB97.09-16] More than 2.5 billion people in poor countries have little or no electricity, with conventional fuels and their accompanying pollution far too expensive to bring relief to those in need, according to a report by the United Nations Development Programme. The report, which is expected to form the centrepiece of a special UN General Assembly on 19 June to assess progress of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, recommends a three-pronged strategy: more efficient use of energy; an increase in renewable sources of energy such as biomass, solar, wind and sun-hydro power; and utilisation of the next generation of fossil-fuel using technologies. The report is only 'lukewarm' on nuclear energy, however, saying that it is not only expensive but brings with it problems of reactor safety, radioactive waste and proliferation. (Reuters, 28 February)

Prepared by the Uranium Institute Information Service.
All news and views are those of the publications cited.

The Uranium Institute
12th Floor, Bowater House West
114 Knightsbridge
London SW1X 7LJ
UK

Tel: (44) 171 225 0303 Fax: (44) 171 225 0308
e-mail: ui@uilondon.org
World Wide Web: <http://www.uilondon.org>

From int@fme.knooppunt.be Wed Mar 5 07:43:00 1997
Date: Wed, 05 Mar 1997 05:46:13
From: Pol D'Huyvetter <int@fme.knooppunt.be>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: NPT PrepComm - Art. 4 & UN International Clean Energy Agency

Dear friends,

I have been surprised to see that the review of article 4 of the NPT is not a priority for the upcoming PrepComm in NYC.

I want to forward a relevant newsflash which I found in this weeks News Briefing of the pro-nuclear Uranium Institute. It might help us to push for the review of Art. 4 and the reform of the UN IAEA.

> [NB97.09-16] More than 2.5 billion people in poor countries have
> little or no electricity, with conventional fuels and their
> accompanying pollution far too expensive to bring relief to those
> in need, according to a report by the United Nations Development
> Programme. The report, which is expected to form the
> centrepiece of a special UN General Assembly on 19 June
> to assess progress of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit,
> recommends a three-pronged strategy: more efficient use of
> energy; an increase in renewable sources of energy such as
> biomass, solar, wind and sun-hydro power; and utilisation of the
> next generation of fossil-fuel using technologies. The report
> is
> only 'lukewarm' on nuclear energy, however, saying that it is
> not
> only expensive but brings with it problems of reactor safety,
> radioactive waste and proliferation. (Reuters, 28 February)

Why would the UN continue to sponsor atomic energy through the IAEA when the UNDP is 'lukewarm' about its future??

Let's stop the promotion of nuclear energy by the UN, and ask the creation of a new UN International 'Clean' Energy Agency.

Thank you for your attention,

Pol D'Huyvetter

```
*****-
***
*           For Mother Earth International office
*
*****-
***
*           Lange Steenstraat 16/D, 9000 Gent, Belgium
*
*           Phone/fax +32-9-233 84 39
*
*           E-mail: int@fme.knooppunt.be
*
*****-
***
*           WWW:http://www.knooppunt.be/~fme
*
*****-
***
*           Postal account : 000-1618561-19
*
*****-
***
*   For Mother Earth is member of Abolition 2000 - a global
*
*network to eliminate nuclear weapons, the International Peace*
* Bureau (IPB) and World Information Service on Energy (WISE)
*
*****-
***
*   For Mother Earth has offices in Belgium, Romania, Slovakia,
*
*   Sri Lanka and USA, aswell as active members/groups in
*
*   Belarus, Finland, Germany, Netherlands and Ukraine
*
*****-
***
```

From scott@igc.org Wed Mar 5 07:43:00 1997
Date: Tue, 4 Mar 1997 23:02:38 -0800 (PST)
From: Scott Weikart <scott@igc.org>
To: YOU@igc.org
Subject: Executive Update

It's been over four months since Geoff Sears resigned as Executive Director of IGC, and I wanted to give you a short update on our plans.

We have hired an executive search firm to help us find a permanent Executive Director. To see the job description, and details on how you can recommend possible candidates for the job, send a blank email message to <edjob-info@igc.org> .

Because of the fast pace of the Internet, IGC is continually examining new ways to do things, so we can provide you with better services. We're planning improvements in IGC accounts, like upgraded software, and substantially more free hours for users outside the DC and San Francisco areas. We're also developing a number of new Internet extended services, along with expanded consulting activities. See the upcoming NetNews for more details.

Scott Weikart
Acting Executive Director

From joe@fcnl.orgWed Mar 5 17:52:31 1997
Date: Wed, 05 Mar 1997 16:11:43 -0500
From: Joe Volk <joe@fcnl.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Names of religious leaders re CWC

3/5/97

Howard,

Thanks. That's great. We'll incorporate your list into our database for CWC in case we have future uses for it. The combination of the two lists should give Ivo what he needs.

Cheers,

Joe

At 11:46 AM 3/5/97 -0800, you wrote:

>

>

>Dear Joe:

>

>I have reviewed the list of religious leaders that you sent to
>ACDA and have some suggested additions. I'll also sending the
>list by fax.

>

>CATHOLIC

>

>Staff of the U.S. Catholic Conference

> John Carr, Secretary, Dept. of Social Development & World

>Peace

> Drew Christiansen, S.J., Director, Office of Intnat'l Justice

>& Peace

> Gerard F. Powers, Foreign Policy Advisor

> 3211 Fourth Street, NE

> Washington, DC 20017

> 202 541-3000

>

>Pax Christi USA

> Bishop Walter F. Sullivan, President

> Catholic Diocese of Richmond

> 811 Cathedral Place

> Richmond, VA 23200-4801

> 804 359-5661

>

> Nancy Small, National Coordinator

> Pax Christi USA

> 348 E. 10th Street

> Erie, PA 16503

> 814 453-4955 fax: 814 452-4784

>

>JEWISH

>

>For Reconstructist, contact:

> Rabbi Arthur Waskow, Director
> The Shalom Center
> 6711 Lincoln Drive
> Philadelphia, PA 19119 (h) 215 844-8494

>PROTESTANT

>
> Rev.Edwin G. Capon, President (He signed NCC letter to
> The Swedenborgian Church Clinton on ND.)
> 170 Virginia Street
> St. Paul, MN 55102
> (Headquarters is: 48 Sargeant Street, Newton, MA 02158
> 617 969-4240 fax: 617 964-3258

>
> Rev. Dr. Robert E. Sawyer, President
> Moravian Church, Southern Province (There are two
> 459 S. Church Street branches.)
> Winston-Salem NC 27101
> 910 725-5811 fax: 910725-1029

> (Philip Wogaman has only one "l" in his first name.)

> Perhaps Rev. James Forbes, Riverside Church, New York, NY

>HISTORIC PEACE CHURCHES

>
> Rev. James Schrag, General Secretary
> The General Conference Mennonite Church (a second branch)
> 722 Main
> P.O. Box 347
> Newton, KS 67114
> 316 283-5100 fax: 316 283-0454

>
> Ronald J.R. Mathies, Executive Director
> Mennonite Central Committee
> 21 South 12th Street
> P.O.Box 500
> Akron, PA 17501-0500
> 717 859-1151 fax: 717 859-2171

> How about the Friends general secretaries?

>
> Bruce Birchard, General Secretary
> Friends General Conference
> 1216 Arch Street, 2B
> Philadelphia, PA 19107
> 215 561-1700 fax: 215 561-0159

>
> Johan Maurer, General Secretary
> Friends United Meeting
> 101 Quaker Hill Drive
> Richmond, IN 47374-1980
> 317 962-7573 fax: 317 966-1293

>
> Norval Hadley, Executive Director
> Evangelical Friends Mission
> P.O. Box 525
> Arvada, CO 80001
> 303 421-8100 fax; 431-6455

> Also:

>
> John Stoner
> New Call to Peacemaking
> P.O. Box 500
> Akron, PA 17501
> 717 859-1958

>EVANGELICAL

>
> Jim Wallis
> Sojourners
> 2401 15th Street, NW
> Washington, DC 20009
> 202 328-8842 fax: 328-8757

>
> Dr. Ron Sider, President
> Evangelicals for Social Action
> 10 East Lancaster Avenue
> Wynnewood, PA 19096-3495
> 610 645-9390 fax: 610 649-8090

>
> W. Grant McMurray, President
> Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ
> of Latter Day Saints
> P.O. Box 1059
> Independence, MO 64051
> 816 833-1000 fax: 816 521-3096

> For Southern Baptists, contact:

>
> Cooperative Baptist Fellowship (moderates)
> Atlanta, GA
> Ask David Wilkinson, Communications Coordinator
> for name of top officer
> 770 455-7379

>
> Dr. Phil Strickland (he worked on Salt II for
> Pres Carter)
> Texas Christian Life Commission (a unit of Texas S. Baptist
> Dallas, TX Convention)
> 214 828-5190 fax: 214 828-5187
> Ask him about top moderate S. Bapt. leader in Texas

>
> Dr. Robert Parham (mostly personal issues)
> Baptist Center for Ethics
> 4219 Hillsboro Road, #210

> Nashville, TN 37215
> 615 383-3192
>

>HEADS OF WASHINGTON OFFICES

>
> Rev. Dr. Thom White Wolf Fassett, General Secretary
> United Methodist General Board
> of Church and Society
> Staff person for United Methodist on this issue is
> Robin Ringler, not Jane Hull Harvey or Jaydee Hanson,
> although they are farther up the hierarchy.

>
> Persons outside denominational establishments who are working
>on CWC:

>
> Mary Miller, Executive Director
> Episcopal Peace Fellowship
> P.O. Box 28156
> Washington, DC 20038-8156
> 202 783-3380 fax: 202 393-3695

>
> William Yolton
> Presbyterian Peace Fellowship
> 3825 Gibbs Street
> Alexandria, VA 22309-2552
> 703 360-3657

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

>
>OTHER

>
> Jo Becker, Executive Director
> Fellowship of Reconciliation
> 521 N. Broadway
> Nyack, NY 10960
> 914 358-4601 fax: 914 358-4924

>
> Rev. James Lawson, Chairperson
> FOR National Council
> Los Angeles, CA

>
> Rev. Dr. Joseph Lowery, President
> Southern Christian Leadership Council

>
> Mrs. Coretta King

>
>
>
>

Joe Volk

Executive Secretary
Friends Committee on National Legislation
245 Second Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002
Phone: 202/ 547-6000
Fax: 202/ 547-6019
E-mail: joe@fcnl.org
Web page: <http://www.fcnl.org/pub/fcnl>

From panukes@igc.apc.org Wed Mar 5 17:51:18 1997
Date: Wed, 5 Mar 1997 12:01:28 -0800 (PST)
From: Peace Action - National Office <panukes@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: START 3: call your senator!

To All U.S. Nuclear Disarmament Activists:

Here is a list of Senators whose signatures are being solicited for Senator Patty Murray's (D-WA) "Dear Colleague" letter to the Prez calling for him to negotiate a START III framework agreement at the Clinton-Yeltsin Summit on March 20-21.

****Senators must sign by FRIDAY MARCH 7.****

If your Senators are on this list, please call to urge/remind them to sign on. The more calls their offices get, the more likely they are to sign!

For a copy of the "Dear Colleague" letter, contact Ben McMakin in Sen. Murray's office: 202 224-2621.

Thanks,

Fran Teplitz
Peace Action

CALIFORNIA:

Barbara Boxer
Staff: Matt Kagen 202 224-3553

Diane Feinstein
Staff Dan Shapiro 202 224-3841

CONNECTICUT

Christopher Dodd
Staff: Janice O'Connell 202 224-2823

Joseph Lieberman
Staff: Fred Downey 202 224-4041

DELAWARE

Joseph Biden
Staff: Brian Mckeon 202 224-5042

IOWA:

Tom Harkin
Staff: Peter Tyler 202 224-3254

ILLINOIS:

Carol Moseley-Braun
Staff: Chai Pegues 202 224-2854

Richard Durbin
Staff: Dan O'Grady

INDIANA:

Richard Lugar
Staff: Ken Myers 202 224-4814

MASSACHUSETTS:

John F. Kerry
Staff: Scott Bunton 202 224-2742

MARYLAND:

Paul Sarbanes
Vince San Fuentes 202 224-4524

MICHIGAN:

Carl Levin
Staff: Richard Fieldhouse 202 224-6221

NEW JERSEY:

Frank Lautenberg
Staff: Sharon Waxman 202 224-4744

Torriceli
Staff: Eric Shuffler

NEW MEXICO:

Jeff Bingaman
Staff: Wayne Glass (?) 202 224-5521

OHIO:

John Glenn
Staff: Randy Rydell 202 224-3353

OREGON:

Ron Wyden
Staff: Jim Sheire 202 224-5244

SOUTH DAKOTA:

Tom Daschle

Staff: Randy DeValk 202 224-2321

WISCONSIN:

Russ Feingold

Staff: Linda Rotblatt 202 224-5323

From: disarmament@igc.org Wed Mar 5 17:51:18 1997
Date: Wed, 5 Mar 1997 13:32:43 -0800 (PST)
From: disarmament@igc.org
To: ctb-followers@igc.org
Subject: Bikini

The New York Times, March 5, 1997

Decades After Nuclear Testing, Bikini Looks to Tourism

By NICHOLAS D. KRISTOF

Bikini Atoll - Marshall Islands -- After the 23 nuclear explosions that the United States conducted on this remote coral atoll in the 1940s and 50s, one almost expects to visit today and find just a few charred islets surrounded by brackish water emitting an eerie glow.

So the amazing thing about Bikini is how alive it is: a white sand island full of coconut palms swaying over a perfect turquoise sea, fish and sea turtles swimming languorously by the beach. There are also a few tourists, and many more are expected, because Bikini is now once more open to the public.

The paradox is that the same atomic bombs and hydrogen bombs that once caused immense tragedy to the Bikinians, even vaporizing some of their islets, have now made the island an unusually valuable tourist property.

Aside from its worldwide fame and relics like a bunker that once had a hot line to the White House, Bikini has the appeal of an untouched island and coral reef, as well as a lagoon offering some of the best scuba diving in the world.

Divers often like to explore shipwrecks, and there is no place with wrecks like the lagoon here in Bikini, one of the specks of islands scattered in the Pacific between Hawaii and Japan. Some 19 ships, including the only divable aircraft carrier in the world, lie at the bottom of the lagoon, where they sank after the United States tested what would happen to big ships when an atomic bomb exploded nearby. (They sink.)

Most atolls in the Pacific are barely viable in a modern economy. But Bikini, because of its fame and the bombed-out shipwrecks, might emerge as one of the few that can thrive on tourism. The heartbreak of the Bikinians would become their sustenance.

Six scientific surveys have declared that the island is now basically habitable, so long as residents do not eat too many local coconuts. So the people of Bikini -- who have been wandering about the Marshall Islands as "nuclear nomads" ever since the United States evicted them from their island in 1946 -- are now considering whether to return.

"It's so beautiful here," said Edward Maddison, a Bikinian who

is helping run a new scuba diving program for foreigners on Bikini.

"Sometimes I bring my family here, and my kids love to swim in the lagoon because it's so clean.

"Every time I go back, people ask me what it's like, if it's safe to come back to Bikini. If it's safe, we'll be coming back."

The Marshall Islanders were in effect guinea pigs during the nuclear testing, and Western doctors still examine them to determine the delayed effects of radiation. But this time, the Bikini islanders say with a smile, it is they who are conducting the experiment: they stand back and monitor the results as wealthy Western tourists visit the island.

"We're very curious about the effects on those people," said Johnny Johnson, a Bikinian now living in Majuro, the capital of the Marshall Islands.

Bikini became a household name around the world in 1946 when the United States announced that it would test nuclear weapons on the atoll. The countdown for the first explosion was broadcast around the world, vast supplies of film were used to record the mushroom cloud, and Godzilla was said to have risen from Bikini lagoon after being disturbed by the explosions.

A skimpy new bathing suit for women was just coming on the market then in France, and its makers called it the bikini, advertising it as the world's smallest and hoping perhaps to suggest the shocking effect of a nuclear blast.

Over the next 12 years, 22 more atomic or hydrogen bombs were detonated here. One hydrogen bomb dropped over Bikini in 1954 was the most powerful explosion ever detonated by the United States, equivalent to 750 Hiroshima-type bombs. It vaporized one islet and part of two others, and it showered radioactive particles on Marshallese living on other atolls.

So the testing left Bikini deserted.

"It was really bad for the Bikinians, but anything bad can be turned into something good," said Fabio Amaral, a Brazilian who runs the Bikini dive program along with Maddison and an American, Scott Herman. It is precisely the enforced desertion of Bikini, Amaral noted, that has made it such a gem today.

"This is a wilderness," he added. "This place hasn't been touched in 40 years."

A large sea turtle made the point a moment later, lazily swimming in shallow water a few feet off the beach. Schools of fish dart about the coral, and Bikinians are also trying to set up a sports fishing program to attract Americans interested in catching bonefish and other game fish.

"I went out with two rods at first, but I had to go down to one because I had double-hookings too often," said Roderick Bourke, 26, an Australian who runs the diving resort and catches the fish that are served to guests.

Despite nervous jokes about how the Bikini landing strip has no need for runway lights, the sea and wind have long since dispersed almost all of the radioactivity, according to extensive testing. Indeed, Bikini now has less background radiation than some American cities. The problem is that the ground still contains cesium-137, a radioactive substance, and this is

concentrated in fruits and coconuts grown on Bikini.

A small group of Bikinians sent back to Bikini in the early 1970s had to be evacuated in 1978 because their diet of coconuts resulted in an alarming buildup of cesium in their bodies.

There has been talk of scraping off the entire top layer of earth and sand of Bikini to get rid of the cesium, but the scientific studies agree that the simplest and cheapest way of dealing with this problem would be to spread potassium fertilizer. Plants prefer potassium to cesium, so if potassium were available they apparently would take it and leave the cesium alone.

But the Bikinians are still profoundly wary, and they say they want an assurance from President Clinton that it is safe to go back.

"I see what's going on there on Bikini, and I'm very envious of the people there," said Jason Aitap, the acting mayor on Ejit, a bleak little island accessible only by boat and inhabited by some of the 2,200 Bikinians now living in exile. "I'd love to go back. But you've got to understand that we really want assurances from the U.S. that it's safe."

A few other Bikinians, sitting on the broken white coral outside a home and listening to Aitap, agreed and nodded their heads. One after another, the Bikinians on Ejit repeated the mantra: the United States has a responsibility, after poisoning their soil, to declare that it is safe for them to return.

The U.S. ambassador to the Marshall Islands, Joan Plaisted, said the United States would look into the possibility of issuing some kind of a statement about whether it is safe to return to Bikini. She added that the United States feels a legal, and perhaps moral, responsibility to the Bikinians because of the nuclear testing.

"The United States government certainly remains committed to the return of the Bikini people to their original homeland," she said.

The United States seems a bit flummoxed, though, by the way Clinton has been effectively made the king of Bikinians. There is a long tradition of Marshall Islanders having an outside king, or iroi, and these days many Bikinians say Clinton is the man.

Traditionally, the king receives fealty from his people but also has a responsibility for them. The Bikinians insist that by moving them off their island and promising to care for them, the United States entered that relationship so that the American president is their king and is responsible for their welfare.

"That's exactly what he is," Aitap said after being asked if Clinton was their king. "And we expect him to act like an iroi and look after his people."

One reason the Bikinians want Clinton as their king is that they are worried by the efforts of Imata Kabua, the president of the Marshall Islands, to declare himself their king -- and claim one-third of their revenues.

Kabua notes that he comes from a family of chiefs on an atoll near Bikini, and he says he is rightly the king of Bikinians and entitled to the money.

So far, he has not gotten any money from them, but in January he demanded that the Bikinians build him a fine new house in the capital. At a time when many Bikinians themselves are still living in plywood shacks, they saw no reason to use their money to build a mansion for a millionaire like Kabua.

Asked about the Bikinians' attitude, Kabua responded with an expletive. His tongue was loosened and he appeared to be drunk (he was interviewed in the hotel bar that he frequents), and he said he would go to court to get access to some of their money. He also said that if they resisted he would expel them from the islands where they have been living, in some cases for decades.

"I'm going to sue them," he said, and then he repeated the expletive.

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

From katie@Chch.plaNet.org.NZThu Mar 6 04:27:16 1997
Date: Thu, 6 Mar 1997 09:46:15 +1200 (NZST)
From: katie <katie@Chch.plaNet.org.NZ>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: ICJ NEWS

NEWS RE THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

1. WEERAMANTRY APPOINTED VICE-PRESIDENT ICJ

A few weeks ago, Judge Christopher Weeramantry was appointed Vice President to the ICJ and could be President by the millenium. He was one of the earliest supporters of the World Court Project working closely with both Harold Evans and IALANA. His 77 page 'dissenting opinion' in the ICJ advisory opinion case is a brilliant masterpiece arguing illegality of nuclear weapons in all circumstances.

2. SOLOMON ISLANDS TO TAKE PAPUA NEW GUINEA (PNG) TO ICJ

The Solomon Islands, empowered by their recent role in the ICJ nuclear weapon case, has given notice that they are lodging a case against PNG in late March. They have condemned PNG's use of mercenaries to end the island conflict with their tiny island neighbour Bougainville. They have also called on the 16 nation South Pacific Forum to back its legal action. PNG has hired some 40 mercenaries through British-based Sandline International to train government troops for a mission against Bougainville's secessionist rebels. This is part of a plan to end a 9 year conflict and reopen a giant copper mine on Bougainville owned by an Australian company. (Based on a Reuter report in Christchurch Press, NZ 6.3.97)

From nfzns@gn.apc.orgThu Mar 6 04:27:16 1997
Date: Wed, 5 Mar 1997 22:21:52 GMT
From: Stewart Kemp <nfzns@gn.apc.org>
To: nfla.news@conf.gn.apc.org
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: UK Nuclear News 5 March 1997

>From: GMR@MCR1.poptel.org.uk
>Date: Wed, 05 Mar 1997 15:18:38 GMT
>Subject: NPU Bulletin 5 Mar
>To: nfzns@gn.apc.org
>
>DAILY INFORMATION BULLETIN - NUCLEAR POLICY
>
>Weds 5 Mar 1997
>
>97-8244 Angry German anti-nuclear activists converge on n/waste storage site to confront 30,000 riot police. G,Ind,T,DT
>97-8245 France is only European country still building new n/power stations. Nicholas Schoon on the decline of n/power station

> building. Ind
>97-8246 Letter from a group of anti-nuclear campaigners on BNF's
> proposal to commission and operate the MOX plant at
Sellafield.
> Ind
>97-8247 Range of fizzy drinks, including Coca Cola and Irn Bru,
could
> have been contaminated by radioactive CO2 from tanker also
> used to deliver gas to Hunterston B, Scottish Office warns.
> G,Ind,DT
>97-8248 Lab denies claims by minister that it tested bodies of
animals
> which died in Gulf war, possibly from pesticides: minister
> said their tests had shown death by natural causes. Ind
>97-8249 Nato chief says that Moscow is ready for security deal.
T,FT
>
>
>GM Research, Metropolitan House, Hobson Street, Oldham, OL1 1QD.
>Tel: 0161-911 4179. Fax: 0161-627 1736.
>Internet: gmr@mcr1.poptel.org.uk
>
>

Stewart Kemp (nfznsc@gn.apc.org)
From nfznsc@gn.apc.org Thu Mar 6 04:27:16 1997
Date: Wed, 5 Mar 1997 22:41:20 GMT
From: National Steering Cttee Nuclear Free Local Authorities
<nfznsc@gn.apc.org>
To: nfla.news@conf.gn.apc.org
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: UK Nuclear News 4 March 1997

>From GMR@MCR1.poptel.org.uk Tue Mar 4 15:02:39 1997
Received: from MCR1.poptel.org.uk by gnew.gn.apc.org
(8.8.5/Revision: 2.06 03 December 1996)
id PAA11388; Tue, 4 Mar 1997 15:02:22 GMT
From: GMR@MCR1.poptel.org.uk
Date: Tue, 04 Mar 1997 15:02:03 GMT
Subject: NPU Bulletin 4 Mar
To: nfznsc@gn.apc.org
Message-Id: <39736117MCR1@MCR1.poptel.org.uk>
Status: RO

DAILY INFORMATION BULLETIN - NUCLEAR POLICY

Tues 4 Mar 1997

97-8235 Rail saboteurs slow German n/waste train: big demos expected
as
consignment nears destination. G,Ind,T,DT
978236 Nato prepares pact to reassure Ukraine over enlarged
alliance.

Ind

GM Research, Metropolitan House, Hobson Street, Oldham, OL1 1QD.
Tel: 0161-911 4179. Fax: 0161-627 1736.
Internet: gmr@mcrl.poptel.org.uk
From wslf@igc.apc.org Thu Mar 6 04:27:17 1997
Date: Wed, 5 Mar 1997 18:17:55 -0800 (PST)
From: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@igc.apc.org>
To: tomatompn+@igc.org, abolition-caucus@igc.org
Cc: kilali@igc.org
Subject: VICTORY IN COURT!

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: March 5, 1997 P. 1 of 2
CONTACT: Jackie
Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation (510) 839-5877
Marylia Kelley, Tri-Valley CAREs (510) 443-7148
Tom Cochran, Natural Resources Defense Council (202) 289-6868
Howard
Crystal, Meyer & Glitzenstein (202) 588-5206

PUBLIC INTEREST GROUPS WIN FIRST LEGAL CHALLENGE
TO NATIONAL IGNITION FACILITY (NIF)

COURT UPHOLDS GROUPS' CONTENTION THAT NIF
ADVISORY PANEL OPERATED OUTSIDE THE LAW

In a victory for the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC),
Western
States Legal Foundation (WSLF), and Tri-Valley Citizens Against
a
Radioactive Environment (CAREs), the U.S. District Court for the
District of
Columbia today granted a preliminary injunction prohibiting the U.S.
Department of Energy (DOE) from funding or relying upon the
recommendations
of a National Academy of Sciences (NAS) advisory committee studying
DOE's
planned new multibillion-dollar National Ignition Facility (NIF)
at the
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California.

In their lawsuit, the three public interest groups, who have
raised serious
technical, environmental, safety and policy concerns about the NIF,
charged
that the NAS Committee is operating in violation of the Federal
Advisory
Committee Act (FACA). This law, which applies to all federal
agencies
which either "establish" or "utilize" advisory committees, is
designed to
ensure that advisory committees are created only when they are deemed
to be
essential; that their membership is balanced and unbiased; and that
the

public has meaningful access to advisory committee meetings and documents. Plaintiffs argued that neither DOE nor the NAS Committee has complied with the requirements of FACA concerning a balanced membership, public notice of meetings or public access to meeting materials or the meetings themselves.

District Court Judge Paul L. Friedman agreed with the public interest groups that the NAS Committee is likely operating in violation of FACA, and issued a preliminary injunction. The preliminary injunction, of unlimited duration:

prohibits DOE from relying on any interim report prepared by the NAS Committee;

prevents DOE and the NAS from spending any additional DOE funds on the committee; and

enjoins the NAS from spending Federal funds on publication or dissemination of the NAS committee's interim report.

According to Dr. Thomas B. Cochran, Director of NRDC's Nuclear Program, NRDC is very pleased with the court's ruling. "DOE, Congress and the public deserve an independent and impartial review of the readiness of the National Ignition Facility before committing \$1.2 billion on its construction." Moreover, Dr. Cochran noted that DOE is planning a series of future experiments with existing facilities which will help to ensure that the NIF can achieve its mission. "Delaying construction of the NIF until these experiments are completed can only serve to benefit DOE." he said.

According to WSLF Executive Director, Jackie Cabasso, "Technology choices made today will have far-reaching consequences for the future. A billion dollar decision to go forward with the NIF has major implications for both weapons and energy development. As a matter of fundamental democracy, deliberations on the scientific validity of NIF must include all

points of view, and must take place in the light of full public scrutiny -- not in secrecy, behind closed doors."

"Today's ruling underscores the validity of local residents' concerns and puts the NIF under a large dark cloud., said Tri-Valley CARES President Marylia Kelley. "From its radioactive waste streams to its ever-rising price tag, the NIF can best be described as 'nuclear pork.'" We certainly hope DOE will not try to go ahead with construction this month without a credible scientific analysis of the project."

DOE had requested that NAS form an advisory committee to study the scientific and technological readiness of the NIF in late 1995, after a previous DOE advisory committee failed to recommend that DOE proceed with construction of the facility. That committee had reported uncertainties in the NIF's ability to meet its principal design objective. Many members of the former DOE committee who had expressed confidence in the NIF were later invited to join the new NAS committee, known as the "Committee for the Review of the Inertial Confinement Fusion Program at the Department of Energy." Other members of the former DOE committee, who had expressed reservations as to whether NIF could achieve its technological goals -- and thus whether it is worth spending multiple billions of taxpayer money on this effort -- are not serving on the NAS Committee.

Even before the NAS Committee held its first meeting, NRDC's Cochran had raised concerns regarding the lack of balance and conflict of interest of members on the Committee. As Dr. Cochran documented, many of the NAS Committee's sixteen members have financial or professional ties to Lawrence Livermore or DOE's related fusion program, or had already expressed their approval for proceeding with the NIF before serving on the NAS Committee.

Despite these concerns, DOE Deputy Assistant Secretary for

Research and Development Dr. R. Staffin told the NAS Committee last August that its recommendations, at least in the form of an interim report, would be essential before DOE approved the physical construction of the NIF. Prior to today's court order, this interim report was scheduled to be released tomorrow. DOE was planning to begin groundbreaking on the NIF later this month.

Plaintiffs are represented by the Washington, DC law firm of Meyer & Glitzenstein.

*** Jackie Cabasso * Western States Legal Foundation ***
1440 Broadway, Suite 500 Oakland, California USA 94612
Telephone: +(510)839-5877 / Fax: +(510)839-5397
***** E-mail: WSLF@igc.apc.org *****
Western States Legal Foundation is part of Abolition 2000,
A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

From nfzns@gn.apc.org Fri Mar 7 04:00:13 1997
Date: Thu, 6 Mar 1997 14:00:06 GMT
From: Stewart Kemp <nfzns@gn.apc.org>
To: nfla.news@conf.gn.apc.org
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: UK Nuclear News 6 March 1997

>From: GMR@MCR1.poptel.org.uk
>Date: Thu, 06 Mar 1997 12:49:50 GMT
>Subject: NPU Bulletin 6 Mar
>To: nfzns@gn.apc.org
>
>DAILY INFORMATION BULLETIN - NUCLEAR POLICY
>
>Thurs 6 Mar 1997
>
>97-8255 Inquiry ordered into possible contamination of soft drinks
by
> CO2 wagon that had delivered to Hunterston B. G,FT
>97-8256 Riot police crush German anti-nuclear convoy protest.
> G,Ind,T,DT,Eur 6 Mar
>97-1752 Surveys show that Holy Loch in Scotland is contaminated
with
> toxic waste after closure of US n/sub base on the Clyde.
> T;NewSc 8
>97-8257 Earl Howe apologises for misleading Parliament on cause
of
> death of animals in Gulf war zone. Ind,FT,DT
>
>
>
>GM Research, Metropolitan House, Hobson Street, Oldham, OL1 1QD.
>Tel: 0161-911 4179. Fax: 0161-627 1736.
>Internet: gmr@mcr1.poptel.org.uk
>
>

Stewart Kemp (nfzns@gn.apc.org)
From disarmament@igc.org Fri Mar 7 04:00:13 1997
Date: Thu, 6 Mar 1997 08:42:07 -0800 (PST)
From: disarmament@igc.org
To: ctb-followers@igc.org
Subject: START Talking Editorials

Dear Folks:

Here are a couple of editorials RE: START III and Bold Nuclear Cuts. These should inspire you, and provide more information for letters-to-the-editor, meetings with editorial boards, and op-eds.

With the upcoming Summit - MARCH 20-21 in Helsinki - NOW is the time to push forward on media work, with the message:

Negotiate a START III framework agreement, and bold cuts toward a nuclear weapons-free 21st century.

For more information on the START Talking campaign, and assistance in media work, please contact:

Kathy Crandall
Disarmament Clearinghouse Coordinator
Tel: 202 898 0150 ext 232
Fax: 202 898 0172
E-Mail: disarmament@igc.apc.org

And please remember to send your published letters, op-eds and editorials in to me too!

Disarmament Clearinghouse
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington, DC 20005

EDITORIALS * EDITORIALS * EDITORIALS * EDITORIALS *

DAYTON DAILY NEWS Feb. 22, 1997

"Move More Boldly Toward Nuclear Cuts"

'We are still too rigidly conditioned by an arms-control mentality rooted in the Cold War.' -General George Lee Butler, Retired Commander-In-Chief, U.S. Strategic Command

Gen. George Lee Butler knows nuclear weapons much better than most. The retired commander-in-chief of the United States Strategic Command, he helped refine the power that could annihilate the Soviet Union or any other nation at ground zero. In that position he was the risk of the trap in which the United States was caught. And he has the right idea about how to try to get loose:

President Clinton should propose bolder cuts on the nuclear arsenal when he meets with Russian President Boris Yeltsin next month.

The United States should jump to the START 3 talks as a way of getting past START 2, which is having trouble getting ratified by the Duma, the Russian legislature.

START 2 - already ratified by the United States - would cut U.S. and Russian long-range nuclear weapons down to 3,500 each by 2003. Some Russian lawmakers balk at this because, among other reasons, the restriction on multiple-warhead weapons means they have to eliminate their vulnerable multiwarhed SS-18s. This means that, to achieve parity with the United States, the Russians would need to build new missiles with *single* warheads. Russia can ill afford that, and that would not make the United States more secure.

Gen. Butler proposes cutting the weapons to 2,000 each. This way the Russians wouldn't have to build any new missiles to maintain parity with the lower ceiling.

Moreover, Gen. Butler - whose manifesto last December was signed by more than 60 retired generals and admirals from nuclear states - calls on the president to start negotiations to take land and sea-based ballistic missiles off standing alert. "Why is it," he asks, "that five years after removing bombers, the most stable element of the nuclear triad, from alert, we keep missiles - with their 30-minute flight time - on effectively hair-trigger postures?"

Such a drawdown could reduce the risks inherent in the policy of mutually-assured destruction.

"Not one is more conscious than I am that realistic prospects for elimination will evolve over many year," Gen. Butler said in a Jan. 8 speech. "I was in the public arena for too long ever to make the perfect the enemy of the good. I hasten to add, however, my strong conviction that we are far too timorous in imagining the good; we are still too rigidly conditioned by an arms-control mentality deeply rooted in the Cold War. . . . We forget too quickly how seemingly intractable conflicts can suddenly yield under the weight of reason or with a change of leadership. We have lost sight too soon that in the blink of an historical eye of the world we knew for a traumatic half-century has been utterly transformed."

THE ARIZONA DAILY STAR

2/16/97

"A Faster Track for START"

No logical reason exists for the United States and Russia to have enormous stockpiles of nuclear weapons. Paring them down in the fastest and least costly way is a prime issue as both nations prepare for new arms negotiations.

The Clinton administration ought to recognize that in the arms talks the United States now remains too inflexible. At issue now is the already-negotiated START II treaty, which would reduce U.S. nuclear missiles to 3,500 and Russian missiles to 3,000. The Russian Duma has not ratified the treaty yet.

Russians and others think they got the bad end of the deal because they have to give up what they consider the pride of their rocket forces, the SS-18, and all their ICBMs (intercontinental ballistic missiles) with multiple warheads. Many in the Russian Congress, the Duma, believe this will force Russia to build up to 500 new single-warhead missiles, spending billions of dollars more when the nation is in economic crisis.

Then when START III is negotiated, they'll have to destroy the

missiles they just built.

Given this, arms experts, former and present U.S. military leaders and the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons advise instead that the nations should skip START II and go straight to negotiating START III, with even lower ceilings on nuclear missiles. In fact, 2,000 missiles each may be a much more realistic goal, and that level wouldn't force construction of more Russian missiles.

Unfortunately, the Clinton administration, which has never negotiated a Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, has taken the unwise position that it won't begin negotiating START II until the Duma ratifies START II.

An attractive opportunity that is not on the arms talk agenda would be to take both the U.S. and Russian nuclear weapons off a state of alert. Air Force Gen. Lee Butler has spoken eloquently about this and other subjects, such as renouncing the use of nuclear weapons and speeding their demise around the world.

A former head of the Strategic Air Command, Butler said in a January speech: "Why is it that five years after removing bombers, the most stable element of the nuclear triad, from alert, we keep missiles - with their 30-minute flight time - on effectively hair-trigger postures? What could be more corrosive to building and sustaining security relationships built on trust?"

Butler thinks that 90 percent of the reduction battle would be won if both nations simply took the remaining missiles of alert.

President Clinton and Boris Yeltsin are scheduled to meet March 20 for a summit. Positions on arms talks will probably be discussed. The president needs some pushing to speed up nuclear disarmament and get past some of the laborious build-downs in START.

We would no more launch a nuclear attack on Russia than it would on us. The United States still has 15,400 nuclear warheads and the Russians have 20,00 to 22,000. The two nations need to cut those numbers down drastically, and make those cuts faster, without building more missiles to retain temporary parity.

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005

Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 Fax: 202 898 0172

<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

From wagingpeace@napf.org Fri Mar 7 04:00:13 1997

Date: Thu, 06 Mar 1997 11:46:40 -0800

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

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Cc: INESnet@fy.chalmers.se, yaro@glas.apc.org, wiednerb@aol.com

Subject: NATO Expansion

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

EXPANDING NATO: THE COSTS ARE TOO HIGH
by David Krieger*
2/28/97

The Clinton Administration, for reasons that are far from clear, has decided that expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to include Eastern European nations is an important foreign policy objective. Secretary of State Albright has recently been in Europe and Russia promoting this policy, and seems to consider it one of the highest goals of the Administration.

While many Eastern European nations appear eager to join NATO, the Russians have expressed strong opposition to moving NATO closer to their borders. The Russians find the NATO expansion policy provocative. Their opposition to it threatens to undermine positive U.S.-Russian relations, and to put an end to the progress made in the last decade to reduce U.S. and Russian nuclear arms.

NATO was formed in 1949 to prevent the Soviet Union from invading Western Europe. Its purpose was to provide for the common security of Western Europe, and to involve the United States in this common security plan. NATO has based its security strategy on the threat to use nuclear weapons, if necessary, to repel Soviet ground forces. NATO still maintains a strategy of nuclear deterrence, even in the aftermath of the Cold War.

For more than five years, however, there has been no Soviet Union, and Russia is now a fledgling democracy. The Russians are suffering serious economic problems, including an inability to keep current with the salaries of their military forces. The Russians are acknowledged to pose no current threat to Western Europe. They, therefore, question the policy of expanding NATO closer to their borders. Strong protests against this policy have been voiced in the Russian Duma.

George Kennen, a former Ambassador to the Soviet Union and a leading expert in American foreign policy, has stated that "expanding NATO would be the most fateful error of American policy in the entire post-Cold-War era."

He explained: "Such a decision may be expected to inflame the nationalistic, anti-Western and militaristic tendencies in Russian opinion; to have an adverse effect on the development of Russian democracy; to restore the atmosphere of the Cold War to East-West relations, and to impel Russian foreign policy in directions decidedly not to our liking.

And, last but not least, it might make it much more difficult, if not impossible, to secure the Russian Duma's ratification of the START II agreement and to achieve further reductions of nuclear weaponry."

The Washington-based Center for Defense Information has suggested that U.S. policy with regard to expansion of NATO "may undercut a decade's worth of arms control treaties." They also suggest that "should NATO decide to deploy troops or nuclear weapons on the territory of new members...Moscow, with its historic fear of encirclement, may feel compelled to rely more heavily on its own nuclear arsenals and refuse to consider further cuts."

With the obvious dangers to U.S.-Russian relations inherent in the eastward expansion of NATO, one may wonder what is motivating U.S. policy.

In his 1997 State of the Union message, President Clinton called for helping to build "an undivided democratic Europe." "To that end," he said,

"we must expand NATO by 1999, so that countries that were once our adversaries can become our allies." The President's statement provided no

indication of how NATO expansion would further the goal of "an undivided democratic Europe," nor why NATO must be expanded by 1999, nor why countries once our adversaries could not be our allies without being members of NATO.

Secretary of State Albright recently argued, "Generally people need to not see NATO as an adversarial alliance against Russia but basically a way that the institutions of Europe can be strengthened in a security system that is not opposed to somebody." Understandably, the Russians are not

convinced
that they are not the "somebody" being opposed.

George Kennen has pointed out that "Russians are little impressed with American assurances that it [NATO expansion] reflects no hostile intentions. They would see their prestige (always uppermost in the Russian mind) and their security interests as adversely affected."

The eastward expansion of NATO appears to be poor policy. It offers no apparent advantages, and risks undermining the post-Cold War progress in U.S.-Russian relations. At worst, it could send us spiralling back into the Cold War. It will most likely undermine efforts to further reduce nuclear arsenals. With a policy of NATO expansion, we can count on carrying large nuclear arsenals across Mr. Clinton's imaginary bridge into the twenty-first century.

Michael Mandelbaum, a professor of American foreign policy at Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, has described the plan for expanding NATO as "a rarity in public policy: an initiative that promises no benefits whatsoever." Mandelbaum estimates the financial costs of NATO expansion as being some \$100 billion over ten years. These costs, however burdensome, may prove to be incomparably small in relation to the costs of forcing the Russians to rely more heavily on their nuclear arsenal to defend against an expanded NATO.

Before expanding NATO eastward, it would seem prudent to engage in a full analysis of the security implications of doing so, including the implications for future U.S.-Russian relations. Such an analysis would be analogous to the kind of Environmental Impact Statement which is now required by law for any large-scale development that could affect the environment. I am proposing, therefore, that a "Security Impact Statement" be prepared and discussed openly in all NATO countries, including the U.S., prior to undertaking the proposed eastward expansion of NATO.

This would be an important step in involving the citizenry in a process of "informed consent" on foreign policy issues. Since there is no actual need to expand NATO, and much to lose by doing so, why not take the issue to the

people instead of imposing it on them.

At the same time, Mr. Clinton could explore with the Russians major reductions in nuclear arsenals down to a few hundred weapons in exchange for reducing rather than increasing the size of NATO. This would provide all countries involved with enhanced security for the next century.

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

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
Web Site: <http://www.napf.org>
From: disarmament@igc.apc.org Fri Mar 7 04:00:13 1997
Date: Thu, 6 Mar 1997 11:44:59 -0800 (PST)
From: Disarmament Clearinghouse <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
To: LANLaction@aol.com
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Medical Associations for Abolition

Physicians for Social Responsibility
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington, DC 20005

** PRESS RELEASE ** PRESS RELEASE ** PRESS RELEASE **

Contact: Sharon Pickett 301-365-9307
Daryl Kimball 202-898-0150

Presidents of Major Medical Organizations
Urge Clinton/Yeltsin Negotiations on START III

Physicians Endorse Resolutions
Calling for Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

The presidents of four major medical organizations will hold a press conference on March 6, from 12:00 - 1:30 pm at the National Press Club to announce their unified call for the elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. For decades, the campaign to eliminate nuclear weapons has been lead by organizations such as Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR) and International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. The mainstream medical community has now joined in this important effort. In the past few months, the American Medical Association, the American College of Physicians, the American Public Health Association, and the World Federation of Public Health Associations have all endorsed resolutions calling

for the abolition of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

Participating in the press conference will be:

* Dr. Christine Cassel,
President of the American College of Physicians

* Dr. Barry Levy,
President of the American Public Health Association

* Dr. Ira Helfand,
Past-President of Physicians for Social Responsibility

* Dr. Vic Sidel,
Co-President, International Physicians for the
Prevention of Nuclear War

* (an AMA officer is invited but not yet confirmed)

The physicians will address several issues that dramatically affect the public health and safety. They will highlight the urgent need for Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin to conclude a START III "framework" agreement at their upcoming Summit in Helsinki.

They will express their concern about the increasing risk of accidental nuclear war and call on Russia and the United States to remove their nuclear forces from alert status. They will also urge U.S. Senate ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention.

"It is important to remember that the health of the entire planet depends on further progress in eliminating nuclear and chemical threats," said Robert K. Musil, Ph.D., executive director of PSR. "There is no cure for nuclear war ... only prevention. We urge the President to use the Summit to negotiate new U.S./Russian arms agreements that will lead the world into a new millenium free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction."

Lunch Will Be Served. RSVP 301-365-9307
Interviews and Copies of the Resolutions Are Available Upon Request

From brucehall@igc.org Fri Mar 7 04:00:13 1997
Date: Thu, 6 Mar 1997 15:11:56 -0800 (PST)
From: Bruce Hall <brucehall@igc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: new nukes

To : Abolitionists all over
From: Bruce Hall at Greenpeace
Date: March 6, 1997
re : More Penetrating developments

Dear folks -

Two bits of recent information about lab and Pentagon efforts to field an earth-penetrating capability for use against potential deeply buried targets. The B61-11 is a recently modified nuclear bomb being introduced into the US nuclear arsenal. It can be adjusted to a variety of yields - from a low of 300 tons to upwards of 300 kilotons.

Enjoy,

Bruce

Sandia National Laboratory

The B61-11 was authorized in August 1995 with a requested delivery date of December 31, 1996. The B61-11 is a mechanical field modification to the B61-7. The B61-11 will be an earth-penetrating weapon that will replace the aging B53 bomb. The B61-11 may be delivered by a variety of aircraft including the B-2A, F16, and the B-1B. The retrofit will consist of repackaging the Los Alamos physics package and Sandia's arming fuzing, and firing (AF&F) electronics into a new one-piece steel earth-penetrating center-case designed by Sandia. We have conducted 13 full-scale drop tests this year... (I believe they are referring to 96... the article's date is missing - Bruce)... three in Alaska and 10 at the Tonopah Test Range, in support of the development program. Sandia has also designed and is fabricating for the Air Force ten trainers and nine sets of handling gear. The program is on schedule and B61-7 to B61-11 retrofit kits were to be delivered to the Air Force in December 1996. Retrofits were scheduled to begin in January 1997.

The Kansas City plant continues to do the fabrication work for the B61-11 until at least 1999 - Bruce

+++++

JANE'S DEFENSE WEEKLY
March 5, 1997

USA WILL STUDY GROWING UNDERGROUND THREATS

By Barbara Starr
Washington, DC

The threat posed by a growing number of underground facilities in nations unfriendly to the USA will be the subject of a report commissioned by the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology, Paul Kaminski.

The Defense Science Board (DSB) will report on the military and security threat posed by such underground facilities as command and control bunkers, ballistic missile sites and production and storage facilities for weapons of mass destruction.

Kaminski referred particularly to two sites: the underground

chemical weapons facility at Tarhunah in Libya, and "a huge underground facility in Russia whose purpose is undetermined."

Ordering the study, Kamininski said that underground facilities can "appear in a number of forms."

This includes tunneling in mountains, "cut and cover" construction, hardened buildings above ground or basement facilities under urban civilian buildings.

The DSB was asked to look at three areas:

* The ability to find the facility. Kaminski said that facilities in remote areas are "not well covered by National sensors," and "we generally have little human intelligence [HUMINT] from such areas." The DSB was asked to examine potential collection and analysis techniques for timely detection and location of facilities.

* An examination of observation and assessment methods to determine the vulnerabilities of underground sites, including understanding site functions, connections and access to the outside and the interior structure. "This is a technically daunting task unless we have HUMINT sources or we have observed the construction of cut and cover," Kaminski said.

"A remaining option, however, is to neutralise the functioning of the facility by attacking its external connections to the outside world...[that is] destroy its entrances, power, air supply and communications for a period of time," he said. The DSB is to assess military strike tactics and tools.

The DSB report is due by year-end, with an interim report due mid-year to provide guidance for the future budget.

=====
==

From LCNP@aol.com Fri Mar 7 04:00:13 1997
Date: Thu, 6 Mar 1997 23:06:03 -0500 (EST)
From: LCNP@aol.com
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Cc: LCNP@aol.com, peace-caucus@igc.apc.org, R.Braun@ping.de, fredpax@sn.no, ialana@antenna.nl
Subject: Action Alert: European Parliament NPT resolution

Dear Friends,

The attached resolution is being discussed and most likely voted upon in the European Parliament on Thursday March 13. While not binding on member States, it will provide a strong authoritative push for European States to support strong disarmament moves at the NPT Prep Com in April, including calling for the start of negotiations on a Nuclear Weapons Convention.

1. Europeans: Please contact your members of the European Parliament and urge

them to support the resolution.

2. Other activists: If you have European affiliates, please alert them to this resolution and ask them to contact their European Parliament members.

If you do not know your EMPs, contact me at <lcnp@aol.com> (Phone 1 212 674 7790) or Martin Butcher at <nan@gn.apc.org>, phone 32 2 230 0732.

Peace
Alyn Ware

Forwarded message:

From: nan@gn.apc.org (NATO Alerts Network)
To: lcnp@aol.com
Date: 97-03-06 12:47:31 EST

Motion for a resolution pursuant to Rule 47,

The European Parliament,

- having regard to its resolutions B2-0845/85, B2-0829/85, A3-0139/94 and A3-0111/94 on nuclear non-proliferation and the Non-Proliferation Treaty; to resolution A4-0054/95 on the extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty; to its resolutions B3-0364/93, B3-0562/93, B4-1091/95, B4-1303 and B4-0502/96 calling for an end to nuclear tests and to its resolutions A2-0099/85 and B3-0302/92 on technology transfer and the risks of nuclear proliferation;

A. considering that the existence and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons, and their delivery systems potentially pose a major threat to the security of the Union and global security as a whole and the Union has taken an active role in global non-proliferation and disarmament efforts with its joint actions on dual-use technology transfer and on the renewal of the NPT,

B. Whereas the Non-Proliferation Treaty was renewed indefinitely by the Review and Renewal Conference on the NPT in New York on May 9, 1995 and believing

the
document Principles and
Objectives of the NPT, approved when the Treaty was renewed,
to be an
intrinsic part of the Treaty
mechanism, greatly strengthening the NPT. Further recognising
that
building confidence in the
new reviews mechanisms will be the most important job of the
first
PrepCom,

C. whereas the first meeting of the Preparatory Committee (PrepCom)
for the
new and strengthened
review process of the NPT will take place in New York from April
7-18,

D. Welcoming the conclusion of the negotiations for the
Comprehensive Test
Ban Treaty (CTBT) and
its adoption by the UN General Assembly in September 1996,
the
signature by all member states
of the Union and believing early ratification to be essential,

E. Believing moves towards nuclear disarmament by the nuclear
weapons
states to be an essential
complement to non-proliferation measures taken under the Treaty
and in
other fora, according to
their obligations under article 6 of the NPT,

F. Believing that the Advisory Opinion of the International Court
of
Justice (ICJ), the Report of the
Canberra Commission and the Statement by former Generals and
Admirals of
December 4, 1996,
on the obligation to pursue nuclear disarmament in good faith
are
important contributions to the
implementation of article 6 of the NPT,

G. Welcoming resolution 51/45M of the UN General Assembly on the
Advisory
Opinion of the ICJ
and calling for the commencement of negotiations leading to
a nuclear
weapons convention in
1997,

1. Calls upon the Presidency to present a package of measures to

strengthen
the NPT and further EU
non-proliferation policy to the NPT PrepCom, including:

- a joint approach to the NPT PrepCom which allows the maximum possible time for substantive issues to be considered in a review of both the Treaty articles and the Principles and Objectives;
inclusion of the Principles and Objectives as a formalised part of the review process, allowing for them to be updated and changed as circumstances warrant,
- a proposal for a new, formal system of reporting past progress and future actions to implement the treaty and the Principles and Objectives, to further strengthen the review process;
- a proposal that the optional PrepCom in 2000 should be used exclusively to prepare for the Review Conference in 2000, thus freeing time at the three preceding PrepComs for substantive issues to be discussed;
- a proposal that at the end of each PrepCom the President of the PrepCom should prepare a report outlining the progress that has been made, and make recommendations for action to the next PrepCom, and that this report should be the basis for continuing consultations throughout the year;

2. Calls upon all member states of the European Union to ratify the CTBT urgently, and to adopt a joint action under Article J.3 TEU, to promote signature and ratification by other states, to include all necessary assistance to these states to enable them to comply with the provisions of the treaty;

3. Calls upon the Presidency, on behalf of the Council and Member States, to make the necessary démarches to allow the commencement in 1997 of negotiations leading to a nuclear weapons convention;
or

3. Calls upon the member states to support the commencement of

negotiations
in 1997 leading to the
conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention;

4. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the
Council,
Commission, President of the first
NPT PrepCom, the Secretary-General of the UN, the President
of the ICJ,
the President of

IALANA and the President of the Conference on Disarmament.

From wslf@igc.apc.org Fri Mar 7 04:00:13 1997

Date: Thu, 6 Mar 1997 22:48:36 -0800 (PST)

From: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@igc.apc.org>

To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, tomatompn+@igc.org

Cc: olins@pacbell.net, don@be.com, tedbtaylor@aol.com,
rgould@igc.org

Subject: letter to the editor

Greetings, friends. Following is a short letter by my colleague
John
Burroughs, that was published in the Nation, March 3. The letter,
which you
may find thought provoking, discusses the tricky relationship between
nuclear disarmament and general disarmament. -- Jackie Cabasso

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR
THE NATION
March 3, 1997, page 26
by John Burroughs

In their proposal that the Clinton Administration initiate
comprehensive
global disarmament negotiations ("Down & Out: A Nuclear Path",
December 30,
1996), Gar Alperovitz, Alex Campbell and Thad Williamson point out
that
"some on the left worry that discussion of general disarmament will
get in
the way of nuclear disarmament". This is not an idle worry. The
United
States opposed a recent U.N. General Assembly resolution calling
for
negotiations leading towards a nuclear weapons abolition convention,
on the
ground that no reference was made to a treaty on general and complete
disarmament. This despite the unanimous finding of the International
Court
of Justice clearly delinking the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
obligation
to eliminate nuclear weapons from the obligation to achieve a general
disarmament treaty. The U.S. weapons establishment is also arguing
that the
nuclear threat is desirable until the risk of devastating

conventional war
is minimized.

It is true that nuclear disarmament cannot be cleanly separated from other disarmament. Nuclear negotiations will inevitably involve important elements of general arms control, notably control of missiles that can be used for rapid delivery of warheads of all types: conventional, nuclear, chemical, and biological. And because a nuclear-weapon-free world could go nuclear again, the nuclear threat compels us to address all aspects of global security. But we must not let reduction and elimination of nuclear arsenals - or such critical short term steps as taking nuclear forces off alert and removing warheads from delivery systems - become contingent upon successful general disarmament. That is a formula of "nuclear weapons (in the hands of a select few countries) forever".

*** Jackie Cabasso * Western States Legal Foundation ***

1440 Broadway, Suite 500 Oakland, California USA 94612

Telephone: +(510)839-5877 / Fax: +(510)839-5397

***** E-mail: WSLF@igc.apc.org *****

Western States Legal Foundation is part of Abolition 2000,

A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

From ipb@gn.apc.org Fri Mar 7 04:00:13 1997

Date: Thu, 06 Mar 1997 19:20:53 -0100

From: International Peace Bureau <ipb@gn.apc.org>

To: "'Slater, Alice'" <aslater@IGC.APC.ORG>,

"'Heffermehl, Fredrik'" <fredpax@sn.no>,

'WILPF' <womensleague@gn.apc.org>

Cc: 'ABOLITION-CAUCUS' <ABOLITION-CAUCUS@IGC.APC.ORG>,

"'Kantola, Malla'" <mkantola@katto.kaapeli.fi>,

"'Weiss, Cora'" <srfnyusa@IGC.APC.ORG>

Subject: Meeting with Finns re NPT

Notes from informal meeting with Finnish representative re NPT: March 6, Geneva

Representatives of IPB and WILPF met today with Mr Kahiluoto, Head of Arms Control and NonProliferation at the Finnish Foreign Ministry. He works closely with Amb. Patokallio, Western Group candidate for President at the upcoming NPT PrepComm.

Our main purpose was to make representations on behalf of Abolition 2000. We gave him a packet of documents including the A2000 statement, the list of 698 endorsing organisations, and the NPT resolution passed at Moorea. We stressed that the concern of A2000 was to see the opening of negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention in 1997, as called

for in the Malaysian UNGA resolution. We discussed whether this might come about either via an Ad Hoc Committee in the CD, or as a subsidiary body in the NPT Review process.

His angle was that, since none of the P5 is prepared to even talk about it in a "deliberative" fashion, we must "be realistic" - ie concentrate on fissban, bilateral reductions etc. Western group felt that attempts to bring up nuclear disarmament in CD were a way to avoid the landmines issue - others of course see the linkage the other way round. Finland is involved in Ottawa process but "it's not a negotiating forum".

Discussion of Finland's own landmines policy: he disagreed with Red Cross critique of "military utility" etc. Finland is heavily pro-mine clearance, rehabilitation, etc but not willing to renounce yet its option to deploy mines in front of advancing Russian tanks.

I raised the issue of whether the US sub-criticals and in particular the B61-11 earth-penetrator system were NPT violations or even illegal in view of the possible use of the latter in situations such as bunker-busting where the "very existence of the state" is clearly not at stake. Therefore outlawed according to the ICJ ruling. He said he hadn't heard of the B61 system.

NPT procedural matters:

- Thematic PrepComms? perhaps, but not exclusively so.
 - NGO input to PrepComm? Probably half a day for "structured dialogue" - perhaps this means everyone is bored with endless 2-minute statements and is looking for another way to do it. Worth exploring?
 - Committees - probably 3 main committees looking at sections of the treaty & elements from the Principles & Objectives. One extra Committee may be set up to look at non-treaty items eg nuclear safety.
 - Subsidiary bodies: he noted there is no provision for intersessional meetings. However this might be something we would want to press for, especially if there are any signs of willingness to timidly approach the elimination issue.
- Next meeting of Western Group: March 18.

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 a member of Abolition 2000 - a Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons, and many other international bodies

From DGracie@afsc.orgFri Mar 7 04:01:45 1997
Date: Thu, 06 Mar 1997 14:12:30 -0500
From: David Gracie <DGracie@afsc.org>
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: I agree

Howard: I find myself in perfect agreement with you on points 1-11. I
am
glad you are going to be able to hook this up.

From Majordomo@igc.org Fri Mar 7 04:02:27 1997
Date: Thu, 6 Mar 1997 11:41:52 -0800 (PST)
From: Majordomo@igc.org
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: Welcome to ctb-news

--

Welcome to the ctb-news mailing list!

If you ever want to remove yourself from this mailing list, you can send mail to "Majordomo@igc.org" with the following command in the body of your email message:

```
unsubscribe ctb-news
```

If you try to unsubscribe from this mailing list, and your request is rejected, then send mail again to "Majordomo@igc.org" with the following command in the body of your email message:

```
unsubscribe ctb-news mupj@igc.apc.org
```

Here's the general information for the list you've subscribed to, in case you don't already have it:

Welcome to CTB-News. You'll receive the latest information on nuclear testing, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), and disarmament posted to your electronic mailbox. Its a service of the Comprehensive Test Ban Clearinghouse.

The CTB Clearinghouse - a joint venture sponsored by Greenpeace, Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility, and Plutonium Challenge - disseminates news and information to activists about the ongoing Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty negotiations in Geneva.

The information you will receive is also posted on the Internet newsgroup 'alt.activism.nuclear-tests.news'.

From wandwill@clark.net Sat Mar 8 07:58:17 1997
Date: Fri, 7 Mar 1997 14:55:22 -0500 (EST)
From: WAND/WILL <wandwill@clark.net>
To: cdavis@clw.org

Blast fax to Mon Lobby list

message:

Monday Lobby and the Military Spending Working Group will not be meeting on Monday, March 10 - so that everyone may attend the Rep. Frank/Sen. Wyden forum on redefining national security: Monday, March 10, 9:30 am - 3:00 pm, Room 1100 Longworth House Office Building

Monday Lobby has been rescheduled for Tuesday, March 11, noon-1pm, at Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE (across from Hart Senate office building).

The Military Spending Working Group will also meet on Tuesday, March 11, at FCNL at 11:00 am - just prior to Monday (okay, Tuesday) Lobby.

Women's Action for New Directions (WAND)
Deborah Walden, WAND Director of Policy and Programs
Women Legislators' Lobby (WiLL)
Cynthia Campbell, WiLL Washington Director
110 Maryland Avenue, N.E., Suite 205
Washington, D.C. 20002
voice: 202/543-8505
fax: 202/675-6469
e-mail: wandwill@clark.net

WAND's mission is to empower women to act politically to reduce violence and militarism and redirect military resources toward human and environmental needs.

WiLL (the Women Legislator's Lobby) is the only national multi-partisan network of women state legislators working to influence public policy at the federal level, and to ensure that our nation's spending priorities meet human and environmental needs. WiLL includes women legislators from all 50 states, representing millions of constituents. One in three women state

legislators is a WiLL member.

From worldpeace@gn.apc.org Sat Mar 8 07:58:17 1997

Date: Fri, 7 Mar 1997 18:10:43 GMT

From: Housmans Peace Resource Project <worldpeace@gn.apc.org>

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, listproc@hawaii.edu,
okamoto@shudo-u.ac.jp

Cc: hiromitu@shudo-u.ac.jp, jyamada@jca.or.jp, okamoto@hpc.ac.jp

Subject: Re: inquiry

FROM: Housmans Peace Resource Project, 5 Caledonian Road, Kings
Cross, London N1, UK (tel +44-171-278 4474; fax +44-171-278 0444;
e-mail worldpeace@gn.apc.org).

TO:

Mitsuo Okamoto

By e-mail to: okamoto@shudo-u.ac.jp

7 March 1997

Dear friend

You ask about being able to use local phones for your e-mail
everywhere in the world.

I believe there are 2 main types of option for you - but I may
have misunderstood the situation.

Firstly, you could have your e-mail address supplied by a large
international organisation like the Microsoft Network - I think
that you can then connect in almost any country, and I think it is
often by a local rate call.

Secondly, you could have your e-mail address on an APC
(Association for Progressive Communications) node, such as
GreenNet in Britain or IGC in the USA etc etc. (Though I don't
think there is one in Japan yet.) Besides supporting progressive
non-profit-making internet service providers, using APC means - I
think - that you can access your account in one country from any
other country with an APC node. And since some APC nodes have
local call access in their country (GreenNet in Britain does, for
example), then this might be an answer.

Best wishes

Albert Beale

Editor, Housmans World Peace Database and
Directory

From ledwidge@psr.org Sat Mar 8 07:58:18 1997

Date: Fri, 07 Mar 1997 13:49:30 -0800

From: Lisa Ledwidge <ledwidge@psr.org>
To: spsr@aecom.yu.edu, inpeace@bsuvc.bsu.edu,
DISARM-L@CNSIBM.ALBANY.edu,
abolition-caucus@igc.org
Cc: dkimball@igc.org, bmusil@igc.org, kperry@igc.org,
ramine@igc.org,
lopeza@igc.org, rswanson@igc.org
Subject: PSR Press Release, March 6, 1997

Dear PSR friends and supporters,

Physicians for Social Responsibility, the American affiliate of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, held a press conference yesterday in Washington DC which featured statements from some of the nation's largest medical organizations-- the American Medical Association, American College of Physicians and American Public Health Association-- calling for the abolition of nuclear weapons. The organizations also urged Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin to establish a framework agreement on START III and a timetable for removing all existing nuclear weapons from alert status. The two presidents are to meet in Helsinki, Finland March 20 & 21.

More details, including a wire story, press release and statements, follow. For more information please contact Lisa Ledwidge at PSR, 202-898-0150 x222 or <ledwidge@psr.org>.

.....

March 6, 1997

US-Russia-Nuclear

Doctors urge new cuts in nuclear weapons

By Harry Dumphy
Associated Press Writer

WASHINGTON (AP) - Four U.S. medical organizations on Thursday urged President Clinton and Russian President Boris Yeltsin to begin a new round of nuclear weapons reductions at their summit meeting this month.

The organizations said they were joining a group of 61 former generals and admirals from around the world who said in December the need for nuclear weapons has vanished with the disappearance of the former Soviet Union and a sharp decline in international tensions.

The four medical organizations are the American College of Physicians, the American Public Health Association, Physicians for Social Responsibility and International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War.

The groups also want the United States and Russia to remove existing nuclear weapons from alert status because of the risk of accidental nuclear attack.

In addition, Physicians for Social Responsibility asked Clinton to guarantee that enlargement of NATO would not lead to deployment of nuclear weapons in former Warsaw Pact nations.

The doctors' groups said the Senate should ratify a convention banning chemical weapons that goes into effect April 29 with or without U.S. approval.

Dr. Christine Cassel of the American College of Physicians said another treaty, the START II weapons agreement to cut U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals in half by 2003, was not enough.

She said the Clinton-Yeltsin summit March 20-21 in Helsinki, Finland, offers a significant opportunity to establish guidelines for START III "and make progress towards getting rid of the dangerous, ticking time bomb" of nuclear weapons.

The Russian parliament has not yet ratified START II. The Russian military is reluctant to get rid of all weapons outlawed by the treaty, and manufacturing permitted replacements would be expensive.

Dr. Barry S. Levy of the American Public Health Association called for an international nuclear weapons convention by 2000 "that would require the phased elimination of these weapons with a time-bound framework under strict and effective international control."

Replying to a question on whether nuclear weapons would always be needed to deter rogue states and terrorist groups, Dr. Ira Helfand of Physicians for Social Responsibility said such weapons were no protection against terrorists.

.....

Physicians for Social Responsibility
1101 14th St. NW Washington DC 20005
202-898-0150, fax 202-898-0172

News Alert
News Alert
News Alert

For Immediate Release: March 6, 1997
Contact: Daryl Kimball 202-898-0150

Physicians Announce Unified Call for Nuclear Disarmament

Washington, D.C. The presidents of four major medical organizations met at the National Press Club today to announce their unified call for the elimination of all nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. The announcement comes just days before U.S. President Bill Clinton and Russian President Boris Yelstin will meet in Helsinki to discuss arms reduction and other issues of national security.

Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR), the American affiliate of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, has worked for decades to alert the public to the continuing threat of nuclear war. Mainstream medical associations including the American Medical Association, the American College of Physicians and the American Public Health Association have now joined in this effort. In the past few months, each of these organizations has endorsed resolutions

calling for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

"The best way to prevent the use of nuclear weapons is to eradicate them," said Dr. Ira Helfand, past-president of PSR. "The command and control policies of the US and Russia are so unreliable that the dangers of accidental nuclear war are greater than ever. When missiles can be launched in less than four minutes, it doesn't allow much time to compensate for accidents and false alarms. As physicians, we find this situation unacceptable. We are calling on Clinton and Yelstin to use this historic opportunity to affirm their commitment to the abolition of nuclear weapons and to put this issue at the top of their political agenda. Specifically, we want a framework agreement on Start III and a timetable for removing all existing nuclear weapons from alert status."

Also speaking at the conference were Dr. Christine Cassel, president of the American College of Physicians; Dr. Barry Levy, President of the American Public Health Association; and Dr. Vic Sidel, past-president of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. Dr. Robert McAfee, past-president of the American Medical Association was unable to attend but submitted a statement in support of the physicians campaign to "remind the public and our nation's policymakers about the continuing threat posed by nuclear weapons."

--30--

.....
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

March 6, 1997

Statement attributable to:

Robert E. McAfee, M.D.
Past President
American Medical Association

"The American Medical Association (AMA) welcomes the efforts our colleagues from the American College of Physicians, the American Public Health Association, Physicians for Social Responsibility, and the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War to remind the public and out nation's policymakers about the continuing threat posed by nuclear weapons.

"We join in calling for action leading to the elimination by all nations of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass and indiscriminate destruction.

"We urge other medical associations worldwide to address the continuing threat of nuclear war and nuclear weapons, and urge them to support the elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass and indiscriminate destruction."

.....

American Public Health Association Supports Abolition of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction

Statement of Barry S. Levy, M.D., M.P.H.
President, American Public Health Association
March 6, 1997

My name is Barry S. Levy. As a physician I have worked in public health for 25 years, both in the United States and 20 other countries. I serve as president of the American Public Health Association (APHA), the oldest and largest public health association in the world. This 125-year-old Association represents 50,000 public health professionals throughout the United States. I am also an Adjunct Professor at Tufts University School of Medicine.

The American Public Health Association believes that nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction continue to represent an enormous threat to the health of the public worldwide. In terms of risk to human health and well-being, there is no greater public health threat.

At its annual meeting last November, APHA's Governing Council unanimously reaffirmed a policy statement concerning the abolition of nuclear weapons:

We call upon all nations to undertake these responsibilities:

1. To respect the moratorium on explosive nuclear-weapons testing currently being observed;
2. To ratify promptly the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; and
3. To initiate promptly and to conclude by the year 2000 negotiations on a nuclear-weapons convention that requires the phased elimination of nuclear weapons within a time bound framework under strict and effective international control.

In addition we call upon the Administration to join all nations to negotiate promptly a comprehensive treaty that bans new weapons development at the national weapons laboratories, bans the production of all weapons including usable fissile materials, and places existing stockpiles of such material under international safeguards.

Recently, APHA's Governing council also unanimously adopted a policy statement urging the U.S. Senate to ratify the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Administration to implement the treaty in a manner that protects the health of all people and the environment. In addition, the statement urges all nations to ratify, implement and observe the treaty.

The Convention bans the production, storage and use of chemical weapons and monitors trade in potential weapons ingredients. The treaty has been signed by 68 nations and will go into effect on April 29 - whether or not the United States ratifies it.

The horrors of mustard gas, chlorine and other chemical weapons became apparent during World War I. The Geneva Protocol of 1925 outlawed their first use. Now, 72 years later, after the development of lethal weapons such as nerve agents, it is time to take the next important step to eliminate these public health horrors by ratification and implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Public health is what we do as a society, collectively, to assure the conditions in which people can be healthy. Nothing assures this more than the abolition of nuclear weapons, chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

.....

end
From shundahai@saltmine.radix.net Sat Mar 8 07:58:18 1997
Date: Fri, 7 Mar 1997 19:04:16 -0500 (EST)
From: The Shundahai Network <shundahai@saltmine.radix.net>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: ALERT: NBC NATIONAL NEWS 3/7

Dear Friends,

NBC nightly news tonight will broadcast a story on the Nevada Test Site under the "Fleecing of America" series. The story is about how the Device Assembly Facility (Part of SSM) is wasting precious taxpayer money. They filmed at the Shundahai Network office in Las Vegas for over an hour here and hopefully will cover the larger environmental and economic picture of the entire nuclear weapons program. Any how if you get a chance check it out.

Peace, Reinard

SHUNDAHAI NETWORK
"Peace and Harmony with all Creation"
Breaking the Nuclear Chain

5007 Elmhurst St., Las Vegas, NV 89108 ph(702)647-3095
Fax: (702)647-9385 Email: shundahai@radix.net

ACTION FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION!

5007 Elmhurst, Las Vegas, NV 89108 Phone: (702) 647-3095
Fax: (702)647-9385 Email: shundahi@intermind.net

SHUT THE TEST SITE DOWN!
NONVIOLENT DIRECT ACTION CAMP
March 31 - April 4, 1997

<http://www.macronet.org/macronet/shundahai/shutdown.html>

"It's in our backyard...its in our front yard.
This nuclear contamination is shortening all life.
Were going to have to unite as a people and say no more!
We, the people, are going to have to put our thoughts
together to save our planet here.

We only have One Water...One Air...One Mother Earth."
Corbin Harney, Newe (Western Shoshone) Spiritual Leader;
Founder and Executive Director, Shundahai Network

From abolition@motherearth.knooppunt.be Sat Mar 8 07:58:18 1997
Date: Sat, 8 Mar 97 10:24:04 +0100
From: Motherearth Office Bel <abolition@motherearth.knooppunt.be>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Gorleben action report

Dearest Folx:

Here is a bit longish report from Gorleben, it was pretty incredible,
i hope you find this interesting, feel free to use it however useful.

Paxus in Vienna
6 March 97 - my birthday

>From the Tracks to Gorleben

Germans do things in a big way. Twenty years ago the resistance
to
storage of nuclear fuel at the Gorleben facility started and for
18 of
those years thru protests and legal actions they succeeded in
preventing the arrival of any spent fuel shipments (tho some other
waste was delivered). There have been two shipments since the German
state finally broke through all the obstacles and the third one has
just gone through - this is part of its story. The demonstrations
have grown larger each year - this is a glimpse into the piece of
it i
saw.

What is interesting to me about the background is that many of the
people who started the resistance movement against the Castor (which
is the name of the fuel container) moved into the area and started
working the land there. We are often talking about getting local
people involved in various actions, this is a case where the actions
went on for so long that the activists actually became the local
people. This is a mostly agricultural area and the people who moved

became farmers. But the local resistance is very deep, all through the action old people from around the towns were seen supporting demonstrators in lots of ways, from cakes which arrived at midnight to rides for protesters on farm equipment between the 14 different camps which were organized along the routes of the transport. The kitchen told me that a significant amount of the food they prepared for the protesters was donated by the local farmers. But the support is actually much deeper, with farmers putting their tractors on the line in blockades, knowing that the police will likely smash them (as they have before).

We arrived the night before the transports did and the main camp was already several thousand. Rampenplan was cooking and asking only donations, they were losing thousands no doubt, but were totally happy to be there, even with the stress. The sky regularly had helicopters in it, but the tactic from last year of flying very close to the ground and destroying tents had been abandoned. We walked over to the special crane which moves the Castors from the end of the train tracks to the trucks, from here they make the 18 km journey to the village of Gorleben.

Two things were amazing about the crane. The first was that we could get so close to it. We stood about 15 meters (about 45 feet) from it at the closest point. Last year some people climbed the fence and took a welder to the legs of the crane and managed to cut through three of them before they were stopped, just short of collapsing the whole thing. Even with this history, there was only one low fence of 1 meter and then another high fence of about 4 meters, with simple three strands of barbed wire at the top. The crane itself stood well above the fence an easy target for someone coming from the trees or even with a good throwing arm and a rope from besides the tracks.

The second thing which surprised me was the relationship between the police guarding the crane and the protesters, it was extremely cordial. The police were making no effort to avoid conversation with the protesters, in fact they even initiated it on a couple of occasions I saw. Some protesters were allowed to sit on the first low fence with their feet over onto the police's side. I saw one protester offer an officer a paper tissue for his runny nose, he took it and they continued chatting. I wondered to myself if the police would be able to fully function the next day in beating the same people they

had taken such kindness' from the night before. And even if they did perform the mechanical work of beating up the protesters, certainly psychologically such contact makes the job expensive. Many protesters reported that the police guarding the transport opposed the transport, but felt they needed to do their job.

My favorite piece of propaganda from the action was a flier which was in the green color of the German police. It called on the police not to do the job of protecting the Castor transport and it gave a phone number for them to call. What was great about it is that it came from a groups of "critical police", who were refusing to support the transport. When i talked with a few Germans about this they said that the civil service system in Germany was such that these police could not get fired for such insubordination, they would likely never get prompted again, but apparently they were driven by their beliefs to act in such a way - inspiring.

The Castors themselves are huge. Weighing a bit more than 500 metric tons, they fill a freight car of a train and are something like 20 meters long. They look like a large pillars on their side made of stainless steel. Because of previous protests 6 were brought this time instead of one. As i watched it a man from the action group Robin Wood came by with a Geiger counter and informed me that the gamma radiation was 20 times background levels. So i stepped back from the fence, the thing was big enuf to see without being close. Gamma radiation is stopped by almost anything, including paper or cloths, but there is potential for damage to the eyes, which was one of the most damaged organs from the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings.

When the second round of police were called up (over 30,000 total were called officially, up from 19,000 at the previous transport) women were included for the first time in the group, which met with serious protest both from police and some of the media. The principal issue is damage to reproductive systems. Police traveling with the Castors on the train are allowed to go 150 km and then they have their life time does and are not allowed to travel with them again. On the shifts for this transport they were allowed to walk beside them (at somewhat greater distance) for 4 hours and then permanently shifted away. The police labor union even called for this shipment to be abandoned because of the danger to the forces. Our delaying tactics may ultimately succeed, because the Germans simply run out of police who can escort the transports (there are 420 more to go and they have

only moved 8 so far in three shipments).

It is interesting to note that the principal reason for choosing the

Gorleben site is that when it was selected 20 years ago it was considered ideal, because it was located in a "nose" of west Germany surrounded to the north, east and south by east Germany, so in the event of an accident the communists would likely get the problem.

Now of course it is located in the center of unified Germany just over 100 miles from Berlin. The best laid plans.

The past two shipments had gone from the crane thru the village of Dannenburg which is about one km from the crane. But the blockade this year made it impossible. About 20 tractors were parked in the road, which alone would have made it difficult, but huge holes were dug underneath the road, which were not a problem for normal traffic, would be potentially dangerous for the 500 plus ton Castor transports.

The police had to take another route, which was several km longer, which means some more delay. The transports were 4 hours late in arriving at the crane because of demos which took place en route, including one where people put concrete on their hands and feet and connected themselves to the tracks. The police, unable to figure out

how to remove the demonstrators without cutting their limbs, cut out a section of track and then spent a few hours replacing it.

We slept for two days on the section of road which lead from the tracks to the final storage in Gorleben. At midnight the second night

there was the voice of the police on the loud speaker "Achtung, Achtung, this is the Police" (in German of course). They told us that

we were in violation of some relevant laws and they gave us three warnings (ultimately they would give many more warnings, something like 8 over the course of the eviction, many after it had started). They explained that they would start by using simply physical force of

the police to remove us, then would escalate to water cannons and finally they would use clubs to remove us if necessary. In one of the

relatively few agreements between all of the protesting groups - the first section of protesters after the crane (which was called X-000 ,X

thousand", the entire event was called day "X 3" for the third transport), it was agreed that this first part would be without violence and without property destruction - just thousands of people, Gandhi style blocking the transport with their bodies. In the end, it

was at least 5,000 and i would estimate 10,000 people who were on the road for this first part of the action.

It was not the case that the entire action was non-violent. The German Autonom group is fairly famous for their hard tactics. At one point the day before the transport the police advance on an Autonom position (a separate camp) and found first rocks coming at them, but they continued to advance, presumably with the intention of arresting.

Then the Molotov cocktails came out and the police decided that the arrests were not so important. This little trick was not without troubles, one woman got hit by a Molotov and ended up in the hospital in critical condition. The boulevard press ran the headline "The first Casualty of Castor?", perhaps - certainly not the last. The whole protest is often described as a kind of civil war.

At about 1:AM the police started to move, just using the promised physical force. It was the same kind of scene which most of us have seen at demos, police pulling people apart, various hand grips, police putting fingers in peoples noses and turning, some punches in the face

- but it was not excessively violent. As often is the case, it very much depended on the attitude of the police person who got to you. Many were sympathetic with the protesters and made some effort not to

use too much pain. Others were exhausted and frustrated. Still others were clearly into hurting people. As Crystal once said, "Every cop has his/her own agenda"

The difference for me was the sheer size. Even with the relatively efficient removal, because of the tremendous number of people on the

road, they could not move very fast. There is a bit of a race against the clock. The Castor can not move on the road at night, for legal and logistical reasons. It takes about 8 hours to go the 18 km from the Crane to the storage (at least it did with X2 - the second transport), a bit longer because we forced it to take an alternative route. So daylight is the key. All through the night there were occasional announcements of other actions going on, members of the German Parliament, on site, spoke to the protesters telling them that

they were doing the right thing. Announcements of more tunnels beneath the roads brought cheers and there was even a brief musical performance, but people were so exhausted that this was cut short. The evictions started at 1AM, with the likely intent of clearing the

path by daybreak, but it was clear by about 3:30 AM that simply physical violence was going to be too slow. So the water cannons started.

I did not think they would use the water cannons at night, because even with the helicopters flying overhead which huge lights it was

quite difficult to see and if you hit someone directly in the face with a water cannon you can really hurt them (Tom tells a story of a Belgian woman going deaf). Water cannons are also a variable strength weapon, at X2 they used them both at high pressure and with tear gas, but the bad press coverage of this tactic was sufficient to start the cannon with low pressure and no tear gas. Still low pressure is enuf to knock you down if you are standing. The police actually took a fair amount of beating by the cannons themselves, they had to be in front of the cannons to move us and were often soaked and hit - which could not have made them very happy. The cannons themselves have an odd comic appearance to them. Long nozzles between two large lights all mounted on a large joystick controlled form inside the cab of the vehicle makes them look like cartoon characters a bit, with huge eyes, long noses and bobbing heads. There comic value disappears when you hear people getting hit.

But even with the water cannons (which did slowly but steadily increase in pressure as the night wore on) it was not possible for the police to use tear gas, because of the high level of press attention and the bad press they got last time for using it. Similarly, they probably selected not to start clubbing people for the same reasons. So as it was a full 4 hours of daylight passed before the demonstrators were removed (excluding the Freiburg folx who climbed the trees and set up cat walks which the police were totally unprepared for and end up running the Castors under them). Then because of the huge number of police and vehicles involved, it took them another couple of hours to reorganize themselves before the transport could start moving.

We were some of the last people to be removed. They finally had started the eviction process coming from both directions to try to speed things up. A huge plastic sheet was put overhead of perhaps 1000 people (at one point the press donated 50 meters of plastic to protect the protesters). And the group regularly broke into choruses of ,We all live in a Yellow Submarine", which the international in my affinity group found hilarious. Our group consisted of people from the FAIRE and PIANO projects and we had decided to use ,Siemens" as our identifying password. The need for the password was that people often went away from the group and when they came back had trouble

finding us in the sea of protesters. So they would call out ,Siemens" and listen for the reply ,Boycott" and then go to the place. Other groups picked up this technique and the group beside us was ,Elvis" to which they responded ,Lives!" (,Leben" in German).

We were only able to hold our position for a couple of minutes. Krista Piano got punched several times in the face, Tom from Gent got his arm twisted again (he had been up front earlier and been thrown out of the line the night before). Nadias nose was twisted and got cut. Sarah Piano got fingers up her nose. Ogy Faire and i simply had our wrists held back long enuf to convince us to cooperate. Then we were the last we were temporarily blocked from getting with the larger group because the police finally controlled the first part of the road and formed a line separation us from the mass of the group. Ultimately they let us reconnect.

I don't really know how many people were there, no one can guess very accurately, many people intentionally stayed out of sight. There were entire camps which i did not see (and the media paid no attention to).

There were camps of motorcycle folx, a women and lesbian camp (i would have called it lesbians and other women, but you don't mess with this name stuff), there was the Hamburg camp, which was harder action folx, there were wild cat action camps, people staying with friends in the towns along the way and almost all of these did not make it to the main action at the beginning where there were probably 10,000 people (including perhaps a couple thousand non-activist visitors). The numbers don't really matter - the spirit was incredible, the cost both political and financial was huge and the message was clear, it is not just about trains and geological sites - it is about people being upset and active on the issue, which is not going away.

I could not stay to the very end, so Krista Piano and i did some quick talking and walking on the way to her next stop to try to catch the Castor on route. We went thru the village of Dannenburg and caught what for me was the most telling incident of the entire action. About 40 police in full gear came and started puncturing the tires of the tractors which were in the blockade. This road could not be used because of the underground tunnels in it, so this was a measure probably designed as revenge by the police against the local people (Tom theorized that the tractors might be moved to block the other

road, but this seems unlikely in retrospect, because of the distance and speed of the Castors at that point). The local people physically stopped the police from damaging some tractors and drove some others away. But the anger of the local people was intense. They did not outnumber the police by more than a dozen and had no weapons - but the police knew they were totally in the wrong and started to retreat. The local people started to advance and there was this surrealistic scene of angry unarmed locals advancing against totally geared up police with shields, clubs, guns and the whole bit. Soon the police were running from the locals. They ran into a near by field where 5 or 6 helicopters descended and picked them up as the locals chased after them. As the helicopters flew off, i was reminded of the final scene of the Vietnam war, with US marines fleeing the embassy in Saigon holding on to helicopters - uninvited violent intruders running from their failures.

Post script: The newspapers are reporting the extraordinary cost of the transport because of the action at US\$ 100 million. The German state is talking about not delivering the next shipment to this rural area of central Germany, but to a mining site which is located in the most populated province in the country, near the Ruhrgebiet, which is the largest multicity complex on the continent, including Koln, Dortmund and Dusseldorf. This choice would significantly save on travel costs for activists.

End of forwarded message.

--

For Mother Earth
International Working Group

Tom Keunen
Gewad 15
9000 Gent
Belgium

Tel: +32+9 233 49 24
Fax: +32+9 233 73 02

E-mail: tom@motherearth.knooppunt.be

*** "Why participate in the ruin of creation ***
* when you can participate in the creation of ruins."*

End of forwarded message.

From worldpeace@gn.apc.org Sat Mar 8 07:58:18 1997

From lcapt@efn.org Mon Mar 10 04:45:47 1997
Date: Sun, 9 Mar 1997 13:38:02 -0500 (EST)
From: Lane County American Peace Test <lcapt@efn.org>
To: cpa@efn.org
Cc: efn_news@efn.org, local_activists@efn.org,
eug_neighbors@efn.org,
foe@efn.org, abolition-caucus@igc.org, lcapt@efn.org
Subject: VERY IMPORTANT: RE: CORBIN HARNEY, SPIRITUAL LEADER WESTERN SHOSHONE

SUNDAY MARCH 9, 1997

CORBIN HARNEY, SPIRITUAL LEADER WESTERN SHOSHONE NATION IS SPEAKING TODAY IN EUGENE, SUNDAY, MARCH 9TH. THE TIME IS 5PM - 9PM. LOCATION IS THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON - ERB MEMORIAL UNION (EMU) FIR ROOM (2ND FLOOR). THERE WILL BE ALSO BE 2 VIDEOS SHOWING "ONE AIR, ONE WATER, ONE EARTH" AND "NUKES IN SPACE." DRUMMERS AND FLUTISTS FROM THE HEARTS OF EUGENE FEATURING DAPHNE TURNER AND KATHY BOQUET AS WELL AS INFORMATION ON THE UPCOMING ACTIONS AT THE NEVADA NUCLEAR TEST SITE.

CORBIN WILL BE HERE THE WEEK OF MARCH 9 - MARCH 16, 1997. FOR INFORMATION OR SCHEDULING QUESTIONS CALL RICK GOLD @ (541)484-9884.

SPONSORED BY THE SHUNDAHAI NETWORK & LANE COUNTY AMERICAN PEACE TEST - 454 WILLAMETTE, EUGENE, OREGON 97401 - (541)484-9884.

From int@fme.knooppunt.be Mon Mar 10 04:45:47 1997
Date: Sun, 09 Mar 1997 23:49:41
From: Pol D'Huyvetter <int@fme.knooppunt.be>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, fme@knooppunt.be
Subject: ACTION NATO SUMMIT MADRID

Dear friends,

Next July 8 is the first anniversary of the historic decision by the international Court of Justice (ICJ) on how international law applies to nuclear weapons.

On the same day all of the NATO leaders meeting in Madrid for the NATO Summit will be startled to receive a visit from a Spanish bailiff with a summons. They will be told that unless they carry out a radical legal surgery on NATO's nuclear weapons policy, they will be confronted with a new campaign of non-violent direct actions to

remind them of their obligations under international law.

This was decided by peace and environmental activists meeting in Gent (Belgium) this weekend.

You'll be able to receive regular updates on this campaign through a new electronic mail-server (more info soon).

We hope you will join this new initiative to abolish nuclear weapons. Contact us today.

Sincerely,

George Farebrother (World Court Project UK)

Pol D'Huyvetter (For Mother Earth International)

Ak Malten (Global Anti-Nuclear Alliance, NL)

Eirlys Rhiannon (Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, UK)

Koen Moens (Forum voor Vredesaktie, B)

Yvonne Timmermans (Earth First, NL)

Hanna Jarvinen (For Mother Earth International)

Mikko Koskinen (For Mother Earth Finland)

Katri Silvonen (For Mother Earth International)

Tom Keunen (For Mother Earth International)

Prof. Pierre Pierart (European Nuclear Test Ban Coalition, Belgium)

end

From nfzns@gn.apc.org Mon Mar 10 04:45:47 1997

Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 10:03:50 GMT

From: Stewart Kemp <nfzns@gn.apc.org>

To: nfla.news@conf.gn.apc.org

Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Subject: UK Nuclear News 7 March 1997

>From: GMR@MCR1.poptel.org.uk

>Date: Fri, 07 Mar 1997 12:24:03 GMT

>Subject: NPU Bulletin 7 Mar

>To: nfzns@gn.apc.org

>

>DAILY INFORMATION BULLETIN - NUCLEAR POLICY

>

>Fri 7 Mar 1997

>

>97-8262 German n/industry faces extinction as opposition parties rush

> to renounce n/power. Ind
>97-8263 Yeltsin uses fighting return to attack Nato expansion. FT
>97-8264 Nato down to shortlist of three likely new members - Poland,
> Czech Republic and Hungary, with Slovenia a possible fourth.
> Ind
>
>
>
>GM Research, Metropolitan House, Hobson Street, Oldham, OL1 1QD.
>Tel: 0161-911 4179. Fax: 0161-627 1736.
>Internet: gmr@mcr1.poptel.org.uk
>
>

Stewart Kemp (nfznscc@gn.apc.org)

From int@fme.knooppunt.be Mon Mar 10 15:09:44 1997
Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 13:59:21
From: Pol D'Huyvetter <int@fme.knooppunt.be>
To: A-days@knooppunt.be
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: INFO NEW MAILING LIST : Nuclear Weapons Abolitiion Days

Mailinglist Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days

=====
===

Launch New
International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons

NATO Summit Madrid July 8 1997
August 6th 1997 NATO HQ Brussels
August 9th 1997 at 'sites of crime'

=====

Dear friends,

Folowing the first international meeting here in Gent, I am happy to announce that we have installed a new 'majordomo' automatic inter-active electronic mailer this morning.

With this mailer we wish to improve the campaign to abolish nuclear weapons upholding international law by non-violent direct actions.

Further you'll find :

- * info (i.e. un/subscribe, list users, ...)
- * five guidelines (against growing E-mail inflation) for using this new mailer!!

Peace,

Pol D'Huyvetter
Contact Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days

Attached :

- * users information
- * guidelines

* For Mother Earth International office

*

* Lange Steenstraat 16/D, 9000 Gent, Belgium

*

* Phone/fax +32-9-233 84 39

*

* E-mail: int@fme.knooppunt.be

*

* WWW: <http://www.knooppunt.be/~fme>

*

* Postal account : 000-1618561-19

*

* For Mother Earth is member of Abolition 2000 - a global

*

network to eliminate nuclear weapons, the International Peace

* Bureau (IPB) and World Information Service on Energy (WISE)

*

For Mother Earth has offices in Belgium, Slovakia, Sri Lanka,

* USA, as well as active members/groups in Belarus, Finland,

*

* Germany, Netherlands, Rumania and Ukraine

*

XXXXXXXXXX

USERS INFO

XXXXXXXXXX

Mailinglist Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days

Send mail destined to the list to

<A-days@knooppunt.be>

The list is CLOSED, which means only people who subscribed can mail messages.

Unlisted users can send their message to <int@fme.knooppunt.be> with request to forward.

In the initial set-up today we have listed '43' accounts, which were collected during the preparation of this new campaign.

ATTENTION!

--

Send 'ADMINISTRATIVE' requests (subscribe, unscubscribe...) only
to

<majordomo@knooppunt.be>

--

#List of commands to put in body of the message

For Subscription

subscribe A-days <your account>

For Unsubscription

unsubscribe A-days <your account>

To get a list of the members of the list

who A-days

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Five guidelines
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Today I can think of five guidelines and one suggestion to make this
mailer a good experience. Let me know if you have others.

As we are aware of a running inflation with E-mail, we wish to ask
you to consider :

* Five guidelines
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

1. please only use this mailer in relationship to the issue of
international law/nuclear weapons/non-violent direct actions,
(past, present and future).
2. if you reply to a message, please reply to the author only,
unless the aim is to have a discussion through the mailer.

3. Refrain from putting 'very long messages' on this mailer. You can

however always announce briefly which info you have available

4. Please send your message only one time

5. I wish to repeat :

Don't send (un)subscribe messages to

<A-days@knooppunt.be>

Send message to

<majordomo@knooppunt.be>

with <unsubscribe A-days>

or <subscribe A-days>

in body of message

Wish this will help.

end

From disarmament@igc.org Mon Mar 10 15:18:28 1997
Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 09:15:32 -0800 (PST)
From: disarmament@igc.org
To: ctb-followers@igc.org
Subject: Docs, START II, NATO

APO 03/06 1613 Docs Urge Nuke Weapons Cuts

By HARRY DUNPHY

Associated Press Writer

WASHINGTON (AP) -- Four U.S. medical organizations on Thursday urged President Clinton and Russian President Boris Yeltsin to begin a new round of nuclear weapons reductions at their summit meeting this month.

The organizations said they were joining a group of 61 former generals and admirals from around the world who said in December the need for nuclear weapons had vanished with the disappearance of the former Soviet Union and a sharp decline in international tensions.

The four medical organizations are the American College of Physicians, the American Public Health Association, Physicians for Social Responsibility and International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War.

The groups also want the United States and Russia to remove existing nuclear weapons from alert status because of the risk of accidental nuclear attack.

In addition, Physicians for Social Responsibility asked Clinton to guarantee that enlargement of NATO would not lead to deployment of nuclear weapons in former Warsaw Pact nations.

The doctors' groups said the Senate should ratify a convention banning chemical weapons that goes into effect April 29 with or without U.S. approval.

Dr. Christine Cassel of the American College of Physicians said another treaty, the START II weapons agreement to cut U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals in half by 2003, was not enough.

She said the Clinton-Yeltsin summit March 20-21 in Helsinki, Finland, offers a significant opportunity to establish guidelines for a Start III treaty "and make progress towards getting rid of the dangerous, ticking time bomb" of nuclear weapons.

The Russian parliament has not yet ratified START II. The Russian military is reluctant to get rid of all weapons outlawed by the treaty, and manufacturing permitted replacements would be expensive.

Dr. Barry S. Levy of the American Public Health Association called for an international nuclear weapons convention by 2000 "that would require the phased elimination of these weapons with a time-bound framework under strict and effective international control."

Replying to a question on whether nuclear weapons would always be needed to deter rogue states and terrorist groups, Dr. Ira Helfand of Physicians for Social Responsibility said such weapons were no protection against terrorists. He said rogue states could not deliver any nuclear weapons they possessed or might develop to their targets.

APO 03/09 1845 Russia Gen. Pushes Arms Treaty

By JOHN IAMS

Associated Press Writer

MOSCOW (AP) -- The head of Russia's strategic rocket forces on Sunday urged Parliament to ratify the languishing START II arms control treaty, saying there are no alternatives on the table.

The treaty was signed by Presidents Boris Yeltsin and George Bush in 1993, and ratified by the U.S. Senate last year. But the Russian Parliament has balked, in part because some Russians believe the pact gives the United States an unfair advantage in strategic nuclear weapons.

"Despite the variety of opinions on this document's ratification, everyone agrees that there is no alternative to it," Gen. Igor Sergeyev told the Interfax news agency on Sunday. "That is the key point."

Some lawmakers have said Parliament will not ratify the treaty if the American-led North Atlantic Treaty Organization expands eastward toward Russia's borders, as it is planning to do.

President Clinton and Russian President Boris Yeltsin will discuss arms control and the NATO expansion during their summit in Helsinki, Finland, on March 19-20.

START II sets a warhead limit of 3,500 on each side, down from pre-treaty levels of about 8,000. It also calls for the elimination, by 2003, of all land-based nuclear weapons with multiple warheads, which would make obsolete the SS-18, Russia's most powerful missile.

The Russian military is reluctant to get rid of all the weapons outlawed by the treaty, and it can not easily afford to manufacture the permitted replacements. "We have to upgrade missiles to maintain the necessary military potential," Sergeyev said.

The treaty remains shelved in the Russian Parliament, the State Duma, where nationalists and Communists have voiced strong opposition. Some lawmakers have requested the deadline for implementation be delayed because of the pressure it would put on the cash-strapped Russian economy.

Sergeyev said the situation in Russia now was very different from the conditions under which the treaty was signed.

"The demands that the time period for the treaty's implementation be extended until the years 2006-2007, instead of 2003, are quite justified," the general said.

Meanwhile, NATO Secretary-General Javier Solana met with Russia's foreign minister Sunday, as the two sides tried to ease tensions over the alliance's eastward expansion.

The third round of talks between Solana and Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov comes just four months before the beginning of NATO's program to invite new members.

Russia, unable to halt the expansion, is pushing for as many concessions as it can wring from NATO, whose leaders are anxious to soothe Moscow's irritation over the plan. Solana and Primakov were expected to work on a draft document setting out a special relationship between Russia and the alliance.

Both Primakov and Solana say talks so far have been constructive and they expect to work out a document agreeable to both sides, although Moscow publicly continues to take a hard line on the expansion issue.

RTw 03/10 1104 NATO-Russia edge towards enlargement deal

By Jonathan Clayton

BRUSSELS, March 10 (Reuter) - NATO and Russia have sketched the outlines of a deal on the alliance's planned eastwards enlargement, but major differences remain over Moscow's insistence of a freeze on new military installations, according to alliance diplomatic sources.

"This is now one of the main problems, the Russians simply don't understand how NATO works," said one alliance diplomat after the latest round of talks between the alliance and Russia on a new post-Cold War relationship.

He said countries most likely to be invited to join the alliance at a special summit in Madrid in July -- Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic -- would modernise and upgrade their armed forces and military facilities anyway.

"This is something that would happen anyway, not because of NATO membership. These countries would want to upgrade their defence facilities. Also, NATO is made up of national armies working together," added the diplomat.

Russia has signalled it no longer has any objections to these countries joining the alliance as long as they get assurances no NATO infrastructure whatsoever would be moved eastwards, diplomats said.

NATO cannot accept any demands that effectively would give the new members "second class" membership, but in reply has said it has no plans to station nuclear weapons or troops on the territory of the new members.

In addition, the alliance's military says it must be free to adapt communications' facilities and airfields to meet basic NATO standards.

Russia said on Monday talks in Moscow on Sunday between NATO Secretary-General Javier Solana and Russian Foreign Secretary Yevgeny Primakov had been "positive," but acknowledged differences remained on "a range of problems."

Alliance diplomats said Russia had clearly decided it could not stop NATO's expansion later this year and was now trying to strike as good a deal as possible.

They said Russia now appeared to have dropped its previous demand that any NATO-Russia document should be in the form of a legally-binding treaty rather than a politically-binding commitment from the alliance's 16 leaders.

"I think the Russians now accept the argument that such a treaty would be unwieldy," added the diplomat.

Alliance sources said the plan, now broadly accepted by both sides, was to try and create a framework for consultation which could move towards "mutual agreements" over a broad range of areas.

"The trick for the alliance is to try and give the Russians

co-decision without appearing to let them have a veto over alliance activities. That is a difficult circle to try and square," said one analyst.

Solana left Moscow on Monday for Central Asia, but Assistant Secretary-General Gebhardt von Moltke stayed behind for a further day of negotiations with Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Nikolai Afanasievsky.

Alliance sources said the two men were trying to merge the different position papers presented by both sides into a single document.

"It will be full of brackets, but at least it will be one document and a basis for more negotiation," said another alliance diplomat.

Both sides are keen to make progress ahead of a summit in Helsinki on March 21 between Presidents Bill Clinton and Boris Yeltsin at which major steps towards a deal could be made.

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005

Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 Fax: 202 898 0172

<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

From nirsnet@igc.apc.org Mon Mar 10 15:18:28 1997

Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 09:06:22 -0800 (PST)

From: Michael Mariotte <nirsnet@igc.apc.org>

To: Graham Daniell <gdaniell@wt.com.au>, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Subject: Re: Three Mile Island

Yes, the study was conducted by scientists at the University of North Carolina, led by Dr. Steve Wing. A two-page fact sheet on the study is available at the NIRS web site (www.nirs.org) in the Radiation section of NIRSNET on the Web. We will try to put the whole study up once we get a scannable copy of it.

You can also call Cindy Folkers at NIRS (202-328-0002) for more info or a copy of the study (it's \$2 for postage and handling).

Michael Mariotte, NIRS

At 05:56 AM 3/1/97 +0800, Graham Daniell wrote:

>Hi,

>

>A couple of days ago there was a news report on public radio here about a

>recently concluded Three Mile Island follow up study. It showed increased

>health problems downwind if the site were far higher than that expected for

>the amount of radioactivity "officially" released. eg: lung cancer was up 500

>- 600 percent). The study was carried out by America's Institute of Environmental Health Scientists I believe.

>

>I have not heard any re regarding this since. Can anyone confirm this

>report and can you indicate where I can get authoritative information about it?

>

>Towards a nuclear-free millennium,

>Graham Daniell

>Perth, Western Australia

>gdaniell@wt.com.au

>

>

>

From wagingpeace@napf.org Mon Mar 10 15:18:28 1997

Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 09:12:19 -0800

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

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Cc: INESnet@fy.chalmers.se

The Self-Destructiveness Of Nuclear Weapons:
A Dangerous And Costly Mental Block

By Dean Babst, David Krieger and Bob Aldridge*

There is a worldwide reluctance to think about the self-destructive consequences of the use of nuclear weapons. While it may be understandable that individuals deny to themselves the probable outcome and consequences of the use of nuclear weapons, it is dangerous and costly to do so. It prevents public discourse and political engagement by citizens of the nuclear weapons states on one of the most important issues of our time.

The lack of public attention in nuclear weapons states to the self-destructiveness of nuclear weapons has allowed humankind to place itself in danger of annihilation, and to spend some \$8 trillion over the course of the Nuclear Age doing so. Denial of the dangers or likelihood of nuclear weapons use has created a dangerous mental block that must be overcome. We owe it to ourselves and to our posterity to break through this mental block, and directly confront the dangers of annihilation, including self-annihilation, that are inherent in reliance on nuclear arsenals.

We reasoned that if it were generally understood by the citizens in nuclear weapons states that the use of a hundred or so nuclear weapons could turn the world into an unbearable place to live, the public would take a less complacent view of maintaining nuclear arsenals. We believed

that an awareness of the self-destructive consequences of the use of nuclear arsenals would lead to a general understanding that nuclear weapons are a source of insecurity rather than security. This understanding, we reasoned, would lead to a desire to rid the world of nuclear weapons as soon as possible.

We discovered, however, that there was virtually nothing being published on the subject of the self-destructive consequences of the use of nuclear weapons. The fact that an issue as important as this one was not even

being discussed in the mass media alerted us to the existence of widespread public denial regarding this issue. We also realized that the issue of nuclear arsenals and their use was not even entering into public debate during elections in the nuclear weapon states. As we looked into this situation further, we found that there were many other indications of public denial of the suicidal dangers of nuclear arsenals. We have listed some of these indications below.

Robert McNamara, Secretary of Defense under Presidents John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, in his 1986 book *Blundering into Disaster*, said that the 25,000 tactical and strategic nuclear warheads the United States and Soviet Union each came to possess during the Cold War were not amassed through any logical plan. They were developed through "the persistent failure to recognize that nuclear explosives are not weapons in any traditional sense."¹

In the *Veterans For Peace Journal*, John Barr said that during the 1988 U.S. elections, no candidate for public office breathed a word about "nuclear winter" or "extinction."² Despite these continuing grave perils, neither has been mentioned in subsequent U.S. national elections.

If Russia follows the U.S. in ratifying the START II treaty, the number of strategic nuclear weapons kept by the U.S. and Russia each will be reduced to 3,000 - 3,500 by the year 2003. Former Secretary of State Warren Christopher has pointed out that even with these limits the United States alone will still have "a capacity to destroy civilization as we know it several times over."³ This overkill capacity has been widely known for a long time. Destroying oneself to protect oneself is completely illogical and could only persist if people are reluctant to think about what they are doing.

Dr. Steven Kull of Stanford University wondered why nations would build nuclear defenses with such excessive destructive capacities. From 1984 through 1987, he interviewed top defense planners in both the Soviet Union and the United States, promising them confidentiality. He found that leaders on both sides were thinking of deterrence in terms of the number of weapons each side had rather than their destructive power.⁴

In San Francisco, California, in late 1995, the Navy was exhibiting its Trident submarine, the USS Jackson. When the submarine's captain was asked about its destructive ability, his reply was: "[The Trident has] as much destructive force as all the bombs dropped in World War II." He was asked:

"Does that bother you?" He replied, "I try not to think of it too often."⁵

While much has been said about spending billions of dollars to develop a

"Star Wars Defense," there has been little or no mention of where the highly radioactive materials from the intercepted warheads would fall. To

illustrate, a typical nuclear warhead contains more than four pounds of plutonium. Inhaling as little as 2/10,000 of an ounce of plutonium dust can cause lung cancer.⁶ Radioactive debris from a blasted warhead would remain deadly for hundred of thousands of years after the plutonium particles drifted down around the world.

EFFECT OF ONE TRIDENT SUBMARINE ATTACK

What needs to be reported is that nuclear weapons are not usable weapons

since detonating only a small portion of those deployed could make life unbearable for all. Consider the following example: One U.S. Trident submarine alone carries a total explosive force four times more powerful than all of the destructive forces used in World War II, in which 50 million people died.⁷ If just one U.S. Trident submarine launched its independently-targeted nuclear warheads, it would produce 192 nuclear explosions. Each nuclear explosion over a city would incinerate people -

- just as the crematoria in Nazi Germany incinerated people. Each warhead alone has an explosive force:

Equal to 100,000 tons of TNT (some up to 475,000 tons);

8-40 times more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb;

10,000-47,000 times more powerful than the truck bomb blasts by terrorists

in Oklahoma City and Saudi Arabia.⁸

Disruption of World Economy: The explosion from one Trident submarine's

nuclear warheads would be enough to kill millions of people and create chaos in the world's rapidly growing international economy. It would destroy or disrupt transportation by trains, planes, trucks and ships making food, water, fuel and medical supplies difficult to obtain.

Radiation Dangers: The global radioactive fallout from a hundred or more

powerful nuclear explosions would be like the fallout from many Chernobyl power plant accidents all occurring at the same time over a vast area.

No

one in the world could feel safe from the invisible, odorless and tasteless

radioactive global fallout that could be settling around us for years to come. In addition, warheads exploding over nuclear missile sites, nuclear

power plants, nuclear waste dumps, and the like would greatly multiply the

amounts of global radioactive fallout produced.

Where radioactive fallout lands on any given day is affected by where the

nuclear warheads explode and by the direction of the wind and rain

following the explosions. For years after the Chernobyl accident, meat and dairy products in Ireland, Sweden, Denmark, Great Britain, Italy and the Netherlands were contaminated.⁹

According to a 1995 report by local officials to the United Nations, more than 8 million people in the Chernobyl-contaminated areas of Ukraine, Belarus and Russia are still suffering ten years later from heart disease, thyroid cancer, spontaneous abortion, birth defects, and other horrible diseases.¹⁰

Electromagnetic Pulse: When a nuclear explosion occurs above ground, it can produce an electromagnetic pulse (EMP) (an intense burst of energy that can travel at the speed of light across a wide area and pack enough punch to burn out electrical systems.¹¹ In a 1962 atmospheric test over Johnson Island in the Pacific Ocean, the EMP burned out lights, popped circuit breakers, rang burglar alarms and downed power lines in Honolulu, 800 miles away.¹²

An EMP can disrupt the world's economy by wiping out electronic records and equipment in a flash. Modern international banking that can transfer billions of dollars electronically in seconds could be thrown into chaos.

Chaos in global communication might trigger the release of other nuclear weapons. Transportation could be thrown into further chaos when the electronic equipment in cars, trucks, trains and planes became unworkable or unreliable.

Burning Cities: Future assessments of possible self-destruction should also include studies on the impact of smoke filled skies. Smoke from many burning cities and forests could darken the skies, chilling the earth, and harming world food crops. The studies by Carl Sagan, Richard Turco, and their colleagues provide excellent guidance for assessing this danger.¹³

It can be seen from the above that the use of just one Trident submarine could transform the world into a hideous place to live. By July 1997, the U.S. will have 18 Trident submarines and plans to keep 14 under the START II agreement. This is in addition to its many bombers and land-based nuclear missiles. Under the START II agreement, Russia plans to maintain a similar nuclear inventory.

Great Britain is replacing older Polaris submarines with four modern and more deadly Tridents. France is building four new missile launching subs. China has one and possibly two such submarines and may build more.

All of this is occurring even though submarine missiles are more likely to be used through misunderstanding than bombs on aircraft or land-based missiles because communications deep in the oceans are more difficult.

ELIMINATING ALL NUCLEAR WEAPONS IS AN ACHIEVABLE GOAL

It is possible to communicate a realistic picture of nuclear weapons self-destructiveness to the people of the world. It was done in the early 1980s, at the height of the Cold War, through books and films such as *The Final Epidemic*¹⁴ and articles such as "Nuclear Winter" in *Parade Magazine*.¹⁵ These materials aroused concern in many people that helped initiate the nuclear arms reduction agreements.

People today must not be deluded into complacency -- the danger still exists. The news media has the ability and the responsibility to help rid the world of nuclear weapons by alerting the world public to the self-destructive consequences of nuclear weapons use.

Ask yourself, "Have I ever seen a logical explanation as to why nations spend many billions of dollars a year to maintain an enormous nuclear overkill capacity that if used would destroy humanity?" If you have not seen such a logical explanation, how can such grossly illogical behavior be explained other than by a global mental block?

The longer the mental block exists, the longer nuclear weapons will exist. And the longer nuclear weapons exist, the greater is the chance that nuclear explosions will take place somewhere through accidents, misunderstanding, miscalculation, aging equipment failure, government instability, or terrorists.

It is encouraging that many knowledgeable people and organizations are working for the elimination of all nuclear weapons from the world. Their efforts are crucial, but their effectiveness has been reduced in the past by the reluctance of people to think about the self-destructiveness of nuclear weapons. By taking this reluctance into consideration, hopefully their efforts will be more effective.

Based on the vast nuclear overkill capacities that the declared nuclear powers still maintain, it appears none have done research on the self-annihilating effects of nuclear weapons. The U.S. budgeted some \$36 billion for defense research and development in 1996.¹⁶ It is unlikely that any of this money has been used for studying how to prevent self-destructive dangers.

Leaders of countries that do not have nuclear weapons should be made aware that the protection offered by the nuclear weapons states to their allies, referred to as "nuclear umbrellas," would not protect them if nuclear weapons were used.

We encourage all individuals, including leaders of concerned organizations and nations, to work together to achieve a Nuclear Weapons Convention by the year 2000 that prohibits and eliminates all nuclear weapons by early in the twenty-first century.

*Dean Babst is a retired government scientist and Coordinator of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation's Accidental Nuclear War Studies Program. David Krieger is President of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation. Bob Aldridge is a former aerospace engineer who now leads the Pacific Life Research Center. We appreciate the many helpful suggestions of Daniel Glaser, Professor Emeritus, University of Southern California, and Phil Murray, physician and member of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War.

1 McNamara, Robert S. Blundering Into Disaster, Pantheon Books, New York, NY, 1986, p. 122.

2 Barr, John F. "Peace Through Strength," From Manchester (NH) Union Leader as reported in the Veterans For Peace Journal, Spring 1989.

3 Calhoun, Martin; Schultz, Kathryn et. al. "The Nuclear Nineties: Broken Promises, Misplaced Priorities," The Defense Monitor, Vol. XXIV, No. 8, Washington, D.C., Sept./Oct. 1995.

4 Kull, Stephen. Minds At War, Basic Books, New York, NY 1988.

5 Nolte, Carl. "On Silent Patrol Under the Sea," San Francisco Chronicle, 15 Oct. 1995.

6 Underwood, Doug. "Accident Worries," Seattle Times, 4 Feb. 1982.

7 Babst, Dean. "Assessing The Self-Destructiveness Of Trident II Submarines," Global Security Study No. 7, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, Santa Barbara, CA, Nov. 1989.

8 Mosher, David, et al. Rethinking the Trident Force, U.S. Congressional Budget Office, Washington, D.C. July 1993. While most of the warheads on Trident submarines have an explosive power equal to 100,000 tons of TNT (100 kt), some 400 of their warheads have an explosive power equal to 475,000 tons. The comparison with the Oklahoma City and Saudi Arabia bombings is based on the assumption that the terrorists' bombs each had an explosive force of 10 tons of TNT.

9 Magagnini, Stephen. "What We Now Know of Chernobyl Toll," Sacramento Bee, 27 April 1995.

10 Lawrence, Lore. "Ukrainian Town Still Suffering From Chernobyl," San Francisco Chronicle, 28 July 1995.

11 Broad, William J. "The Chaos Factor," Science 83, Jan./Feb. 1983.

12 Stein, Daniel L. "Electromagnetic Pulse(The Uncertain Certainty)," Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, March 1983.

13 Sagan, Carl. The Nuclear Winter, Council for a Livable World Education Fund, Boston, MA, 1983.

14 Adams, Ruth and Cullen, Susan. The Final Epidemic, Educational Foundation for Nuclear Science, Chicago, IL, 1981.

15 Sagan, Carl, "Nuclear Winter," Parade Magazine, 30 Oct. 1983

16 "The Defense Bill," San Francisco Chronicle, 1 Dec. 1995.

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

Web Site: <http://www.napf.org>

From ledwidge@psr.org Mon Mar 10 15:18:28 1997

Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 15:55:58 -0800

From: Lisa Ledwidge <ledwidge@psr.org>

To: delgree@aol.com, psrilch@igc.org, scole01@ibm.net, Eddarnold@aol.com

Cc: wandwill@clark.net, BBanks40@aol.com, tperry@ucsususa.org,
spusa@spusa.org,

shundahai@radix.net, shundahi@intermind.net, dculp@nrdc.org,
panukes@igc.org, susangordon@igc.org, meldredge@igc.org,

mupj@igc.org,

bruce.hall@green2.greenpeace.org, joe@fcnl.org, disarmament@igc.org,

vision@igc.org, fmillar@igc.org, dkimball@igc.org, kperry@igc.org,

tmccaffery@igc.org, bmusil@igc.org, rswanson@igc.org

Subject: Action Alert--Please Urge Your Senator To Oppose the Nuclear Waste Bill

To: PSR members and supporters in CO, FL, GA, IL, IN, and OR

From: Lisa Ledwidge, Organizer/Research Asst., PSR Security Programs

Date: 10 March 1997

Re: Action Alert -- Nuclear Waste Bill

.

*** PSR Action Alert ***

PLEASE CALL YOUR SENATOR BEFORE THIS WEDNESDAY

URGE HIM TO OPPOSE S. 104, NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT OF 1997

The Senate Energy Committee is expected to vote on Senate bill 104, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997, on WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12. The bill authorizes construction and operation of a temporary nuclear waste storage facility adjacent to Yucca Mountain in Nevada. It also opens the door to the transportation of unprecedented volumes of high-level nuclear waste on our nation's highways and railways.

S. 104 is a badly flawed nuclear waste management strategy. The bill fails to address concerns about shipment safety, would allow construction of an interim nuclear waste dump with the simple submittal of a license application, and curtails a broad range of environmental laws -- for example, site selection, license application and construction would be exempted from the public participation process normally required by law (the National Environmental Policy Act).

The Energy Committee, of which one or both of your Senators is

a member, is expected to vote on S. 104 this Wednesday.

**** What You Can Do ****

- . CALL OR FAX YOUR SENATOR'S OFFICE (See list below).
- . DEMAND A VOTE AGAINST S. 104 IN COMMITTEE.

Key Senators on the Senate Energy Committee (contact the Energy aide):

Campbell (Colo.)	(202) 224-5852	224-1933 fax
Cleland (Ga.)	call (202) 224-3121	for numbers
Durbin (Ill.)	(202) 224--2152	228-0400 fax
Graham (Fla.)	(202) 224-3041	224-2237 fax
Lugar (Ind.)	(202) 224-4814	228-0360 fax
Smith (Ore.)	(202) 224-3753	228-3997 fax
Wyden (Ore.)	(202) 224-5244	call for fax

For more information contact PSR (202-898-0150] or the Nuclear Information & Resource Service [202-328-0002, <nirsnet@igc.apc.org> or <http://www.nirs.org>], or see the NIRS alert below.

.

Nuclear Information and Resource Service
ALERT ALERT ALERT

1424 16th St. NW Suite 404 Washington, DC 20036
Contact: Mary Olson (maryo@igc.org) (202)328-0002 fax
202-462-2183
nirsnet@igc.apc.org

ALERT--- MOBILE CHERNOBYL BILL SCHEDULED TO MOVE (again!?!)
Senate Energy Committee To Vote March 12, Senate Floor vote could follow
very fast.

Clinton Veto Standing Firm, We Need 34 (+) Votes to Sustain the Veto. Calls to the Full Senate Still Needed: VOTE NO ON S 104.

The wolves are crying, but are they "Crying Wolf?" Action by the Senate Energy Committee on Murkowski's (R-Alaska,) S 104, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997 a.k.a. The Mobile Chernobyl Bill, has been twice postponed, leaving one to wonder if the vote will happen on Wednesday; we can only assume that it will. After all, they thought that they could just sweep in and pass this thing the first weeks of the new Congress.

The industry's assumption that Clinton would back down after the election was wrong. Clinton and Gore are standing strong in their commitment to veto S 104 or any similar legislation. Even while their candidate for Energy Secretary - Frederico Pena - was being held "hostage" by Murkowski and the industry allies, they did not cut any backroom deals.

Murkowski and his gang also misjudged the number in the Senate that would remain firm in opposition. This means that the pro-S 104 sponsors are putting on the steam to beg, borrow or steal or rent any Senator that they can to insure they have 67 votes for S 104 on the floor -- the number needed to override a veto.

Now we need to deliver the 34 votes to back that veto up. This may move pretty fast since the Senate is not busy with other matters at the moment. All Senators need to be contacted.

PLEASE PUT THE WORD OUT SO THAT WHEN WE KNOW THAT A FLOOR VOTE IS SCHEDULED YOUR NETWORKS ARE READY TO DUMP A LOT OF ATTENTION CALLS, FAXES, LETTERS ON THE HILL.

Capital Switchboard 202-224-3121

Visit the NIRS Website for more information on the bill and impacts in your state. www.nirs.org

Key Swings:

Cleland (GA), Durbin (IL), Johnson (SD), Lugar (IN), Leahy, (VT), Hagel, (NE) Harkin, (IA), Sessions, (AL), Smith, (OR)

If you have networks in these states, please do some networking and focus energy there now, but ALL Senators need to hear from constituents throughout the month of March (and as the fight goes on). WE ARE WINNING THIS ONE, SO LET'S NOT LET IT GO NOW !!!!!!!

!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! STOP A MOBILE CHERNOBYL !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

PS We hear that sponsors in the House are lining up co-sponsors now too, even though there still is no bill introduced. If you are having contact with your Rep for any reason, don't forget to tell them to STAY OFF THE NUKE WASTE BILL!

.

-- end --

From disarmament@igc.org Mon Mar 10 15:18:28 1997
Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 12:40:53 -0800 (PST)
From: disarmament@igc.org
To: ctb-followers@igc.org
Subject: START III, Summit

USE SUMMIT TO REDUCE WARHEADS

Commentary in DEFENSE NEWS March 10-16
by George Pitman

When Russian President Boris Yeltsin and U.S. President Bill Clinton meet March 20-21 in Helsinki, Finland, they are likely to agree on common ground for negotiating a third Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) either to replace or complement the START II, which Russia has not ratified.

In either case, their agreement likely will include a ceiling on the number of nuclear warheads allowed, and this presents an opportunity to push for a much deeper cut in warhead deployment.

What is an appropriate level for a START III agreement?

START II, which was negotiated in 1993, established a ceiling of 3,000 to 3,500 warheads and mandated the elimination of all multiple warhead, independently targeted intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and replacement with single-warhead ICBMs.

The Russian Duma has refused to ratify START II claiming among other things, Russia cannot afford to replace its multiple warhead ICBMs with the single warhead missile as called for in the pact. Russia is suffering a severe economic pinch and for months has been unable to pay its armed forces, government workers or pensioners.

Under these conditions, it is unreasonable for the United States to expect Russia to ratify START II. If Russia and the United States begin negotiations for a new treaty, Russia likely will propose a warhead ceiling of 2,000 or fewer warheads.

However, the United States should push for a significantly lower warhead ceiling.*** Under what circumstances would the United States ever need 2,000 nuclear weapons? Since 1945, the United States considered using nuclear weapons in five different conflicts, during which five U.S. Presidents, from Harry Truman to Richard Nixon, rejected their use.*** They were rejected because there were no suitable targets that could not have been destroyed by conventional weapons, because of moral or ethical reasons or because of objections from allies.

In most of these cases many civilians would have been killed in attacking military targets.

During the Cold War, U.S. nuclear weapons served to deter Soviet aggression against Western Europe - no longer a valid reason with the 1991 collapse of the Soviet Union. The only reason for the United States to retain nuclear weapons today is to deter another nation from using nuclear weapons against the continental United States or U.S. troops deployed abroad. The only potential nuclear threats faced by the United States are China or so-called rogue state that may acquire nuclear weapons in the future.

China has between 200 and 250 deployed nuclear weapons, although it has begun testing a new multiple-warhead ICBM that could significantly raise this number. Any other state that would acquire nuclear weapons in the future would have only a few because of the difficulty of acquiring the fissile material.

What criteria should the United States use in choosing a warhead ceiling? First, it should maintain parity with the next largest nuclear power. After the United States and Russia, the next largest nuclear powers are France and the United Kingdom.

France has about 500 deployed strategic nuclear warheads and about 100 tactical nuclear warheads; Great Britain also has about 500 nuclear warheads deployed on its four Trident submarines. Thus, the United States could maintain nuclear parity with the next largest nuclear power between 500 and 600 nuclear weapons.

The United States also should focus on reducing the number of Russian nuclear weapons to the lowest possible level because Russia has placed more emphasis on its nuclear forces since the collapse of its conventional military capabilities and has given up its nuclear no-first-use policy.

In other words, Russia now is willing to use nuclear weapons as its first line of defense and if war ever occurred between Russia and the West, NATO allies would be the likely targets.

Furthermore, as NATO proceeds with its plans to expand eastward, Russia likely will become more reluctant to give up its nuclear weapons.

Nuclear weapons are suitable for use against only two types of targets: large population centers and heavily protected military targets such as missile silos and hardened command and control posts.

Now that the Soviet Union no longer exists, most of the military targets suitable for nuclear weapons no longer exist and it is unlikely the United States would ever use nuclear weapons against large population centers.

Nuclear weapons cause extensive collateral damage even if used against military targets, and the United States has now advanced conventional weapons as effective against such targets as nuclear weapons but which would not cause such extensive collateral damage.

The argument is sometimes made that at least three nuclear submarines are needed to assure that one is on patrol at any time, and five submarines would be required to assure that two subs, one for the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, would be on patrol at any time. Since each Trident submarine carries 20 missiles, the United States could have 40 missiles on patrol at any given time even if it reduced its fleet to five Trident boats.

Currently, eight warheads are deployed on each missile. However, it is unlikely the United States would target eight nuclear weapons at a time. If a U.S. president ever did authorize the use of nuclear weapons, it is likely that only one or two would be authorized.

There is no reason to deploy more than one warhead on each submarine missile. The U.S. Trident missiles should remove multiple warheads and install single-warhead missiles.

Considering Russia no longer poses a conventional military threat to Western Europe and nuclear weapons have no use beyond deterrence, the United States and Russia could sharply cut their arsenals and still maintain levels that would exceed those of any other nuclear power - to between 700 and 1,000 warheads.

By advocating deep reductions, the United States would be continuing its historic leadership role in nuclear arms control and fulfilling its obligations under Article VI of the nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty.

The United States also would pressure China, which has said it would enter into nuclear arms control negotiations only after the United States and Russia reduced their arsenals to China's level.

U.S. PROPOSES DEEPER CUTS IN NUCLEAR ARMS WITH RUSSIA

New York Times -- March 9, 1997

by Michael R. Gordon

MOSCOW -- The United States has told the Kremlin that it is prepared to negotiate deeper cuts in long-range nuclear arms in an effort to ease Russian fears that the West seeks military advantage.

The American proposal could lay the basis for an agreement on the goals of future arms talks at the summit meeting in Helsinki this month between President Clinton and President Boris N. Yeltsin.

It is also intended to prod Russia to ratify the Start II treaty. Signed in 1993, that treaty has languished in the Russian Parliament because of resistance from hard-liners.

"We are trying to achieve guidelines for Start III," an American official said, referring to a future agreement mandating additional cuts in long-range armaments. "It would make clear that we are prepared to go to lower levels and, thus, obviate the Russian concern that Start II is the end of the road."

The American proposal envisions reductions to a level of 2,000 to 2,500 nuclear warheads for each side. American officials would like to announce negotiating guidelines spelling out the main provisions of a future accord at the Helsinki meeting. But the talks have been complicated by disputes over the testing of antimissile systems and NATO expansion. Timing has also been an issue, as the United States says a Start III accord must be preceded by Russian ratification of Start II.

Guidelines for a future arms agreement were discussed here on Thursday by Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott and senior Russian officials. Foreign Minister Yevgeny M. Primakov plans to go to Washington next week for further talks.

The flurry of high-level diplomacy over nuclear arms proposals

recalls the days of the cold war and reflects the new strains in Moscow's dealings with the West.

When it was signed, the Start II agreement was hailed as the cornerstone of a new Russian-American relationship. The agreement required each nation to reduce the number of its warheads to a level of 3,000 to 3,500 by 2003. Russia and the United States had more than 10,000 warheads each in the late 1980s.

But Communist and nationalist members of Parliament here assert that the treaty took advantage of Russia at a time of weakness. The Pentagon's plans to test limited antimissile defenses have also been denounced here as an effort to gain strategic superiority. Even foreign investment has come under attack in Parliament as a scheme to gain an economic stranglehold on Russia.

Aleksei Arbatov, a member of Parliament from the liberal Yabloko faction, cited two additional reasons the Start II accord has bred such suspicion.

First, he said, support for the treaty has been hurt by the Yeltsin government's failure to outline a program for modernizing Russia's strategic arsenal. "The second problem," he said, "is NATO expansion to the East."

Still another reason has to do with the terms of the agreement itself. Members of Parliament complain that Russia cannot keep pace with the Americans under the treaty without a costly restructuring of its forces.

Specifically, they argue, staying even with the Americans under the terms of the accord would require building hundreds of new single-warhead, land-based missiles at the cost of tens of billions of dollars. More cost-effective ways to maintain parity are not available because the Start II treaty bans land-based missiles with multiple warheads. And beyond that, Russia's bomber force is in poor shape.

The ban on land-based missiles with multiple warheads is widely applauded by experts as an important step to reduce the risk of war. But such concerns are lost on a Communist-dominated Parliament, which sees nuclear weapons as a last vestige of Russia's former superpower status and a way to compensate for the disastrous decline in Russian conventional forces.

The United States, in its Start III proposal, tries to meet the Russian concerns by committing itself to negotiating further cuts. The lower level of forces envisioned under Start III would enable Russia to maintain general parity in nuclear arms with Washington at far less cost.

"Under Start III, the Russians could meet the numbers without a major new program," said Spurgeon M. Keeny Jr., president of the Arms Control Association, a private group based in Washington.

Whether negotiating guidelines can be worked out before the Helsinki meeting, however, is unclear.

Many Russian experts, aware of their country's limited negotiating leverage, urge delaying Start II ratification until the United States assures Moscow that it will not seek additional leeway under the 1972 antiballistic missile treaty to test new defensive systems. But developing and testing limited antimissile systems is an American goal.

Prime Minister Viktor S. Chernomyrdin also tied ratification of Start II to Moscow's opposition to NATO expansion last month. But NATO says its decision to expand eastward to include former Soviet bloc nations, is irreversible.

The prospects for new Start III negotiations depend on Washington's success in persuading Russia to let go of these linkages.

Washington has also insisted that a Start III accord cannot be completed unless Start II is ratified. Talks are being carried out on the precise timing of Russian ratification of Start II, the drafting of negotiating guidelines for a follow-up agreement, and the negotiation of the Start III treaty itself.

From: Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005

Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 Fax: 202 898 0172

<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

From ledwidge@psr.org Mon Mar 10 15:18:28 1997

Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 16:59:07 -0800

From: Lisa Ledwidge <ledwidge@psr.org>

To: dkimball@igc.org, bmusil@igc.org, vision@igc.org,

adaction@ix.netcom.com,

ogr.parti@ecunet.org, armscontrol@igc.org, basicusa@igc.org,

cob_washington_office@ecunet.org, cwu_washington.parti@ecunet.org,

jdi@clw.org, skerr@clw.org, cdavis@clw.org,

102375.413@CompuServe.COM,

pdd@clark.net, disarmament@igc.org, bridget@fcnl.org, joe@fcnl.org,

fas@fas.org, bruce.hall@green2.greenpeace.org,

73744.3675@compuserve.com, lamaryates@igc.org, mccwjdb@erols.com,

mupj@igc.org, meldredge@igc.org, network@igc.org,

twashington@nrdc.org,

wjnsns@aol.com, nci@access.digex.net, fmillar@igc.org,

panukes@igc.org,

paprog@igc.org, dculp@nrdc.org, barbara_green@pcusa.org,

pogodef@mnsinc.com, melinda@stimson.org, spusa@spusa.org,

tperry@ucsusa.org, uuawo@aol.com, wandwill@clark.net

Subject: [Fwd: Nuclear Weapons Invite]

[Part 1: "Included Message"]

Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 16:09:20 -0500 (EST)

From: Heather Anttila <hanttila@cato.org>

To: ledwidge@psr.org

Subject: Nuclear Weapons Invite

Dear Lisa--

Here is a copy of the invite for "Should Nuclear Weapons Be Abolished?". Please share it with your co-workers. Thanks.

Heather Anttila

Assistant Conference Director

Cato Institute

The Cato Institute
cordially invites you to a Policy Forum

Should Nuclear Weapons
Be Abolished?

featuring

Vice Admiral John J. Shanahan
(USN Ret.)
Center for Defense Information

and

Dr. Richard Haass
Brookings Institution

Should the United States work toward a nuclear-weapons-free world?
Some experts argue that the end of the Cold War has presented an opportunity to abolish nuclear weapons. Others contend that any initiative that would entail giving up the U.S. nuclear arsenal would be naive and dangerous. Is the continued existence of nuclear weapons an intolerable threat to peace and security, or are nuclear weapons a fact of life and an essential component of national defense?

Thursday, March 13, 1997
12:00 noon
(Luncheon to follow)

To register, call Heather Anttila at (202) 789-5229,
fax her at (202) 842-3490, or e-mail to hanttila@cato.org.
News media please call Robin Hulsey at (202) 789-5293.

From nirsnet@igc.apc.org Mon Mar 10 15:18:28 1997
Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 09:06:22 -0800 (PST)
From: Michael Mariotte <nirsnet@igc.apc.org>
To: Graham Daniell <gdaniell@wt.com.au>, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: Three Mile Island

Yes, the study was conducted by scientists at the University of North Carolina, led by Dr. Steve Wing. A two-page fact sheet on the study is available at the NIRS web site (www.nirs.org) in the Radiation section of NIRSNET on the Web. We will try to put the whole study up once we get a scannable copy of it.

You can also call Cindy Folkers at NIRS (202-328-0002) for more info or a copy of the study (it's \$2 for postage and handling).

Michael Mariotte, NIRS

At 05:56 AM 3/1/97 +0800, Graham Daniell wrote:

>Hi,
>
>A couple of days ago there was a news report on public radio here about
>a
>recently concluded Three Mile Island follow up study. It showed
>increased
>health problems downwind if the site were far higher than that expected
>for
>the amount of radioactivity "officially" released. eg: lung cancer was
>up 500
>- 600 percent). The study was carried out by America's Institute of
>Environmental Health Scientists I believe.
>
>I have not heard any re regarding this since. Can anyone confirm this
>report and can you indicate where I can get authoritative information
>about it?
>
>Towards a nuclear-free millennium,
>Graham Daniell
>Perth, Western Australia
>gdaniell@wt.com.au
>
>
>

From wagingpeace@napf.org Mon Mar 10 15:18:28 1997
Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 09:12:19 -0800
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Cc: INESnet@fy.chalmers.se

The Self-Destructiveness Of Nuclear Weapons:
A Dangerous And Costly Mental Block

By Dean Babst, David Krieger and Bob Aldridge*

There is a worldwide reluctance to think about the self-destructive consequences of the use of nuclear weapons. While it may be understandable that individuals deny to themselves the probable outcome and consequences of the use of nuclear weapons, it is dangerous and costly to do so. It prevents public discourse and political engagement by citizens of the nuclear weapons states on one of the most important issues of our time.

The lack of public attention in nuclear weapons states to the self-destructiveness of nuclear weapons has allowed humankind to place itself in danger of annihilation, and to spend some \$8 trillion over the course of the Nuclear Age doing so. Denial of the dangers or likelihood of nuclear weapons use has created a dangerous mental block that must be overcome. We owe it to ourselves and to our posterity to break through this mental block, and directly confront the dangers of annihilation, including self-annihilation, that are inherent in reliance on nuclear arsenals.

We reasoned that if it were generally understood by the citizens in nuclear weapons states that the use of a hundred or so nuclear weapons

could turn the world into an unbearable place to live, the public would take a less complacent view of maintaining nuclear arsenals. We believed that an awareness of the self-destructive consequences of the use of nuclear arsenals would lead to a general understanding that nuclear weapons are a source of insecurity rather than security. This understanding, we reasoned, would lead to a desire to rid the world of nuclear weapons as soon as possible.

We discovered, however, that there was virtually nothing being published on the subject of the self-destructive consequences of the use of nuclear weapons. The fact that an issue as important as this one was not even being discussed in the mass media alerted us to the existence of widespread public denial regarding this issue. We also realized that the issue of nuclear arsenals and their use was not even entering into public debate during elections in the nuclear weapon states. As we looked into this situation further, we found that there were many other indications of public denial of the suicidal dangers of nuclear arsenals. We have listed some of these indications below.

Robert McNamara, Secretary of Defense under Presidents John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, in his 1986 book *Blundering into Disaster*, said that the 25,000 tactical and strategic nuclear warheads the United States and Soviet Union each came to possess during the Cold War were not amassed through any logical plan. They were developed through "the persistent failure to recognize that nuclear explosives are not weapons in any traditional sense."¹

In the *Veterans For Peace Journal*, John Barr said that during the 1988 U.S. elections, no candidate for public office breathed a word about "nuclear winter" or "extinction."² Despite these continuing grave perils, neither has been mentioned in subsequent U.S. national elections.

If Russia follows the U.S. in ratifying the START II treaty, the number of strategic nuclear weapons kept by the U.S. and Russia each will be reduced to 3,000 - 3,500 by the year 2003. Former Secretary of State Warren Christopher has pointed out that even with these limits the United States alone will still have "a capacity to destroy civilization as we know it several times over."³ This overkill capacity has been widely known for a long time. Destroying oneself to protect oneself is completely illogical and could only persist if people are reluctant to think about what they are doing.

Dr. Steven Kull of Stanford University wondered why nations would build nuclear defenses with such excessive destructive capacities. From 1984

through 1987, he interviewed top defense planners in both the Soviet Union and the United States, promising them confidentiality. He found that leaders on both sides were thinking of deterrence in terms of the number of weapons each side had rather than their destructive power.⁴

In San Francisco, California, in late 1995, the Navy was exhibiting its Trident submarine, the USS Jackson. When the submarine's captain was asked about its destructive ability, his reply was: "[The Trident has] as much destructive force as all the bombs dropped in World War II." He was asked: "Does that bother you?" He replied, "I try not to think of it too often."⁵

While much has been said about spending billions of dollars to develop a "Star Wars Defense," there has been little or no mention of where the highly radioactive materials from the intercepted warheads would fall. To illustrate, a typical nuclear warhead contains more than four pounds of plutonium. Inhaling as little as 2/10,000 of an ounce of plutonium dust can cause lung cancer.⁶ Radioactive debris from a blasted warhead would remain deadly for hundred of thousands of years after the plutonium particles drifted down around the world.

EFFECT OF ONE TRIDENT SUBMARINE ATTACK

What needs to be reported is that nuclear weapons are not usable weapons since detonating only a small portion of those deployed could make life unbearable for all. Consider the following example: One U.S. Trident submarine alone carries a total explosive force four times more powerful than all of the destructive forces used in World War II, in which 50 million people died.⁷ If just one U.S. Trident submarine launched its independently-targeted nuclear warheads, it would produce 192 nuclear explosions. Each nuclear explosion over a city would incinerate people - just as the crematoria in Nazi Germany incinerated people. Each warhead alone has an explosive force:
Equal to 100,000 tons of TNT (some up to 475,000 tons);
8-40 times more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb;
10,000-47,000 times more powerful than the truck bomb blasts by terrorists in Oklahoma City and Saudi Arabia.⁸

Disruption of World Economy: The explosion from one Trident submarine's nuclear warheads would be enough to kill millions of people and create chaos in the world's rapidly growing international economy. It would destroy or disrupt transportation by trains, planes, trucks and ships making food, water, fuel and medical supplies difficult to obtain.

Radiation Dangers: The global radioactive fallout from a hundred or more powerful nuclear explosions would be like the fallout from many Chernobyl

power plant accidents all occurring at the same time over a vast area. No one in the world could feel safe from the invisible, odorless and tasteless radioactive global fallout that could be settling around us for years to come. In addition, warheads exploding over nuclear missile sites, nuclear power plants, nuclear waste dumps, and the like would greatly multiply the amounts of global radioactive fallout produced.

Where radioactive fallout lands on any given day is affected by where the nuclear warheads explode and by the direction of the wind and rain following the explosions. For years after the Chernobyl accident, meat and dairy products in Ireland, Sweden, Denmark, Great Britain, Italy and the Netherlands were contaminated.⁹

According to a 1995 report by local officials to the United Nations, more than 8 million people in the Chernobyl-contaminated areas of Ukraine, Belarus and Russia are still suffering ten years later from heart disease, thyroid cancer, spontaneous abortion, birth defects, and other horrible diseases.¹⁰

Electromagnetic Pulse: When a nuclear explosion occurs above ground, it can produce an electromagnetic pulse (EMP) (an intense burst of energy that can travel at the speed of light across a wide area and pack enough punch to burn out electrical systems.¹¹ In a 1962 atmospheric test over Johnson Island in the Pacific Ocean, the EMP burned out lights, popped circuit breakers, rang burglar alarms and downed power lines in Honolulu, 800 miles away.¹²

An EMP can disrupt the world's economy by wiping out electronic records and equipment in a flash. Modern international banking that can transfer billions of dollars electronically in seconds could be thrown into chaos.

Chaos in global communication might trigger the release of other nuclear weapons. Transportation could be thrown into further chaos when the electronic equipment in cars, trucks, trains and planes became unworkable or unreliable.

Burning Cities: Future assessments of possible self-destruction should also include studies on the impact of smoke filled skies. Smoke from many burning cities and forests could darken the skies, chilling the earth, and harming world food crops. The studies by Carl Sagan, Richard Turco, and their colleagues provide excellent guidance for assessing this danger.¹³

It can be seen from the above that the use of just one Trident submarine

could transform the world into a hideous place to live. By July 1997, the U.S. will have 18 Trident submarines and plans to keep 14 under the START II agreement. This is in addition to its many bombers and land-based nuclear missiles. Under the START II agreement, Russia plans to maintain a similar nuclear inventory.

Great Britain is replacing older Polaris submarines with four modern and more deadly Tridents. France is building four new missile launching subs.

China has one and possibly two such submarines and may build more.

All of this is occurring even though submarine missiles are more likely to be used through misunderstanding than bombs on aircraft or land-based missiles because communications deep in the oceans are more difficult.

ELIMINATING ALL NUCLEAR WEAPONS IS AN ACHIEVABLE GOAL

It is possible to communicate a realistic picture of nuclear weapons self-destructiveness to the people of the world. It was done in the early 1980s, at the height of the Cold War, through books and films such as *The Final Epidemic*¹⁴ and articles such as "Nuclear Winter" in *Parade Magazine*.¹⁵ These materials aroused concern in many people that helped initiate the nuclear arms reduction agreements.

People today must not be deluded into complacency -- the danger still exists. The news media has the ability and the responsibility to help rid the world of nuclear weapons by alerting the world public to the self-destructive consequences of nuclear weapons use.

Ask yourself, "Have I ever seen a logical explanation as to why nations spend many billions of dollars a year to maintain an enormous nuclear overkill capacity that if used would destroy humanity?" If you have not seen such a logical explanation, how can such grossly illogical behavior be explained other than by a global mental block?

The longer the mental block exists, the longer nuclear weapons will exist.

And the longer nuclear weapons exist, the greater is the chance that nuclear explosions will take place somewhere through accidents, misunderstanding, miscalculation, aging equipment failure, government instability, or terrorists.

It is encouraging that many knowledgeable people and organizations are working for the elimination of all nuclear weapons from the world. Their efforts are crucial, but their effectiveness has been reduced in the past by the reluctance of people to think about the self-destructiveness of nuclear weapons. By taking this reluctance into consideration, hopefully their efforts will be more effective.

Based on the vast nuclear overkill capacities that the declared nuclear

powers still maintain, it appears none have done research on the self-annihilating effects of nuclear weapons. The U.S. budgeted some \$36 billion for defense research and development in 1996.¹⁶ It is unlikely that any of this money has been used for studying how to prevent self-destructive dangers.

Leaders of countries that do not have nuclear weapons should be made aware that the protection offered by the nuclear weapons states to their allies, referred to as "nuclear umbrellas," would not protect them if nuclear weapons were used.

We encourage all individuals, including leaders of concerned organizations and nations, to work together to achieve a Nuclear Weapons Convention by the year 2000 that prohibits and eliminates all nuclear weapons by early in the twenty-first century.

*Dean Babst is a retired government scientist and Coordinator of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation's Accidental Nuclear War Studies Program. David Krieger is President of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation. Bob Aldridge is a former aerospace engineer who now leads the Pacific Life Research Center. We appreciate the many helpful suggestions of Daniel Glaser, Professor Emeritus, University of Southern California, and Phil Murray, physician and member of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War.

1 McNamara, Robert S. *Blundering Into Disaster*, Pantheon Books, New York, NY, 1986, p. 122.

2 Barr, John F. "Peace Through Strength," *From Manchester (NH) Union Leader* as reported in the *Veterans For Peace Journal*, Spring 1989.

3 Calhoun, Martin; Schultz, Kathryn et. al. "The Nuclear Nineties: Broken Promises, Misplaced Priorities," *The Defense Monitor*, Vol. XXIV, No. 8, Washington, D.C., Sept./Oct. 1995.

4 Kull, Stephen. *Minds At War*, Basic Books, New York, NY 1988.

5 Nolte, Carl. "On Silent Patrol Under the Sea," *San Francisco Chronicle*, 15 Oct. 1995.

6 Underwood, Doug. "Accident Worries," *Seattle Times*, 4 Feb. 1982.

7 Babst, Dean. "Assessing The Self-Destructiveness Of Trident II Submarines," *Global Security Study No. 7*, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, Santa Barbara, CA, Nov. 1989.

8 Mosher, David, et al. *Rethinking the Trident Force*, U.S. Congressional Budget Office, Washington, D.C. July 1993. While most of the warheads on Trident submarines have an explosive power equal to 100,000 tons of TNT (100 kt), some 400 of their warheads have an explosive power equal to 475,000 tons. The comparison with the Oklahoma City and Saudi Arabia bombings is based on the assumption that the terrorists' bombs each had an explosive force of 10 tons of TNT.

9 Magagnini, Stephen. "What We Now Know of Chernobyl Toll," *Sacramento Bee*, 27 April 1995.

10 Lawrence, Lore. "Ukrainian Town Still Suffering From Chernobyl," *San*

- Francisco Chronicle, 28 July 1995.
- 11 Broad, William J. "The Chaos Factor," Science 83, Jan./Feb. 1983.
- 12 Stein, Daniel L. "Electromagnetic Pulse(The Uncertain Certainty," Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, March 1983.
- 13 Sagan, Carl. The Nuclear Winter, Council for a Livable World Education Fund, Boston, MA, 1983.
- 14 Adams, Ruth and Cullen, Susan. The Final Epidemic, Educational Foundation for Nuclear Science, Chicago, IL, 1981.
- 15 Sagan, Carl, "Nuclear Winter," Parade Magazine, 30 Oct. 1983
- 16 "The Defense Bill," San Francisco Chronicle, 1 Dec. 1995.

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
 Web Site: <http://www.napf.org>
 From ledwidge@psr.org Mon Mar 10 15:18:28 1997
 Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 15:55:58 -0800
 From: Lisa Ledwidge <ledwidge@psr.org>
 To: delgree@aol.com, psrilch@igc.org, scole01@ibm.net, Eddarnold@aol.com
 Cc: wandwill@clark.net, BBanks40@aol.com, tperry@ucsusa.org,
spusa@spusa.org,
shundahai@radix.net, shundahi@intermind.net, dculp@nrhc.org,
panukes@igc.org, susangordon@igc.org, meldredge@igc.org,
mupj@igc.org,
bruce.hall@green2.greenpeace.org, joe@fcnl.org, disarmament@igc.org,
vision@igc.org, fmillar@igc.org, dkimball@igc.org, kperry@igc.org,
tmcaffery@igc.org, bmusil@igc.org, rswanson@igc.org
 Subject: Action Alert--Please Urge Your Senator To Oppose the Nuclear Waste Bill

To: PSR members and supporters in CO, FL, GA, IL, IN, and OR
 From: Lisa Ledwidge, Organizer/Research Asst., PSR Security Programs
 Date: 10 March 1997
 Re: Action Alert -- Nuclear Waste Bill

.

*** PSR Action Alert ***

PLEASE CALL YOUR SENATOR BEFORE THIS WEDNESDAY

URGE HIM TO OPPOSE S. 104, NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT OF 1997

The Senate Energy Committee is expected to vote on Senate bill 104, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997, on WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12. The bill authorizes construction and operation of a temporary nuclear waste storage facility adjacent to Yucca Mountain in Nevada. It also opens the door to the transportation of unprecedented volumes of high-level nuclear waste on our nation's highways and railways.

S. 104 is a badly flawed nuclear waste management strategy. The bill fails to address concerns about shipment safety, would allow construction of an interim nuclear waste dump with the simple submittal of a license application, and curtails a broad range of environmental laws -- for example, site selection, license application and construction would be exempted from the public participation process normally required by law (the National Environmental Policy Act).

The Energy Committee, of which one or both of your Senators is a member, is expected to vote on S. 104 this Wednesday.

** What You Can Do **

- . CALL OR FAX YOUR SENATOR'S OFFICE (See list below).
- . DEMAND A VOTE AGAINST S. 104 IN COMMITTEE.

Key Senators on the Senate Energy Committee (contact the Energy aide):

Campbell (Colo.)	(202) 224-5852	224-1933 fax
Cleland (Ga.)	call (202) 224-3121	for numbers
Durbin (Ill.)	(202) 224--2152	228-0400 fax
Graham (Fla.)	(202) 224-3041	224-2237 fax
Lugar (Ind.)	(202) 224-4814	228-0360 fax
Smith (Ore.)	(202) 224-3753	228-3997 fax
Wyden (Ore.)	(202) 224-5244	call for fax

For more information contact PSR (202-898-0150] or the Nuclear Information & Resource Service [202-328-0002, <nirsnet@igc.apc.org> or <http://www.nirs.org>], or see the NIRS alert below.

.

Nuclear Information and Resource Service
ALERT ALERT ALERT

1424 16th St. NW Suite 404 Washington, DC 20036
Contact: Mary Olson (maryo@igc.org) (202)328-0002 fax
202-462-2183
nirsnet@igc.apc.org

ALERT--- MOBILE CHERNOBYL BILL SCHEDULED TO MOVE (again!?!)
Senate Energy Committee To Vote March 12, Senate Floor vote could follow
very fast.

Clinton Veto Standing Firm, We Need 34 (+) Votes to Sustain the Veto. Calls to the Full Senate Still Needed: VOTE NO ON S 104.

The wolves are crying, but are they "Crying Wolf?" Action by the Senate Energy Committee on Murkowski's (R-Alaska,) S 104, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997 a.k.a. The Mobile Chernobyl Bill, has been twice postponed, leaving one to wonder if the

vote will happen on Wednesday; we can only assume that it will. After all, they thought that they could just sweep in and pass this thing the first weeks of the new Congress.

The industry's assumption that Clinton would back down after the election was wrong. Clinton and Gore are standing strong in their commitment to veto S 104 or any similar legislation. Even while their candidate for Energy Secretary - Frederico Pena - was being held "hostage" by Murkowski and the industry allies, they did not cut any backroom deals.

Murkowski and his gang also misjudged the number in the Senate that would remain firm in opposition. This means that the pro-S 104 sponsors are putting on the steam to beg, borrow or steal or rent any Senator that they can to insure they have 67 votes for S 104 on the floor -- the number needed to override a veto.

Now we need to deliver the 34 votes to back that veto up. This may move pretty fast since the Senate is not busy with other matters at the moment. All Senators need to be contacted.

PLEASE PUT THE WORD OUT SO THAT WHEN WE KNOW THAT A FLOOR VOTE IS SCHEDULED YOUR NETWORKS ARE READY TO DUMP A LOT OF ATTENTION CALLS, FAXES, LETTERS ON THE HILL.

Capital Switchboard 202-224-3121

Visit the NIRS Website for more information on the bill and impacts in your state. www.nirs.org

Key Swings:

Cleland (GA), Durbin (IL), Johnson (SD), Lugar (IN), Leahy, (VT), Hagel, (NE) Harkin, (IA), Sessions, (AL), Smith, (OR)

If you have networks in these states, please do some networking and focus energy there now, but ALL Senators need to hear from constituents throughout the month of March (and as the fight goes on). WE ARE WINNING THIS ONE, SO LET'S NOT LET IT GO NOW !!!!!!!

!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! STOP A MOBILE CHERNOBYL !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

PS We hear that sponsors in the House are lining up co-sponsors now too, even though there still is no bill introduced. If you are having contact with your Rep for any reason, don't forget to tell them to STAY OFF THE NUKE WASTE BILL!

.

-- end --

From disarmament@igc.org Mon Mar 10 15:18:28 1997
Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 12:40:53 -0800 (PST)
From: disarmament@igc.org
To: ctb-followers@igc.org
Subject: START III, Summit

USE SUMMIT TO REDUCE WARHEADS

Commentary in DEFENSE NEWS March 10-16
by George Pitman

When Russian President Boris Yeltsin and U.S. President Bill Clinton meet March 20-21 in Helsinki, Finland, they are likely to agree on common ground for negotiating a third Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) either to replace or complement the START II, which Russia has not ratified.

In either case, their agreement likely will include a ceiling on the number of nuclear warheads allowed, and this presents an opportunity to push for a much deeper cut in warhead deployment.

What is an appropriate level for a START III agreement?

START II, which was negotiated in 1993, established a ceiling of 3,000 to 3,500 warheads and mandated the elimination of all multiple warhead, independently targeted intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and replacement with single-warhead ICBMs.

The Russian Duma has refused to ratify START II claiming among other things, Russia cannot afford to replace its multiple warhead ICBMs with the single warhead missile as called for in the pact. Russia is suffering a severe economic pinch and for months has been unable to pay its armed forces, government workers or pensioners.

Under these conditions, it is unreasonable for the United States to expect Russia to ratify START II. If Russia and the United States begin negotiations for a new treaty, Russia likely will propose a warhead ceiling of 2,000 or fewer warheads.

However, the United States should push for a significantly lower warhead ceiling.*** Under what circumstances would the United States ever need 2,000 nuclear weapons? Since 1945, the United States considered using nuclear weapons in five different conflicts, during which five U.S. Presidents, from Harry Truman to Richard Nixon, rejected their use.*** They were rejected because there were no suitable targets that could not have been destroyed by conventional weapons, because of moral or ethical reasons or because of objections from allies.

In most of these cases many civilians would have been killed in attacking military targets.

During the Cold War, U.S. nuclear weapons served to deter Soviet aggression against Western Europe - no longer a valid reason with the 1991 collapse of the Soviet Union. The only reason for the United States to retain nuclear weapons today is to deter another

nation from using nuclear weapons against the continental United States or U.S. troops deployed abroad. The only potential nuclear threats faced by the United States are China or so-called rogue state that may acquire nuclear weapons in the future.

China has between 200 and 250 deployed nuclear weapons, although it has begun testing a new multiple-warhead ICBM that could significantly raise this number. Any other state that would acquire nuclear weapons in the future would have only a few because of the difficulty of acquiring the fissile material.

What criteria should the United States use in choosing a warhead ceiling? First, it should maintain parity with the next largest nuclear power. After the United States and Russia, the next largest nuclear powers are France and the United Kingdom.

France has about 500 deployed strategic nuclear warheads and about 100 tactical nuclear warheads; Great Britain also has about 500 nuclear warheads deployed on its four Trident submarines. Thus, the United States could maintain nuclear parity with the next largest nuclear power between 500 and 600 nuclear weapons.

The United States also should focus on reducing the number of Russian nuclear weapons to the lowest possible level because Russia has placed more emphasis on its nuclear forces since the collapse of its conventional military capabilities and has given up its nuclear no-first-use policy.

In other words, Russia now is willing to use nuclear weapons as its first line of defense and if war ever occurred between Russia and the West, NATO allies would be the likely targets.

Furthermore, as NATO proceeds with its plans to expand eastward, Russia likely will become more reluctant to give up its nuclear weapons.

Nuclear weapons are suitable for use against only two types of targets: large population centers and heavily protected military targets such as missile silos and hardened command and control posts.

Now that the Soviet Union no longer exists, most of the military targets suitable for nuclear weapons no longer exist and it is unlikely the United States would ever use nuclear weapons against large population centers.

Nuclear weapons cause extensive collateral damage even if used against military targets, and the United States has now advanced conventional weapons as effective against such targets as nuclear weapons but which would not cause such extensive collateral damage.

The argument is sometimes made that at least three nuclear submarines are needed to assure that one is on patrol at any

time, and five submarines would be required to assure that two subs, one for the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, would be on patrol at any time. Since each Trident submarine carries 20 missiles, the United States could have 40 missiles on patrol at any given time even if it reduced its fleet to five Trident boats.

Currently, eight warheads are deployed on each missile. However, it is unlikely the United States would target eight nuclear weapons at a time. If a U.S. president ever died authorize the use of nuclear weapons, it is likely that only one or two would be authorized.

There is no reason to deploy more than one warhead on each submarine missile. The U.S. Trident missiles should remove multiple warheads and install single-warhead missiles.

Considering Russia no longer poses a conventional military threat to Western Europe and nuclear weapons have no use beyond deterrence, the United States and Russia could sharply cut their arsenals and still maintain levels that would exceed those of any other nuclear power - to between 700 and 1,000 warheads.

By advocating deep reductions, the United States would be continuing its historic leadership role in nuclear arms control and fulfilling its obligations under Article VI of the nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty.

The United States also would pressure China, which has said it would enter into nuclear arms control negotiations only after the United States and Russia reduced their arsenals to China's level.

U.S. PROPOSES DEEPER CUTS IN NUCLEAR ARMS WITH RUSSIA
New York Times -- March 9, 1997
by Michael R. Gordon

MOSCOW -- The United States has told the Kremlin that it is prepared to negotiate deeper cuts in long-range nuclear arms in an effort to ease Russian fears that the West seeks military advantage.

The American proposal could lay the basis for an agreement on the goals of future arms talks at the summit meeting in Helsinki this month between President Clinton and President Boris N. Yeltsin.

It is also intended to prod Russia to ratify the Start II treaty. Signed in 1993, that treaty has languished in the Russian Parliament because of resistance from hard-liners.

"We are trying to achieve guidelines for Start III," an American official said, referring to a future agreement mandating additional cuts in long-range armaments. "It would make clear that we are prepared to go to lower levels and, thus, obviate the Russian concern that Start II is the end of the road."

The American proposal envisions reductions to a level of 2,000 to 2,500 nuclear warheads for each side. American officials would

like to announce negotiating guidelines spelling out the main provisions of a future accord at the Helsinki meeting. But the talks have been complicated by disputes over the testing of antimissile systems and NATO expansion. Timing has also been an issue, as the United States says a Start III accord must be preceded by Russian ratification of Start II.

Guidelines for a future arms agreement were discussed here on Thursday by Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott and senior Russian officials. Foreign Minister Yevgeny M. Primakov plans to go to Washington next week for further talks.

The flurry of high-level diplomacy over nuclear arms proposals recalls the days of the cold war and reflects the new strains in Moscow's dealings with the West.

When it was signed, the Start II agreement was hailed as the cornerstone of a new Russian-American relationship. The agreement required each nation to reduce the number of its warheads to a level of 3,000 to 3,500 by 2003. Russia and the United States had more than 10,000 warheads each in the late 1980s.

But Communist and nationalist members of Parliament here assert that the treaty took advantage of Russia at a time of weakness. The Pentagon's plans to test limited antimissile defenses have also been denounced here as an effort to gain strategic superiority. Even foreign investment has come under attack in Parliament as a scheme to gain an economic stranglehold on Russia.

Aleksei Arbatov, a member of Parliament from the liberal Yabloko faction, cited two additional reasons the Start II accord has bred such suspicion.

First, he said, support for the treaty has been hurt by the Yeltsin government's failure to outline a program for modernizing Russia's strategic arsenal. "The second problem," he said, "is NATO expansion to the East."

Still another reason has to do with the terms of the agreement itself. Members of Parliament complain that Russia cannot keep pace with the Americans under the treaty without a costly restructuring of its forces.

Specifically, they argue, staying even with the Americans under the terms of the accord would require building hundreds of new single-warhead, land-based missiles at the cost of tens of billions of dollars. More cost-effective ways to maintain parity are not available because the Start II treaty bans land-based missiles with multiple warheads. And beyond that, Russia's bomber force is in poor shape.

The ban on land-based missiles with multiple warheads is widely applauded by experts as an important step to reduce the risk of war. But such concerns are lost on a Communist-dominated Parliament, which sees nuclear weapons as a last vestige of Russia's former superpower status and a way to compensate for the disastrous decline in Russian conventional forces.

The United States, in its Start III proposal, tries to meet the Russian concerns by committing itself to negotiating further cuts. The lower level of forces envisioned under Start III would enable Russia to maintain general parity in nuclear arms with Washington at far less cost.

"Under Start III, the Russians could meet the numbers without a major new program," said Spurgeon M. Keeny Jr., president of the Arms Control Association, a private group based in Washington.

Whether negotiating guidelines can be worked out before the Helsinki meeting, however, is unclear.

Many Russian experts, aware of their country's limited negotiating leverage, urge delaying Start II ratification until the United States assures Moscow that it will not seek additional leeway under the 1972 antiballistic missile treaty to test new defensive systems. But developing and testing limited antimissile systems is an American goal.

Prime Minister Viktor S. Chernomyrdin also tied ratification of Start II to Moscow's opposition to NATO expansion last month. But NATO says its decision to expand eastward to include former Soviet bloc nations, is irreversible.

The prospects for new Start III negotiations depend on Washington's success in persuading Russia to let go of these linkages.

Washington has also insisted that a Start III accord cannot be completed unless Start II is ratified. Talks are being carried out on the precise timing of Russian ratification of Start II, the drafting of negotiating guidelines for a follow-up agreement, and the negotiation of the Start III treaty itself.

From: Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005

Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 Fax: 202 898 0172

<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

From ledwidge@psr.org Mon Mar 10 15:18:28 1997

Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 16:59:07 -0800

From: Lisa Ledwidge <ledwidge@psr.org>

To: dkimball@igc.org, bmusil@igc.org, vision@igc.org, adaction@ix.netcom.com,

ogr.parti@ecunet.org, armscontrol@igc.org, basicusa@igc.org, cob_washington_office@ecunet.org, cwu_washington.parti@ecunet.org, jdi@clw.org, skerr@clw.org, cdavis@clw.org,

102375.413@CompuServe.COM,

pdd@clark.net, disarmament@igc.org, bridget@fcnl.org, joe@fcnl.org, fas@fas.org, bruce.hall@green2.greenpeace.org,

73744.3675@compuserve.com, lamaryates@igc.org, mccwjdb@erols.com, mupj@igc.org, meldredge@igc.org, network@igc.org,

twashington@nrdc.org,

wjnsns@aol.com, nci@access.digex.net, fmillar@igc.org,

panukes@igc.org,

paprogram@igc.org, dculp@nrdc.org, barbara_green@pcusa.org,

pogodef@mnsinc.com, melinda@stimson.org, spusa@spusa.org,

tperry@ucsususa.org, uuawo@aol.com, wandwill@clark.net

Subject: [Fwd: Nuclear Weapons Invite]

[Part 1: "Included Message"]

Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 16:09:20 -0500 (EST)

From: Heather Anttila <hanttila@cato.org>

To: ledwidge@psr.org
Subject: Nuclear Weapons Invite

Dear Lisa--

Here is a copy of the invite for "Should Nuclear Weapons Be Abolished?". Please share it with your co-workers. Thanks.

Heather Anttila
Assistant Conference Director
Cato Institute

The Cato Institute
cordially invites you to a Policy Forum

Should Nuclear Weapons
Be Abolished?

featuring

Vice Admiral John J. Shanahan
(USN Ret.)
Center for Defense Information

and

Dr. Richard Haass
Brookings Institution

Should the United States work toward a nuclear-weapons-free world? Some experts argue that the end of the Cold War has presented an opportunity to abolish nuclear weapons. Others contend that any initiative that would entail giving up the U.S. nuclear arsenal would be naive and dangerous. Is the continued existence of nuclear weapons an intolerable threat to peace and security, or are nuclear weapons a fact of life and an essential component of national defense?

Thursday, March 13, 1997
12:00 noon
(Luncheon to follow)

To register, call Heather Anttila at (202) 789-5229, fax her at (202) 842-3490, or e-mail to hanttila@cato.org. News media please call Robin Hulsey at (202) 789-5293.

From JTLOWE@aol.com Tue Mar 11 07:00:33 1997

Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 18:21:14 -0500 (EST)

From: JTLOWE@aol.com

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Subject: sample letter to Clinton

Hi,

The National Peace Action has asked me to post the following letter which Peace Action members are using as a model. For those of you in countries other than US I hope it can be modified for your purposes.

Peace and health,

Colby Lowe, member Nuclear Task Force, Peace Action

[Part 2, Text 48 lines]

[Unable to print this part]

From kschultz@mail.cdi.org Tue Mar 11 07:00:33 1997

Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 18:03:53 -0500

From: kathryn schultz <kschultz@mail.cdi.org>

*To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, melinda@stimson.org, johnpike@fas.org,
djohnson@mail.cdi.org*

Subject: Shanahan speech on elimination of nuclear weapons

Greetings,

Thought y'all might like to see the latest speech that Admiral Shanahan gave. The speech, "Why I support the elimination of nuclear weapons,"

follows.

Kathryn

=====
=====

*Prepared Remarks to the Olof Palme International Center, Stockholm, Sweden,
for Vice Admiral John J. Shanahan, USN (Ret.), Director, Center for Defense
Information, 6 March 1997 (This is also available at
<http://www.cdi.org/issues/armscontrol/palme.html>)*

In 1948, as a junior officer in the U.S. Navy, I took part in Operation Fitzwilliam, a classified exercise to determine the effects of nuclear explosions on fully operational and fully manned warships. In 1949, I was involved in two additional nuclear tests in the Pacific.

Even with my personal experience with 3 major nuclear tests, it is difficult, yes, almost impossible to describe the awesome power, the devastation, the contamination, and the sheer horror and unlimited brutality of such a weapon.

I knew then, but didn't realize it, what I know now, that nuclear weapons have no place in the weapons inventories of any nation and there must be an organized serious international effort to rid the world of this weapon of mass

destruction. You now know why I signed the Statement on Nuclear Weapons by International Generals and Admirals, why I today support the work of the Canberra Commission and the position of General Butler and General Goodpaster on the ultimate goal of nuclear abolition, and why the Center for Defense Information has been calling for reductions and the elimination of nuclear weapons for many years -- long before it became politically acceptable.

The goal must be the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons with near- and mid-term reductions in all nuclear stockpiles. An increasing number of people are recognizing that nuclear weapons are not acceptable as instruments of war; that their only utility is to deter the use of a large number of nuclear weapons by other nations. Only four nations could launch such an attack on the United States today and two of them are among our closest allies -- Britain and France. The other two are Russia -- who receives U.S. aid to help them destroy many of those nuclear weapons -- and China -- who is armed with no more than 500 weapons, only a handful of which the Chinese could employ against the United States directly.

We do not need to maintain a first strike posture to deter the use of nuclear weapons by these four countries, only a retaliatory force, and only for as long as any nation has significant numbers of nuclear weapons. Thus, if the United States worked together with the Russians, the Chinese, the British, and the French to reduce nuclear arsenals globally, with the ultimate aim of eliminating them, there would be no need for any of these nations to maintain

a costly and dangerous nuclear deterrent.

All other threats to the United States can be met with conventional weapons.

You don't need nuclear weapons to deter or retaliate against a nation armed with only a handful of nuclear weapons. After all, we have demonstrated that the United States can destroy targets with its vast array of powerful non-nuclear weapons. In the words of then-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Colin Powell, nuclear weapons are "a wasted investment in a military capability that is limited in political or military utility," and that the United States has "ways of responding and punishing conventionally" to attack, that nations "would not wish to see us use." [24 September 1993]

Non-nuclear weapons are also a more credible deterrent. To be credible, you must have demonstrated a willingness to use your weapons. In 52 years, we've used nuclear weapons twice. We've used non-nuclear weapons more times than you or I could count. In the words of then Commander of U.S. Space Command, General Charles Horner, "[Nuclear] deterrence doesn't work outside of the Russian-U.S. context." [15 July 1994] Nuclear weapons did not inhibit Argentina to fight a nuclear-armed Britain over the Malvinas or Falkland Islands. Nor did a single one of the nuclear weapons in the U.S. arsenal prove useful in deterring Saddam Hussein; nor in fighting wars in Korea or Vietnam; or in quelling unrest in Somalia or Bosnia.

My call for working toward the elimination of nuclear weapons is based on realism not idealism. As a former fleet commander, it is clear to me that you can't fight a war using nuclear weapons. Yes, war is about killing people and destroying things and nothing does this more completely than nuclear weapons. The problem is, the indiscriminate and uncontrollable nature of nuclear weapons makes them unusable. Even though we faced military defeat in Vietnam, not one of our 30,000 nuclear weapons was used. The reason is simple: If you use nuclear weapons, you destroy everything that the war is about. You contaminate the very land over which you are fighting to control. You destroy the industry and wealth, you erase the history, you murder the innocents. Nobody wins if nuclear weapons are used.

While these facts are well recognized, the thinking in the Pentagon hasn't changed much. We continue to arm, train, and equip ourselves to fight a war using nuclear weapons. In 1997, the United States will spend some \$24 billion to maintain the capability to deliver some 7,000 strategic nuclear warheads anyplace in the world on minutes notice. Our land-based ICBMs, our bomber force, and our SLBM submarine fleet are ready -- but for what purpose? Where are the targets? Do we need deterrence a thousand times over? It is imperative that Pentagon planners and politicians recognize that the world has changed since 1989.

The eventual elimination of nuclear weapons is called for in the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Working to fulfill this obligation will further our non-proliferation goal. In negotiating and signing the NPT Treaty more than 25 years ago, the non-nuclear weapons states made a bargain with the five

nuclear weapons states. They gave up their right to nuclear weapons in exchange for access to the peaceful application of nuclear power and for positive steps toward disarmament by the nuclear weapons states. The nuclear weapons states recommitted themselves to this goal in the Principles

and Objectives Statement, adopted at the NPT Review and Extension Conference in May 1995. In this document, the nuclear weapons states reaffirmed their commitment to "the determined pursuit...of systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goal

of eliminating those weapons...." If the nuclear weapons states do not act to live up to their end of the NPT bargain, we cannot and should not be surprised if non-nuclear weapons states reconsider their adherence to this valuable treaty. The entire non-proliferation regime could fall.

The United States and the other nuclear weapons states must recognize one simple fact: we cannot forever maintain a world in which some nations possess nuclear weapons while others may not. The United States cannot continue to develop and produce improved nuclear delivery systems, to maintain the ability to fight a nuclear war, and to justify the use of nuclear weapons while at the same time expect nations whose security is threatened by our actions to eschew nuclear weapons forever. Instead of clinging to weapons to deter their use by others, we should be actively working to delegitimize nuclear weapons. The security interests of the United States would be better served by living up to its promise to work in concert with the other nuclear weapons states to reduce and eventually to eliminate nuclear weapons.

My position and that of my fellow signatories to the Generals and Admirals letter is really not radical. It is, after all, the official policy of the

United States government and has been since Truman was in the White House.

Nevertheless, the reaction to our letter in the United States has been troubling. The journalists, the politicians, the policy analysts, and nuclear weapons hawks have largely missed our point, mostly by design. They have focused their criticism on our ultimate goal of eliminating nuclear weapons while ignoring our near term recommendations, the purpose of which is to reduce the dangers of accidental or unauthorized launch of nuclear weapons.

Some believe we are advocating the unilateral elimination of nuclear weapons. While the U.S. could unilaterally reduce our nuclear stockpile further without harming U.S. security, elimination can and should only happen in conjunction with the other nuclear armed and nuclear capable states.

Many people have called our goal unrealistic. I guess they have forgotten what President Eisenhower said back in 1956:

"If men can develop weapons that are so terrifying as to make the thought of global war include almost a sentence for suicide, you would think that man's intelligence and his comprehension...would include also his ability to find a peaceful solution." [President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Press Conference, Washington, DC, 14 November 1956]

Nobody knew how to bring down the Berlin Wall, but that didn't deter us from reaching that goal. Nobody knew how to put a person on the moon, but that didn't stop President Kennedy from establishing that goal and it sure

didn't stop the American space program from taking the baby steps necessary to make that giant leap a reality. While it's true that nobody knows

exactly how to reach the goal of a world without nuclear weapons, we do know a variety of steps which will lead us in the right direction, that will help build the kind of world in which elimination is truly possible. The many steps have been laid out in the Generals and Admirals letter, in publications by the Center for Defense Information and other groups, and spelled out in greater detail in the Canberra Commission's Report.

Unfortunately, in the United States, the journey has been delayed because the destination has been called improbable by an influential and vocal opposition. This opposition has confused the issue by emphasizing what they characterize as the impractical goal of nuclear weapons abolition with what the supporters are after. That is the interim actions and regimes which will make the world a safer place today and which will be the foundation for a nuclear weapons free future.

Some have suggested to me and others that we should downplay or forget altogether our ultimate goal of eliminating nuclear weapons from the planet in

order to achieve our short term goals of de-alerting nuclear weapons, of reducing nuclear stockpiles further, of improving the safety and security of nuclear weapons and weapons materials. Perhaps that would help us accomplish some minor short-term goals, but we believe it would hinder future efforts aimed at not only deeper cuts in arsenals but also in increased openness and improved safeguards.

Additionally, only by remaining committed to zero will our greater

non-proliferation goals be served. Regardless, it's not as if we're saying anything all that radical or new. Our goal is the same as that of all five declared nuclear weapons states -- "the determined pursuit...of systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goal of eliminating those weapons...." [Principles and Objectives Statement, May 1995]

But, how committed is the United States to that goal. According to State Department spokesperson Nicholas Burns, "successive administrations have committed themselves to" the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons, "but, of course, we must live in the real world. We must live practically. We must prepare practically for the security of the American people and our allies around the world who are relying upon the United States to provide for their security." At that briefing Burns was asked by a reporter: "Q: Therefore, the Administration plans to keep some of its nuclear weapons indefinitely?" to which he responded a straightforward "Yes." [4 December 1996]

Many Americans today are unconcerned because they have forgotten or don't understand that nuclear weapons continue to endanger their lives and the future of the planet. For many of them, the threat posed by nuclear weapons disappeared when the Soviet Union crumbled and the Berlin Wall fell. Granted, the number of nuclear weapons worldwide has been reduced from a Cold War height of some 70,000 weapons, but there still exists some 40,000 nuclear weapons on the planet today; 97 percent of which are controlled by the United States and Russia.

We've all heard that the START II Treaty will decrease U.S. and Russian arsenals to 3,500 nuclear weapons. That is grossly misleading. The START II Treaty merely limits the number of deployed strategic nuclear weapons. The United States and Russia each plan to maintain some 10,000 deployed and stored, long- and short-range nuclear weapons. Assuming that the START II Treaty is ratified by the Russian Duma and fully implemented, by the year 2003, there will still exist about 23,000 nuclear weapons worldwide. There are no plans being formally discussed to further reduce these weapons. However, there is good reason to believe that certain agencies in the U.S. Administration are looking beyond START II. Hopefully, this will be on the agenda when President Clinton meets with President Yeltsin in Helsinki.

Still others have responded to the Generals and Admirals letter quite favorably. Some point to it as support for their own efforts to alter U.S. nuclear policy. The staff at CDI continues to work with many of the signers of the letter as well as with like-minded people on Capitol Hill. We also work with three coalitions who are dedicated to this important topic: the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, the Abolition 2000 caucus, and a newly-formed and influential Committee on Nuclear Policy. Many prominent Americans are identifying with this new and important committee.

These groups are not alone in wanting real change in U.S. nuclear posture and doctrine. In October 1996, two months before the Generals and Admirals Statement, Congressman Floyd Spence (R-SC), chair of the House National Security Committee, released a committee report entitled *The Clinton Administration and Stockpile Stewardship: Erosion by Design*. The report is completely at odds with what we see as a mood swing just beginning in the United States. The report criticized the Administration for

even the slightest arms control measures. For example, it claimed that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty "is clearly threatening the nation's long-term ability to maintain a safe and reliable nuclear stockpile." The report also criticizes the Clinton Administration for the lack of concrete plans to resume the production of tritium, for the shrinking size of the nuclear weapons complex, and for the United States' inability to produce plutonium pits on a large scale. According to Congressman Spence, "In my mind, it's no longer a question of the Administration's benign neglect of our nation's nuclear forces, but instead, a compelling case can be made that it is a matter of erosion by design." [NSC Press Release, October 30, 1996] With political leaders like Spence fighting the Administration on every little arms control measure, those who favor reduced reliance on nuclear weapons and deeper cuts in the arsenals have a lot of work to do.

Proponents of nuclear abolition also must overcome the push for NATO expansion. Talk of expanding this military alliance which was formed to protect a weakened Western Europe from Soviet influence and invasion, has already hindered the Russian Duma's consideration of ratifying the START II Treaty. Moreover, it may jeopardize efforts aimed at deeper reductions. In October 1995, then-Senator Sam Nunn gave a moving speech warning about the dangers of NATO expansion:

"I recall very well when the United States and our allies felt we were overwhelmed with conventional forces by the former Soviet Union. How did we respond? We responded by building up tactical nuclear forces. We responded by deploying

thousands of tactical nuclear forces because we did not have the artillery tubes to meet the conventional challenge. Are we confident the Russians would be so different from us if they truly have a nationalistic surge and end up believing the NATO enlargement is a threat to them? I am not confident that would not be their response as it was ours years ago. The security of NATO, Russia's neighbors and the countries of Eastern Europe will not be enhanced if the Russian military finger moves closer to the nuclear trigger."

The window of opportunity for deep reductions and a lessening of the nuclear threat would then be closed. In the words, again of Sam Nunn, "we must avoid being so preoccupied with NATO enlargement that we ignore the consequences it may have for even more important security priorities."

Although the immediate response to the Generals and Admirals letter in the United States has been lukewarm, we must not allow this to dampen our efforts. Recall the words of President Eisenhower who said that:

"Controlled, universal disarmament is the imperative of our time. The demand for it by the hundreds of millions whose chief concern is the long future of themselves and their children will, I hope, become so universal and so insistent that no man, no government anywhere, can withstand it." [Dwight D. Eisenhower, Address to the Indian Parliament, New Delhi, 10 December 1959]

Controlled, universal nuclear disarmament remains the imperative of our age.

We have a unique opportunity and the window may not be open for long.

For the first time in more than 45 years, the elimination of nuclear weapons seems like a distinct, if distant, possibility. Just as the longest journey begins with a single step, it is time for the nations of the world to begin this journey toward eliminating the nuclear threat for all time. And, as the nation which invented the nuclear weapon and as the only nation to have used it in war, the United States has the prime responsibility to lead the world forward, toward a world in which the mushroom cloud is only a nightmare of the past.

There are a number of unilateral steps that the United States could take to jump start the process.

- * The United States could remove the warheads from all missiles and bombers to be eliminated under the START II Treaty. This would not jeopardize U.S. security. It would still leave the United States with 3,500 strategic warheads deployed on ICBMs, SLBMs, and bombers, all ready for war.

- * President Clinton could make U.S. command and control more transparent so as to improve confidence that the United States truly does not target Russia or any non-nuclear weapon state that is a signatory of the NPT Treaty.

- * Furthermore, the United States could bring home the roughly 600 U.S. Air Force tactical bombs currently deployed in Europe and cancel the subcritical nuclear tests that the Department of Energy plans to conduct at the Nevada Test Site.

While unilateral actions can get the denuclearization process moving,

multilateral efforts are required to make the process work. Some of those multilateral efforts include:

- * separating warheads from delivery systems;
- * placing those warheads and missiles into safe,
- * internationally-monitored storage;
- * dismantling all tactical nuclear weapons;
- * eliminating the thousands of strategic warheads that the United

States

and Russia plan to maintain in storage indefinitely;

- * cutting further the deployed strategic arsenals of all five declared nuclear weapons states;

- * banning the production of highly-enriched uranium and plutonium

for

any purpose; and

- * enforcing strict controls on all fissile materials worldwide.

We must work together to create a world in which it is possible for all nations to agree not to develop, build, acquire, maintain, or use nuclear weapons. We will all be far safer in a world without nuclear weapons.

=====

Kathryn R. Schultz
Senior Research Analyst
Center for Defense Information
1500 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Suite 24
Washington, DC 20005
202-862-0700 (Phone)
202-862-0708 (Fax)

kschultz@cdi.org (E-mail)

http://www.cdi.org (CDI's home page)

http://www.cdi.org/kschultz (personal home page)

=====

From disarmament@igc.apc.org Tue Mar 11 07:00:33 1997

Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 16:27:00 -0800 (PST)

From: Disarmament Clearinghouse <disarmament@igc.apc.org>

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Subject: START Talking Summit

**ACTION ALERT * ACTION ALERT * ACTION ALERT * ACTION ALERT **

START TALKING SUMMIT! START TALKING SUMMIT!

** Clinton and Yeltsin meet March 20-21 in Helsinki, Finland **

At his last Press Conference (March 7, 1997), President Clinton stated, " . . . This meeting that we're going to have in Helsinki, President Yeltsin and I, it will be very important. . . It will be a meeting that will be extremely candid, extremely straightforward, and I hope it will help to deal with not only the question of Russia's relationship to Europe but also what we can do with the Russians to continue to reduce the nuclear threat . . ."

Following last month's meeting between Vice President Gore and Prime Minister Chernomyrdin, meetings between experts in both countries have been establishing "guidelines" for a START III framework agreement. These Guidelines were discussed on

Thursday by Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott and senior Russian officials. Foreign Minister Yevgeny M. Primakov plans to come to Washington DC on Saturday March 15 for further talks.

On March 18, President Clinton, Sec'y. of State Albright, and others will leave for Helsinki.

"We are trying to achieve guidelines for Start III," an American official said, referring to a future agreement mandating additional cuts in long-range armaments. "It would make clear that we are prepared to go to lower levels and, thus, obviate the Russian concern that Start II is the end of the road." - New York Times, March 9, 1997.

NOW is the time to push the Clinton Administration to achieve a START III framework agreement and bold cuts toward a nuclear weapons-free 21st century.

It is vital that President Clinton take full advantage of this historic opportunity.

* Lack of progress will leave START II, signed 4 years ago by Presidents Bush and Yeltsin, and ratified by the U.S. Senate last year, unratified by the Russian Duma.

* Lack of progress will leave the world stuck with over 20,000 nuclear weapons, over 95% in the possession of the United States

and Russia.

* Lack of progress will seriously imperil other arms control efforts. For example, the U.S. Senate may be even less likely to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty without Russian ratification first, and multilateral arm reductions, including the Nuclear Weapons Convention, will be less likely to progress with such large U.S. and Russian stockpiles.

** WHAT YOU CAN DO ** WHAT YOU CAN DO ** WHAT YOU CAN DO
**

WRITE A LETTER-TO-THE-EDITOR:

See the enclosed talking points, and sample letter to the editor. For more assistance in writing and placing your letter, please contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse.

WRITE, FAX, AND CALL THE WHITEHOUSE:

(Faxes are recommended). See the enclosed talking points and sample letter.

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
President of the United States of America
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW

Washington, DC 20500

White House Fax: 1 + 202 456 2461

White House Comment Line: 1 + 202 456 1111

CONTACT THE DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE:

For more information, or assistance, and to let us know what you are doing to persuade the President to START Talking at the Summit.

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

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

START TALKING POINTS

Why We Need a START III Framework Agreement

~ Without a START III framework agreement, Russia is unlikely to ratify START II.

Russian Duma on START II

October 17 1996 to U.S. Secretary of Defense Perry

Duma Defense Committee Chairman Lev Rokhilin stated, "ratification of START II is quite problematic."

Duma International Committee Chairman, Vladimir Lukin stated, "Russians are disappointed with the tendencies emerging in America, and it would be difficult to convince the Russian public that the United States is friendly and has peaceful intentions towards Russia."

START II (Strategic Arms Reductions Treaty II), which would limit U.S. and Russian Strategic arsenals to 3,500 each, requires significant changes to the Russian nuclear weapons infrastructure. Russia would have to destroy many more weapons than the United States. In order to achieve parity with the United States, Russia would then build single warhead missiles. Further reducing U.S. and Russian arsenals with a "START III" agreement could adjust this imbalance.

~ The world wants progress toward nuclear disarmament.

In December of 1996, sixty international retired Generals and Admirals called for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Prominent among them is U.S. Retired Four-Star General Lee Butler. The

December statement from retired world military leaders has stirred the debate about nuclear weapons elimination, and marked the culmination of tremendous progress for nuclear disarmament in 1996, including milestones such as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty signing, the World Court Ruling on nuclear weapons, the Canberra Commission Report, and the United Nations Resolution calling for a Nuclear Weapons Convention abolishing nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, a vast amount of work remains.

The impetus for General Lee Butler' anti-nuclear sentiments came from watching worldwide protests against France's testing of nuclear weapons in the South Pacific in the fall of 1995. He said: "Governments lag behind the public in these questions . . . The underlying message was: 'Look the Cold War is over. Don' t bring it back. Let's get on with it.'"

- Retired Four-Star General Lee Butler, New York Times, January 8, 1997

~ In April, 1997 at the NPT (nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty) Review Conference, the United States and Russia both need to show progress toward nuclear disarmament, in accordance with their obligation under Article VI of the NPT.

~ This is an historic opportunity for President Clinton.

Although Clinton exercised his leadership to achieve the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) - an essential step toward nuclear disarmament - the last effort to reduce U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals were made by President Bush, when START II was signed four years ago. The Summit provides an opportunity for President Clinton to achieve deep cuts in U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals as the next bold step to a nuclear weapons-free 21st century.

~ Without further reductions in U.S. and Russian arsenals, we will enter the 21st century with over 20,000 nuclear weapons, more than 95% of them in the possession of Russia and the United States.

~ Multi-lateral negotiations to abolish nuclear weapons will be more difficult without START III.

It is unlikely that China, France, or the U.K. will enter into multilateral negotiations to eliminate nuclear weapons while the United States and Russia maintain these enormous arsenals. Even after START II, Russia and the U.S. will have many more weapons than any of the other nuclear weapons states.

~ Maintaining these enormous arsenals costs enormous amounts of money.

The Cost Study Project's "Atomic Audit" estimates that U.S. taxpayers have spent at least \$4 trillion on nuclear weapons programs since 1942 (in adjusted 1995 dollars). Without Russian ratification and implementation of START II, the Pentagon estimates it will spend \$5 billion over the next seven years on the nuclear weapons that would have been eliminated under START II.

~ Without START reductions, the Department of Energy is seeking a new tritium production source.

Tritium, a radioactive isotope used to boost the destructive power of nuclear weapons, will cost taxpayers even more money to produce, and add to the radioactive waste legacy of nuclear weapons production. With further deep reductions in nuclear arsenals, tritium production now would not be necessary.

~ In addition to tritium production, increased plutonium pit production will be sought, while dismantling of nuclear weapons will be slowed and eventually halted.

*** NUCLEAR ARSENALS *** NUCLEAR ARSENALS ***

Under the ratified Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I) now being implemented, nearly 95 percent of the world's nuclear

weapons belong to the United States or Russia. Even after START II, which has not been ratified by Russia or implemented by either country, the United States and Russia will have the vast majority of nuclear weapons with France, China and the UK each maintaining total nuclear arsenals of less than 500.

START II limits only "strategic" (longer range intercontinental) nuclear weapons, not "tactical" (shorter range, battlefield) weapons. Almost a quarter of the world's nuclear stockpile consists of non-strategic nuclear weapons. After START II the U.S. will keep 950 warheads for non-strategic forces, and Russia may keep as many as 3,000 non-strategic warheads.

START II limits only deployed strategic nuclear weapons to approximately 3,500 each for Russia and the United States. Both the United States and Russia are planning to maintain several thousand "reserve" warheads.

"The size and composition of the total [U.S.] stockpile has now stabilized, and it will not decrease below the current level of nearly 10,000 warheads. If START II is implemented, the only change will be in the ratio of deployed warheads to those in a less-ready status."

- "Nuclear Notebook," Robert S. Norris and William M. Arkin, in *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, January-February 1997.

Under START II all land based missiles will be limited to carrying only one missile; but Submarine Launched Ballistic Missiles (SLBM's) will continue to carry multiple warheads. The United States and Russia both plan to put about half of their

future deployable strategic warheads at sea. (Britain plans to deploy its entire arsenal on submarines and France nearly 90 percent of its arsenal.)

Sample Letter-To-The-Editor
On Deeper Nuclear Arms Cuts

Dear Editor:

Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin plan a Summit meeting, March 20-21 in Helsinki Finland. President Clinton should seize this Summit opportunity to achieve further deep reductions in U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals by negotiating a new "START III" framework agreement as the next step toward the elimination of nuclear weapons.

Four years ago, Presidents Bush and Yeltsin signed the Strategic Arsenal Reduction Treaty (START II) and last year the U.S. Senate ratified the treaty that would reduce the number of deployed U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear warheads to roughly 3500 each. Unfortunately START II ratification has stalled in the Russian Duma. Without bold action from President Clinton to break the START II logjam and achieve further reductions, the world will head toward the 21st century stuck with over 20,000 nuclear warheads - 95 percent in the possession of Russia and the United States.

In stark contrast, 60 retired generals from 16 countries including 17 American and 18 Russian generals, have stated that "the continuing existence of nuclear weapons . . . constitutes a peril to global peace and security . . . long-term international nuclear policy must be based on the declared principle of continuous, complete and irrevocable elimination of nuclear weapons."

Along with these world military leaders, [your organization/affiliation] calls upon President Clinton to begin the next steps toward a nuclear weapons-free 21st century. The March Summit is an historic opportunity for Clinton to take an immediate and significant step. Clinton can and should negotiate a "START III" framework agreement to further reduce nuclear arsenals and persuade Russia to ratify START II.

It is time for President Clinton to START TALKING!

START Talking!

-SAMPLE LETTER TO PRESIDENT CLINTON-

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
President of the United States of America
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20500
Attn.: Mr. Sandy Berger, National Security Advisor

February xx, 1997
Dear Mr. President:

I (Our organization, representing x# of citizens throughout the State of X), am deeply concerned about the dangers of nuclear weapons. I share the hope you expressed in your Inaugural Address that "children can sleep free from the threat of . . . nuclear weapons". I call upon you to negotiate a "START III framework agreement" to achieve further bold cuts in U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals at your upcoming Summit meeting with President Yeltsin.

Recently, 60 retired military leaders from around the world called for further nuclear arms cuts and the phased elimination of nuclear arms. Prominent among them is former commander-in-chief of the Strategic Air Command, General George Lee Butler, who declared nuclear weapons to be "inherently dangerous, hugely expensive, militarily inefficient and morally indefensible." General Butler has said that he hopes that "bold" arms cuts initiatives are scheduled on the agenda of your Yeltsin Summit.

It has been four years since President Bush and President Yeltsin signed the second U.S.-Russian Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, START II. Last year the Senate ratified this important arms control treaty; but the Russian Duma has not yet ratified it. Your approaching March Summit with President Yeltsin presents an ideal opportunity for negotiating a framework agreement on a START III pact to encourage Russian ratification of START II and begin work toward further reducing nuclear weapons and nuclear dangers.

START III negotiations would provide an opportunity for further reductions in strategic nuclear weapons stockpiles, as well as the elimination of non-strategic weapons; the achievement of "zero alert" (removal of warheads from delivery vehicles to prevent the risk of accidental launch); and the strengthening of verification of destruction of nuclear weapons and weapons material. START III would significantly advance progress toward complete nuclear disarmament.

Upon signing the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty on September 24, 1996, you declared that the CTBT "points us toward a century in which the roles and risks of nuclear weapons can be further reduced and ultimately eliminated." It is time for you to take the next bold step in the direction of a nuclear weapons-free 21st century by agreeing in early 1997 to further reduce U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals.

Sincerely,

CONTACT THE DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE:

For more information, or assistance, and to let us know what you are doing to persuade the President to START Talking at the Summit.

Kathy Crandall, Disarmament Clearinghouse Coordinator
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005

TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

The Disarmament Clearinghouse is a project of:

Greenpeace, Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility,
Plutonium Challenge and Women's Action for New Directions.

From lforrow@igc.apc.org Tue Mar 11 07:00:33 1997

Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 19:19:22 -0800 (PST)

From: Lachlan Forrow <lforrow@igc.apc.org>

To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Opposition to US ratification of Chemical Weapons Convention

Given how important US ratification of CWC is to making it conceivable that the US would ever support a Nuclear Weapons Convention, here follows some reality-testing about what dealing with our Senate Foreign Relations Committee is like:

>

>5. US Congressional Opposition to Chemical Weapons Pact

>

>The Associated Press (Cassandra Burrell, "HELMS VOWS TO KILL
>CHEMICAL PACT," Washington, 3/8/97) reported that US Senator
>Jesse Helms, chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
>Saturday vowed unqualified opposition to the proposed chemical
>weapons ban treaty unless its supporters give him the changes he
>wants in it. Helms, a Republican from North Carolina, told
>attendees at the Conservative Political Action Conference that as
>it is written, the treaty will give Americans a false sense of

>security and could even increase the risk that terrorists' use of
>nerve gas will be more widespread. "This treaty will do
>absolutely nothing to reduce the dangers of poison gas," he said.
>"The Russians are actively working to create a new generation of
>chemical agents that are not even covered by the treaty." The
>Federation of American Scientists urged ratification in a letter
>sent Friday to Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott. "The treaty
>denies us no option we would otherwise wish to exercise, for the
>United States has already renounced chemical weapons and is in
>the process of destroying them," the letter said. Helms said
>that the treaty would allow rogue nations among its signatories
>greater access to information in the US, although the countries
>commonly referred to as rogue states, such as Libya, Syria, Iraq,
>and the DPRK, have not signed the treaty. "As long as I'm around,
>there's not going to be a Senate Foreign Relations Committee that
>rubber-stamps dumb and dangerous arms control treaties while
>sending blank checks to the United Nations and embracing (Cuban
>President) Fidel Castro," Helms said. The treaty would ban the
>manufacture of nerve gas and destroy existing arsenals. More than
>160 nations have signed the treaty, including the US under the
>Bush in 1993. Some 70 countries have completed the ratification
>process, enabling the treaty to come into force April 29 even
>without US ratification. President Clinton wants the Senate to
>ratify before then to ensure the US a leading role in
>establishing guidelines to implement the treaty.

>

From lcapt@efn.org Tue Mar 11 07:00:33 1997

Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 23:25:02 -0500 (EST)

From: Lane County American Peace Test <lcapt@efn.org>

To: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@igc.apc.org>, jburroughs@igc.org,

A.Malten@net.HCC.nl, wagingpeace@napf.org,

The Shundahai Network <shundahai@saltmine.radix.net>

Subject: ADDENDUM: NUCLEAR PANELS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL LAW
CONFERENCE, EUGENE

Lane County American Peace Test

Eugene PeaceWorks (sponsors)

454 Willamette

Eugene, Oregon 97401

343-8548

ADVISORY RELEASE

IMPORTANT LATE PANEL SCHEDULE ADDENDUMS

1997 Public Interest Environmental Law Conference

University of Oregon - School of Law - Eugene, Oregon

Sponsored by: Land Air Water (L.A.W.) and

Friends of Land Air Water (F.L.A.W)

PANELS:

[THURSDAY MARCH 13, 1997]

3:00 - 4:15p.m.

Global Nuclear Colonialism; Nuclear Weapons Forever? (110 Fenton)

The half-century embrace of the atom as an instrument of military
technology and an energy panacea has created an unprecedented
environmental

burden in the form of contaminated air, land, and water, and vast quantities of long-lived radioactive wastes. The brunt of this burden has been borne by indigenous peoples, who have suffered devastating health, environmental, economic and cultural impacts resulting from uranium mining, nuclear testing, dumping of radioactive waste, and theft of native lands to support the nuclear infrastructure.

* Jacqueline Cabasso, Exec. Dir., Western States Legal Foundation.

- As the organization's principal political organizer, she is responsible for community education, outreach, media, networking, client coordination and fundraising. Since 1990 she has been centrally involved in int'l disarmament activities. She has spoken at public hearings, legislative symposia and conferences around the U.S., in Europe, Japan, Russia and Kazakhstan, and has addressed gatherings at the Livermore and Los Alamos Labs, the Nevada and Semipalatinsk Nuclear Test Sites, the French nuclear labs at Gramat and Bordeaux, and Hiroshima, Japan.

* Agathon (AK) Malten, Dir., Global Anti-Nuclear Alliance (Netherlands) or GANA

which is a member of the Abolition 2000 Network.

- Mr. Malten worked in schools and a museum as a teacher, worked in social cultural centers leading educational projects, worked with mentally handicapped in diverse settings. His main fields of interest are communication in the widest meaning of the word, organisational structures, networking, inter-human relationships, education, helping people to find their way in life.

* Corbin Harney, Elder and Spiritual Leader of the Western Shoshone

- The Western Shoshone are Native people indigenous to Idaho, Nevada, Utah, and California. He was born in Idaho and raised by the medicine people of the Owyhee Indian Reservation. Since 1957 he has worked with Eunice Silva and Florence Vega, medicine women of Battle Mountain, Nevada

running the Sundance Ceremony, sweat lodges, and doctoring sick people. As

a medicine person, he has also been working steadily to preserve and protect the sacred sites and burial grounds of his people. He has been instrumental in helping to stop nuclear testing on Shoshone land at the Nevada Test Site.

[Friday March 14, 1997]

5:30 - 6:45p.m.

ARE NUCLEAR WEAPONS ILLEGAL? THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE OPINION (JULY 8, 1996) ON THE THREAT AND USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS(129 Law)

International humanitarian law consists of rules and principles that regulate the conduct of warfare, seeking to strike a balance between the imperatives of war and the humanitarian impulse to moderate its savagery. In November 1995, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in The Hague conducted unprecedented hearings on the legality of nuclear weapons.

The ICJ, the judicial branch of the United Nations, is the highest and most authoritative court in the world on questions of international law. The

case pitted the United States, other members of the exclusive "nuclear club" and their allies against non-nuclear countries who argued that the use or threat to use nuclear weapons in any circumstance is prohibited under international law.

On July 8, 1996 the ICJ unanimously held that humanitarian law regulating the conduct of warfare applies to the use of nuclear weapons by the world's most powerful states just as it does to the actions of ordinary soldiers. A fundamental rule, the Court concluded, is that "states must never make civilians the object of attack and must consequently never use weapons that are incapable of distinguishing between civilian and military targets. Referring to Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Court unanimously held that all states are obligated "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."

* Jacqueline Cabasso, Exec. Dir., Western States Legal Foundation

- As the organization's principal political organizer, she is responsible for community education, outreach, media, networking, client coordination and fundraising. Since 1990 she has been centrally involved in int'l disarmament activities. She has spoken at public hearings, legislative symposia and conferences around the U.S., in Europe, Japan, Russia and Kazakhstan, and has addressed gatherings at the Livermore and Los Alamos Labs, the Nevada and Semipalatinsk Nuclear Test Sites, the French nuclear labs at Gramat and Bordeaux, and Hiroshima, Japan.

* John Burroughs, Staff Atty., Western States Legal Foundation

- In 1991, Mr. Burroughs completed his Ph.D. dissertation, *Nuclear Obligations; Nuremberg Law, Nuclear Weapons, and Protest*, analyzing the international law framework for nuclear weapons policy at UC Berkeley,

under the guidance of the late California Supreme Court Justice Frank Newman. He was a visiting professor at John F. Kennedy Law School in the fall of 1992, teaching public international law.

* Agathon (AK) Malten, Dir., Global Anti-Nuclear Alliance (Netherlands)
GANA, which is a member of the Abolition 2000 Network.

- Mr. Malten worked in schools and a museum as a teacher, worked in social cultural centers leading educational projects, worked with mentally handicapped in diverse settings. His main fields of interest are communication in the widest meaning of the word, organisational structures, networking, inter-human relationships, education, helping people to find their way in life.

* David Krieger, Ph.D., J.D., Pres., Nuclear Age Peace Foundation and Judge pro tem and arbitrator for the Santa Barbara Municipal Court

- In 1982, he founded the Foundation and began serving as its president. Under his leadership, the Foundation has initiated many innovative and important projects for peace -- including a World Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons and a Magna Carta for the Nuclear Age calling for individual accountability for crimes under international law. Dr. Krieger is a graduate of Occidental College in Los Angeles. He holds M.A. and Ph.D degrees in political science from the University of Hawaii at Manoa, and a J.D. from the Santa Barbara College of Law. He is a teacher, a judge, a prolific writer, a husband, and a father. He is a very active contributor for Peace.

-end-

From nfznsc@gn.apc.org Tue Mar 11 07:00:33 1997

Date: Tue, 11 Mar 1997 12:36:57 GMT

From: Stewart Kemp <nfznsc@gn.apc.org>

To: nfla.news@conf.gn.apc.org

Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Subject: NPU Bulletin 8-10 Mar

>From: GMR@MCR1.poptel.org.uk

>Date: Tue, 11 Mar 1997 11:26:44 GMT

>Subject: NPU Bulletin 8-10 Mar

>To: nfznsc@gn.apc.org

>

>DAILY INFORMATION BULLETIN - NUCLEAR POLICY

>

>Mon 10 Mar 1997

>

>97-8276 Nato enlargement is no threat to Russia, says foreign secretary

> Malcolm Rifkind. T

>97-8277 New medical evidence that Gulf war illness was caused by

> chemicals goes to select committee: MoD alleged to have ignored

> evidence from NCOs who administered sprays: Soames orders

> inquiry into possible cover-up. Ind

>97-8278 Czech army chemical specialist claims to have detected use of

> mustard gas and sarin in Gulf war. Ind

>97-8279 US doctors say bacteria, not chemicals, may be cause of Gulf

> war syndrome. G

>

>Sun 9 Mar 1997

>

>97-8271 Veterans to argue this week that Gulf war troops were given too

- > many anthrax jabs, against accepted medical advice. Obs
- >97-8272 US fury as Gadaffi steps up work on underground mustard gas
- > factory. STimes
- >
- >Sat 8 Mar 1997
- >
- >97-8267 Scottish brewery recalls CO2 cylinders after traces of
- > radioactivity found. G,Ind
- >
- >GM Research, Metropolitan House, Hobson Street, Oldham, OL1 1QD.
- >Tel: 0161-911 4179. Fax: 0161-627 1736.
- >Internet: gmr@mcr1.poptel.org.uk
- >
- >

Stewart Kemp (nfznsc@gn.apc.org)

From Weissdor@aol.comTue Mar 11 19:21:33 1997
Date: Tue, 11 Mar 1997 11:55:16 -0500 (EST)
From: Weissdor@aol.com
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Japan nuclear explosion

Dear Abolitionists,

Reuters this morning reported the following, which was disseminated on AOL:

"An explosion occurred at a nuclear fuel reprocessing plant north of Tokyo today after a fire at the facility exposed 10 workers to radiation. Japan's Kyodo News service reported. Kyodo said the blast broke nine windows in the plant and white smoke was seen coming out from the roof of the plant's vitrification facility for liquid nuclear waste. There were no details on whether there were any injuries or radiation leaks into the atmosphere following the blast, which occurred about 10 hours after a small fire at the plant."

I don't know how widely this will be covered in the press, and just wanted to pass it along.

Dorrie Weiss
From disarmtimes@igc.apc.orgTue Mar 11 19:21:33 1997
Date: Tue, 11 Mar 1997 09:06:49 -0800 (PST)
From: NGO Committee on Disarmament <disarmtimes@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Cc: nypaxchristi@igc.org
Subject: NPT calendar

NPT PREP COM, AT THE UNITED NATIONS,
APRIL 7-18, 1997

This Preparatory Committee meeting of the States Parties to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty will differ from those preceding previous Review Conferences for the treaty, due to the strengthened review process approved at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference. Decisions about the logistical and substantive work of the PrepCom, and about the modalities of attendance and possible participation by observer States and Non-Governmental Organizations, will not be made until the meeting opens on the 7th of April. NGOs seeking accreditation to attend open sessions of the PrepCom should inform the NGO Committee on Disarmament no later than March 24th. The NGO Committee on Disarmament will turn its list of registrants over to the Secretariat of the PrepCom.

SCHEDULE OF NGO EVENTS (as of 11 March)

DAILY throughout the PrepCom:

- * Abolition 2000 Caucus will meet from 8-9am (location TBA)
- * 9:15-10am briefings (in Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium April 8, 11, 14, 15, 18; other days in small conference room TBA)

SUNDAY, APRIL 6

- * An orientation session for NGOs attending the PrepCom, location TBA (Abolition 2000 Caucus)

MONDAY, APRIL 7 - PrepCom begins - plenary session expected to be open to NGOs

- * 5-7pm: Launch of the model Nuclear Weapons Convention: speakers include Jurgen Scheffran, International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation, and Jonathan Schell, author, The Fate of the Earth; Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium (Abolition 2000 Caucus and Nuclear Weapons Convention working group)

TUESDAY, APRIL 8

- * 5-7pm: Presentation -- "Nuclear Energy and Environmentally Sustainable Alternatives", Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium (Abolition 2000 Caucus and NGOs attending the Commission on Sustainable Development)

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9

- * International Atomic Energy Agency presentations, Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium; NGOs welcome
 - 10am-1pm: "Security in the Nuclear Field and Verification," with Mohammed El Baradei and Demetrios Perricos of the IAEA and David Albright, Institute for Science and International Security
 - 2-5pm: "Peaceful Applications of Nuclear Energy," with Maurice Rosen and Paulo Barretto of the IAEA and Mary Olson, Nuclear Information and Resource Service

THURSDAY, APRIL 10

- * 10:30am-12noon: weekly DPI/NGO briefing in Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium, on the subject of the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons. Panelists: Amb. Richard Butler of Australia, Convenor of the Commission; Amb. Jayantha Dhanapala of Sri Lanka; Amb. Celso Amorim of Brazil. Other Canberra Commission members invited. Sponsored by the NGO Committee on Disarmament, the U.N. Centre for Disarmament Affairs and the U.N. Department of Public Information.
- * 2-5pm: Roundtable discussion of NGO proposals for eliminating nuclear weapons: discussants include Jonathan Dean, Union of Concerned Scientists; Joseph Cirincione, Committee on Nuclear Policy; John Burroughs, Western States Legal Foundation (location TBA)
- * 5-7pm: Presentation: "The Nuclear Fuel Cycle in a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World," Dag Hammarskjold Library

Auditorium (NGO Committee on Disarmament). Panelists: Chris Paine, Natural Resources Defense Council; Arjun Makhijani, Institute for Energy and Environmental Research; Zia Mian, Sustainable Development Policy Forum, Pakistan; Paul Leventhal, Nuclear Control Institute; Martin Kalinowski, International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation (INESAP)

FRIDAY, APRIL 11

* Institute for Energy and Environmental Research presentations, location TBA

* Meeting of the International Peace Bureau steering committee, 777 U.N. Plaza (Church Center)

* Launch of Women's International League for Peace and Freedom nuclear disarmament campaign, location TBA

* 5-7pm: Presentation: "Verification Aspects of a Nuclear Weapons Convention," Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium (International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation)

SATURDAY, APRIL 12

* 10am-4pm: Public Forum on NATO and Nuclear Weapons, 777 U.N. Plaza (Church Center), 2nd floor (International Peace Bureau and Abolition 2000 Caucus)

SUNDAY, APRIL 13

* U.N. Seminar of Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 777 U.N. Plaza (through Tuesday)

MONDAY, APRIL 14

* 5-7pm: Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium reserved for NGO presentation (tentatively reserved for LAWS)

TUESDAY, APRIL 15

* 5-7pm: Reception for Jim Wurst, outgoing editor of Disarmament Times

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16

* 1-3pm: talk on "From Nuclear Disarmament to Comprehensive Arms Restraint," location TBA (World Order Models Project)

* 6pm: Douglas Roche, former Canadian Ambassador to the U.N., speaks on "Spiritual and Ethical Dimensions of Security and Arms Control," 815 Second Avenue at 44th Street, 4th Floor (Temple of Understanding and Anglican Observer at the U.N.)

THURSDAY, APRIL 17 - NO OFFICIAL MEETINGS (due to the holiday of Id Al-Adha)

FRIDAY, APRIL 18 - Final Day of PrepCom

* 5-7pm: Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium reserved for NGO wrapup discussion

* * *

Throughout the PrepCom, there will be a small conference room

available in the U.N. for NGO use. There will be opportunities for NGOs to hold caucus meetings or make presentations in this space. Contact Roger Smith at the NGO Committee on Disarmament.

* * *

THE UNITED NATIONS DISARMAMENT COMMISSION (UNDC) will hold its 1997 session from Monday, April 21 until Tuesday, May 13. This year's UNDC session will discuss three substantive issues: nuclear weapon free zones; guidelines on conventional arms control/limitation and disarmament, with a special emphasis on peacekeeping; and the Fourth U.N. Special Session on Disarmament. The NGO Committee on Disarmament will be sponsoring panel discussions on each of these three topics in the Dag Hammarskjold Library Auditorium from 5-7pm on April 22-24. Contact the NGO Committee for more information or if you wish to attend the sessions of the UNDC.

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
<http://www.peacenet.org/disarm/>
From wilpfnatl@igc.apc.org Tue Mar 11 19:21:33 1997
Date: Tue, 11 Mar 1997 12:07:10 -0800 (PST)
From: Z <wilpfnatl@igc.apc.org>
To: Dietrich Fischer <102464.11110@compuserve.com>, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: US Congress

I don't know about email lists, but the Council for a Livable World sent me a list with phone # and room numbers. Their email address is jdi@clw.org

At 07:51 AM 2/27/97 EST, Dietrich Fischer wrote:
>Dear Members of the Abolition Caucus,
> Does anyone have a listing of email addresses and fax numbers of the
>newly composed US Senate and House of Representatives? It would be helpful to
>lobby them for nuclear abolition. If you know of such a list, could you
>give an
>email address from whom it is available, or post a website from which it may be
>downloaded? Thank you, Dietrich Fischer
>
>

From panukes@igc.apc.org Tue Mar 11 19:21:33 1997
Date: Tue, 11 Mar 1997 15:00:01 -0800 (PST)
From: Peace Action - National Office <panukes@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, jdi@clw.org, palist@igc.org
Subject: discussion list on NATO etc.

Dear disarmament colleagues:

I have finally figured out how to set up and run a majordomo list, and am pleased to announce that a list server and companion igc conference on NATO expansion/START 3 are now operating and ready for any of you who so wish to join.

The list name is <start3-europenwfz@igc.org>.

To subscribe, send a message to <majordomo@igc.org> and, leaving the subject line blank, in the body text of the message write:

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

After you have subscribed, you may wish to send and access messages via the companion igc conference, if you are an igc email user. The conference is called <start3.nato> This is a public conference, so anyone on igc network can go and read it.

Unlike the abolition-caucus list which is completely open and unregulated, I have made the start3-europenwfz list a closed list, which means that Majordomo will send your subscription to me for approval before adding you to the list. So do not send a message to the list before you have subscribed to it, or the message will bounce and give me grief.

The list is closed because on this list a major focus will be practical *organizing* -- discussing strategies and tactics for approaching key government decision makers and the media, organizing demonstrations, events, direct actions, etc. -- and to do these things effectively often means not making our plans public until we want them to be public.

Anybody can subscribe to an open list, and the people on open lists are generally not aware of who the other subscribers are: the people reading this message on abolition-caucus right now may include people from the Pentagon, people from our governments, journalists, pro-nuclear weapons ideologues. And that's OK, because we have no problem with such people reading our discussions and hearing our message. We might even encourage it. But when we get down to planning the finer details of how we deliver our message in specific ways, I think a closed discussion list is a good idea.

The start3-europenwfz list is open to all who want to work on preventing NATO expansion, promoting a deep cuts treaty of some

sorts, and creating a nuclear weapon-free Europe. All anti-nuclear people welcome!

Thanks,

Karina Wood
Peace Action Education Fund, U.S.
From JTLOWE@aol.com Tue Mar 11 19:21:33 1997
Date: Tue, 11 Mar 1997 17:18:39 -0500 (EST)
From: JTLOWE@aol.com
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Nuclear Colonialism

Greetings,

For those who think Nuke C. is not a proper topic for Tahiti I would suggest contacting the following people

From int@fme.knooppunt.beWed Mar 12 03:37:32 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Mar 1997 01:40:09
From: Pol D'Huyvetter <int@fme.knooppunt.be>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, a-days@knooppunt.be, fme@knooppunt.be
Subject: Little mistake

Concerns

Mailinglist Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days

Hello,

We got informed by our system-operator that you will not be able to (un)subscribe, or make any other administrative requests to majordomo@knooppunt.be (i.e. who a-days) when you write

<A-days> this does NOT work !!

The system only accepts

<a-days> PLEASE CORRECT !!

How a small <a> can make a big difference in a campaign to abolish nuclear weapons !!

Peace,

Pol D'Huyvetter

Contactperson
Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days 1997

```
*****  
*           For Mother Earth International office           *  
*****  
*           Lange Steenstraat 16/D, 9000 Gent, Belgium      *  
*           Phone +32-9-233 84 39                          *  
*           Fax +32-9-233 73 02                            *  
*           E-mail: int@fme.knooppunt.be                   *  
*****  
*           WWW: http://www.knooppunt.be/~fme              *  
*****  
*           Postal account : 000-1618561-19                *  
*****  
*   For Mother Earth is member of Abolition 2000 - a global *  
* network to eliminate nuclear weapons, the International Peace *  
* Bureau (IPB) and World Information Service on Energy (WISE) *  
*****  
* For Mother Earth has offices in Belgium, Slovakia, Sri Lanka, *  
* USA, as well as active members/groups in Belarus, Finland, *  
* Germany, Netherlands, Rumania and Ukraine               *  
*****
```


From brucehall@igc.org Wed Mar 12 03:38:40 1997
Date: Tue, 11 Mar 1997 17:31:03 -0800 (PST)
From: Bruce Hall <brucehall@igc.org>
To: rdtandempn+@igc.org
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: NIF Construction

To : Abolitionists everywhere, interested tomatos, and other types.
From: Bruce Hall at Greenpeace
Date: March 11, 1997
re : Energy Department says giant nuclear weapons laser will help the U.S. meet conditions of Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Go figure...

Department of Energy News

News Media Contacts:
Mathew Donoghue/Chris Kielich
(202) 586-5806

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
March 11, 1997

CONSTRUCTION APPROVED FOR NATIONAL IGNITION FACILITY

(World's Largest Laser to Support Nuclear Test Ban,
Reinforce U.S. Scientific Leadership)

The Department of Energy (DOE) has approved the start of construction of the National Ignition Facility (NIF) at DOE's Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, which will house the world's largest laser and create conditions similar to the center of the sun and other stars. The facility will play a vital role in DOE's science-based stockpile stewardship and management program to maintain the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile without underground testing. Groundbreaking for the \$1.2 billion, 192-beam stadium-sized laser center is anticipated with the next few weeks.

"The National Ignition Facility will help the United States meet the conditions of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and reduce the global nuclear danger. The country will also benefit from cutting edge science in astrophysics and fusion energy," said Charles B. Curtis, Acting Secretary of Energy.

Bruce Tarter, director of the laboratory based in Livermore, California said "The National Ignition Facility will make a fundamental contribution to our technical understanding of aging nuclear weapons. The hundreds of men and women who have carried us to this point are now ready to convert this critical scientific effort into concrete, steel and lasers."

The National Ignition Facility will direct the energy of 192 laser beams onto a small (one millimeter) capsule containing isotopes of hydrogen to induce a fusion reaction that will produce more energy than comes from the laser beam, simulating reactions in the explosion of thermonuclear warheads. Temperatures in the fuel

capsule at NIF could reach 100 million degrees with pressures 100 billion times that of the earth's atmosphere. When used with other data and advanced computational capability, results from this work will allow assessment, without testing, of the reliability of the nation's nuclear stockpile as it ages.

Upon completion NIF will be a multipurpose research facility with defense and civilian applications such as fusion energy research and astrophysics. NIF will have 50 times the energy of any laser now in existence and will produce, for the first time in a laboratory setting, conditions of matter close to those that occur in the center of the sun and other stars.

President Clinton signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in September 1996 and has pledged to pursue experimental means of maintaining confidence in the reliability and performance of nuclear weapons. Livermore was selected as the NIF site in December 1996, following the Stewardship and Management Program, DOE's comprehensive plan for maintaining the safety and reliability of the nation's nuclear stockpile through science. Funding to begin site preparation for NIF was included in the FY 97 congressional appropriation. Full construction funding is requested in the FY 98 congressional budget request.

Construction of NIF will create almost 900 long-term jobs in the San Francisco Bay area where Lawrence Livermore lab is located.

About 6,000 jobs nationally and 3,000 locally will be created during the peak construction period between 1998 and 2000.

From int@fme.knooppunt.be Tue Mar 11 19:39:15 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Mar 1997 02:39:27
From: Pol D'Huyvetter <int@fme.knooppunt.be>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Abolition 2000 => response Uranium Institute NB

Uranium Institute News Briefing

latest weekly briefing March 10 is attached

To be or not to be on abolition-caucus? That was the question!

Dear Abolitionists

Thank you to the people who took time to answer the question concerning the UI News Briefings.

Two people shared concerns to have these newsbriefing put on the Abolition 2000 mailer, and suggested interested people to get this info in another way <WISE or directly from uranium institute>.

Five people welcomed the info on abolition, though some mentioned they would be happy to receive it through another mailing list <i.e. Uranium Mining versus Indigenous Peoples mailer>.

What will I do as I never work with majority-minority votes, but with consensus decision making??

I doubt, and feel tempted to continue to post the info as I personally believe strongly that we do have to keep 'everybody' informed about the developments and dangers of the 'civil' atom, which is a twin-brother of the 'military' atom. And in some way the sharing of this info is in my opinion also an opportunity to build bridges between the peacemovement and the environmental movement.

But because there is no consensus, I will ask people who want to continue to receive the info to subscribe to the new <Mailinglist Uranium Mining versus Indigenous Peoples>,

I will stop posting these newsbriefings on abolition-caucus

So if you want to continue to receive this news, send a message to :

<majordomo@knooppunt.be>

with in body of message

subscribe induran <your account>

The advantage will be that you will receive regular updates on environmental racism/nuclear colonialism.

What's the traffic on induran@knooppunt.be?

Concerned about more messages??
Let's share facts !!

Since March 5 we had a total of four messages on this new mailer :

The UI News Briefing, and three stories on mining : with landrights violations of Indigenous Peoples in Australia, a new mine proposal in Saskatchewan (Canada), and plans to open a mine on Navajo land in the USA.

For a nuclear free world

Pol D'Huyvetter

FORWARDED MAIL -----

From: 100141.752@CompuServe.COM (Ted Mole)
Date: 11 Mar 97 Originally To: BlindCopyReceiver;;

UI News Briefing 97.10
(for the period 5 - 11 March 1997)

Prepared by the Uranium Institute Information Service.
All news and views are those of the publications cited.

[NB97.10-1] Japan: 10 employees were exposed to `extremely small' amounts of radiation in a fire at PNC's vitrification facility at Tokai Mura. An associated radiation release into the atmosphere was described as `well within established safety parameters'. The fire was extinguished within 15 minutes. It was followed about 10 hours later by an explosion which broke windows in the building but caused no injuries or further radiation leak. (Reuters, 11 March)

[NB97.10-2] Korea: Wolsong-2 is expected to reach 10% power and to be synchronised to the grid by mid-March following the completion of Phase B low power commissioning tests in February. (UNECAN News, 28 February, p6)

[NB97.10-3] French regulators have issued permission for Chooz-B2, the second N4 1450 MWe PWR, to start up. (Nucleonics Week, 6 March, p18; see also News Briefing 97.07-3)

[NB97.10-4] The government of Kazakstan has formed a new 100% state owned company to manage the state's interest `in all major uranium mining and processing enterprises'. The new company, KazAtomProm, has assumed the assets of KATEP, plus those of three mining administrations and the

51% state owned stake in the Ulba Metallurgical Plant, which produces nuclear fuel pellets. KazAtomProm will also take responsibility for the country's interests in KATEP's joint ventures with Cameco/Uranerz and with Cogema. Meanwhile, World Wide Minerals Ltd of Toronto has announced a joint venture between its subsidiary, KazUran, and KazAtomProm, to renovate and expand existing mines and to explore and develop deposits in southern Kazakhstan. World Wide Minerals also said it will restart the uranium mill at Stepnogorsk later this month, expecting to produce 1.8 million pounds U3O8 (about 1.5 million tU) this year. (FreshFUEL, 10 March, p2; Ux Weekly, 3 March, p3; see also News Briefings 95.34-1, 96.33-2 and 96.42-4)

[NB97.10-5] In the US, the Colorado Plateau mines acquired from Energy Fuels by International Uranium Corp could be in production within the next two months, according to International Uranium chief executive Earl Hoellen. The acquisition of the Energy Fuels properties by International Uranium should be completed by the end of March. (FreshFUEL, 10 March, p2; see also News Briefing 96.50-4) Two other new names to figure in the news are Anaconda Uranium Corp of Toronto and JNR Resources of Vancouver. Anaconda Uranium Corp was formed late in 1996 when Anaconda Resources of Nevada was acquired by Canadian company Mina Resources Ltd. It has been working to raise finance to develop the Copper Mountain Project in Wyoming, and is to be traded on the Vancouver Stock Exchange. JNR Resources has announced that it has staked claims for more than 40 000 acres in Canada's Athabasca Basin, including claims near the Key Lake mine, the West Bear and Midwest Lake deposits, and several claims referred to as Cigar Lake North. The firm is also set to acquire a 50% stake in claims covering over 71 000 acres in Canada's Northwest Territories, in partnership with Northern Geophysics Ltd. (FreshFUEL, 10 March, p3)

[NB97.10-6] US: The nomination of Frederico Pena as the new Secretary of Energy has been approved by the US Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. (SpentFUEL, 10 March, p1; see also News Briefing 97.01-19)

[NB97.10-7] Germany: Despite the efforts of some 5000 demonstrators, six casks of spent fuel and high-level waste completed the final stage of their journey to the Gorleben storage facility by road. (Reuters, 5 March) The German government is now reported to be ready to hold talks on energy policy with the opposition party, the anti-nuclear Social Democrats (SPD). (Reuters, 6 March; see also News Briefings 97.09-1 and 97.08-13) In Switzerland, Greenpeace activists attempted to stop a

shipment of spent fuel leaving the Beznau nuclear power station by blocking railway tracks. (Reuters, 9 March)

[NB97.10-8] Taiwan is expected to ship a first load of low-level waste to North Korea in July, according to reports in the Taiwan press. (Reuters, 4 March; see also News Briefing 97.09-12)

[NB97.10-9] US: A commercial proposal to store spent fuel on a pacific atoll has received 'no apparent support' and has met 'significant' opposition, it is reported. The plan for 'cradle-to-grave' fuel cycle services - the partners would lease fuel, collect it, containerise, ship, store and monitor it - was put forward by US Fuel and Security Inc, a company founded in 1995 with avowed plans to 'wipe out' reprocessing by monopolising nuclear fuel transportation. US Fuel chairman Daniel Murphy claims that his company has obtained backing from Minatom of Russia. (SpentFUEL, 10 March, p4; see also News Briefing 95.46-16)

[NB97.10-10] Sweden: Oskarshamn-1 has been granted regulatory approval to operate for a year on condition that cracks in the moderator tank lid are inspected during the next annual outage and that the lid is ultimately replaced, as already planned. The 440 MWe BWR has been off line since November 1996. (Nucleonics Week, 6 March, p4)

[NB97.10-11] Australia is considering building a small reprocessing and waste treatment plant to manage spent fuel from the Lucas Heights research reactor, an Australian government minister has confirmed. Spent fuel storage space at the 39 year old High Flux Australian Reactor (HIFAR) is almost full, although 120 fuel rods were sent for reprocessing in the UK last year and the US has apparently agreed to take back all US-origin fuel rods. The reprocessing option would involve the development of Australia's Synroc technology for high-level waste solidification. (UIC Weekly News, 7 March; SpentFUEL, 7 March, p3)

[NB97.10-12] Canada's Atomic Energy Control Board (AECB) is set to change its name to the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC) following various amendments to the Nuclear Safety and Control Act, Bill-C23, debated in parliament in February. The new bill is expected to be passed by Senate and receive royal assent this month, but is not expected to be fully proclaimed before the end of the year, as detailed regulations will need to be finalised. (UNECAN News, 28 February, p1) Meanwhile, AECB has approved the start of mining at the Sue C1 open pit at Cogema's McClean Lake. Mining of the Jeb open pit, ultimately to be converted into a management facility for

mill tailings from the McClean Lake mill expected to start up in July, is now nearly complete. (UNECAN News, 28 February, p6)

[NB97.10-13] France's supreme court has annulled the operating licence for the Superphenix fast reactor on the grounds that a licensing decree issued in 1994 assigned the reactor with a 'new' purpose - research and demonstration - not covered in the 1992 restart application and dossier submitted for public inquiry by operator NERSA. The 1240 MWe reactor is currently off line. The French government has re-emphasised its commitment to keep the reactor operating, and is considering either holding a new licensing process to support the 1994 decree, or issuing a new decree more in line with the 1992 documents, which emphasise the reactor's use for electricity generation. (Nucleonics Week, 6 March, p1; see also News Briefing 97.01-15)

[NB97.10-14] The government of the Czech Republic has given the go-ahead for the extension of existing interim storage facilities at the Dukovany nuclear power station and for new storage facilities to be built at the Temelin plant. (CSTK Ecoservice Czech, 7 March) In Hungary, an operating licence has been granted for the newly completed dry storage facility for spent fuel at the Paks plant. However, spent fuel from Paks will still be sent to Russia under existing agreements, and it is reported that the facility will not be used until a new Russian-Hungarian intergovernmental agreement on spent fuel is reached. (NucNet News, 120/97, 6 March; MTI Econews, 6 March)

[NB97.10-15] Australia: Industrial action by 127 workers employed by contractors at the Ranger uranium mine over enterprise bargaining and health and safety issues ended after the workers agreed to new wages and occupational health and safety offers. (Mining Journal, 7 March, p187; Australian Associated Press, 10 March)

[NB97.10-16] No cases of weapons grade fissile material being diverted from inventories and smuggled have been confirmed since August 1994, according to the latest version of the IAEA's database on smuggling. At the end of 1996, most of the 130 confirmed events in the database were deemed 'inocuous' by the IAEA. (Nucleonics Week, 6 March, p13) Meanwhile, a Moscow news agency has reported that the weapons grade plutonium seized at Munich Airport in 1994 has been 'proved' not to be of Russian origin. (BBC Monitoring Summary of World Broadcasts, 7 March; see also News Briefing 96.07-20)

[NB97.10-17] UK: The discovery of 'slight' radioactive contamination in tanks used to supply carbon dioxide to

the Hunterston B AGR power station in Scotland prompted checks on bottled mineral water, beer and carbonated drinks. The discovery of the contamination, caused by a faulty valve, led to fears that road tankers used to supply the power station and also to supply the food industry may have become contaminated. No contamination of the foodstuffs was detected. (PA News, 5 March; Independent, 6 March, p2)

Prepared by the Uranium Institute Information Service.
All news and views are those of the publications cited.

The Uranium Institute
12th Floor, Bowater House West
114 Knightsbridge
London SW1X 7LJ
UK

Tel: (44) 171 225 0303 Fax: (44) 171 225 0308
e-mail: ui@uilondon.org
World Wide Web: <http://www.uilondon.org>

From brucehall@igc.orgWed Mar 12 03:35:59 1997
Date: Tue, 11 Mar 1997 18:27:46 -0800 (PST)
From: Bruce Hall <brucehall@igc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: World Court decision commentary

To : Abolitionists Everywhere
From: Bruce Hall at Greenpeace
Date: March 11, 1997
Re : World Court Analysis in American law Journal

Dear folks -

The January 1997 "American Journal of International Law" features an article by Princeton University Professor Richard Falk entitled: "Nuclear Weapons, International Law, and the World Court:

A Historic Encounter." To be honest, I have not read it, but I have seen

Mr. Falk speak on nuclear weapons issues several times and have found him to be provocative and lively on the subject.

We would be happy to send you a copy. Drop us a line at "brucehall@igc.apc.org" with your name and mailing address.

Have a great day!\

Bruce

From cnic-jp@po.iijnet.or.jpWed Mar 12 03:35:59 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Mar 1997 17:21:10 +0900
From: Citizens' Nuclear Information Center
<cnic-jp@po.iijnet.or.jp>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Accident at Tokai Reprocessing Plant in Japan

[The following text is in the "ISO-2022-JP" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
11 March 1997

Citizens' Nuclear Information Center
1-59-14-302 Higashi-nakano, Nakano-ku, Tokyo 164
Tel: 03-5330-9520, Fax: 03-5330-9530, E-mail:
cnic-jp@po.iijnet.or.jp
Contact: Harry Sigerson

Tokai Reprocessing Plant Suffers Fire then Explosion

Yesterday, at 10:08 in the morning, a fire broke out at the Tokai reprocessing plant in Ibaraki Prefecture. While the Power Reactor and Nuclear Fuel Development Corporation (PNC), that operates the plant, at

first stated that there was no radiation leak, it later admitted that the accident had involved a radiation leak and that thirty workers at the plant had been exposed. About ten hours later, that night, there was an explosion at the same location.

The fire started in a building where low-level waste was being bituminized, a process where by low-level liquid waste that results from the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel is concentrated and combined with bitumen to contain it for storage. The fire broke out in one of the drums that the bituminized waste is stored in, on a turntable used for handling them, the fire was contained by the sprinkler system in fourteen minutes. Initially PNC stated that there had been no radiation released but later changed this saying that radiation monitors had detected an increase in the radiation level near two exhaust pipes at the facility, after the fire.

Of the fifty six workers who were in the building at the time of the fire, thirty have been found to have been exposed to radiation, though this figure could increase. PNC said that they had only absorbed "an extremely small amount" of radiation but gave no exact figures for their exposure. Previously, it had said that no workers were exposed.

At 8:41 that evening there was an explosion in the same building. Nine windows and one external door were blown out and white smoke was seen pouring out of the building. Some 2.1×10^6 Becquerels of radiation, in the form of radioactive iodine-129, were released as a result of the explosion. Iodine-129 has a half-life of 16 million years.

CNIC questions why it took PNC three hours to report a release of radiation to the local government authorities when it reported the fire and its consequences immediately. PNC claimed that the workers were exposed to only very low levels of radiation, but PNC has not release exact information on those received doses, it should do so immediately. CNIC also questions how the explosion could have occurred. Did not PNC foresee that

possibility and take preventative measures?

As in the case of the Monju accident, the response to this accident seems to have been very slow, did not PNC have an emergency procedures manual giving clear guidelines on how to proceed in the event of an accident? If so, was it followed or, as in the case of the Monju accident, was it inadequate? If it was inadequate why was it not revised and improved in light of the Monju accident? The slow response to this accident raises the possibility that PNC, as well as the STA, may have learned nothing from events during and after the Monju accident.

Citizens' Nuclear Information Center
1-59-14-302, Higashi-nakano
Nakano-ku, Tokyo 164, JAPAN
phone:81-3-5330-9520, fax:81-3-5330-9530
e-mail:cnic-jp@po.iiijnet.or.jp / cnic@kiwi.co.jp

From nfznsc@gn.apc.org Thu Mar 13 04:02:53 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Mar 1997 16:47:38 GMT
From: Stewart Kemp <nfznsc@gn.apc.org>
To: nfla.news@conf.gn.apc.org
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: UK Nuclear News 11-12 March 1997

>From: GMR@MCR1.poptel.org.uk
>Date: Wed, 12 Mar 1997 12:39:01 GMT
>Subject: NPU Bulletin 11-12 Mar
>To: nfznsc@gn.apc.org
>
>DAILY INFORMATION BULLETIN - NUCLEAR POLICY
>
>Weds 12 Mar 1997
>
>97-8285 Scottish EPA rules that n/waste stored at Dounreay must be
> returned to country of origin after 10 years instead of current
> 25. T
>97-8286 Explosion and fires at n/waste plant in Japan release slight
> radioactivity. Ind,FT,T,DT
>97-8287 Sweden calls on the five declared n/powers to take their
> n/forces off alert immediately to reduce risk of accidental
> missile launch. FT
>97-8288 New study links Vichy gvt in France to Holocaust: poison gas
> used in concentration camps alleged to have been made in
> France. G
>97-8289 Article by Russian general Igor Rodionov, warning Nato of
> dangers of Nato expansion. T
>97-8290 Doubts remain about how to manage the enlargement of Nato
> (Lionel Barber and Anthony Robinson.) FT
>
>Tues 11 Mar 1997
>
>97-8281 Irish gvt lodges formal objections to plan for underground
> laboratory at Sellafield. FT
>97-8282 Rifkind urges US to back plan for Nato expansion. T
>
>
>GM Research, Metropolitan House, Hobson Street, Oldham, OL1 1QD.
>Tel: 0161-911 4179. Fax: 0161-627 1736.
>Internet: gmr@mcr1.poptel.org.uk
>
>

Stewart Kemp (nfznsc@gn.apc.org)
From abolition@motherearth.knooppunt.be Thu Mar 13 04:02:53 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Mar 97 19:16:29 +0100
From: Motherearth Office Bel <abolition@motherearth.knooppunt.be>
Reply to: krista@motherearth.knooppunt.be
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Stop Westinghouse constructing Temelin npp

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

For immediate release
Photos available on request.

ANTI-NUCLEAR DIRECT ACTION CAMP
At Temelin Nuclear power plant, Czech Republic
July 6th - July 14th 1997

AN INVITATION FOR ALL ANTI NUCLEAR ACTIVISTS!

Since the catastrophe at Chernobyl in 1986, the western nuclear industry had many problems in continuing its work. Due to public opposition and financial problems no more new nuclear power plants(NPP) have been build in western Europe (with France as a glowing exception) nor have new NPP's been ordered in the United States. Thus the nuclear industry lost its market.

Not a surprise that they started to search for a new market and thought to have found this in eastern Europe.

Temelin NPP is a prime example of the western nuclear industry's expansion in the East; Situated 150 km from Prague, it is an unfinished VVER 1000/320, built and abandoned by the Soviets. Now CEZ (Czech electricity utility) and Westinghouse (an American multinational) are completing this unneeded NPP. The American government (through the Export-Import Bank, and thus tax-payers money) has just decided to grant Westinghouse a loan guarantee, despite high levels of public opposition. The mix of western and eastern technology is new and not tested on safety. Besides that the capacity to be created by the new NPP is unneeded. CEZ has run a campaign the last years to promote electrical heating. By severely subsidising the electricity prices and selling and installing the heaters nearly for free, they have created an electricity demand even higher than the proposed capacity for Temelin. In the mean time the government has, due to the costs-overrrrun of Temelin, no money left over to make the existing brown coal plants more ecological sound i.e. filtersystems). Thus the brown coal plants are heavily polluting big areas of the Czech Republic and even Germany, affecting peoples health, life expectation and even birth rates.

Hnutí DUHA (Friends of the Earth - Friends of the Earth Czech Republic) has been running a campaign to stop the the construction of Temelin for over 4 years now. Using the wide range of methods from lobbying and direct actions to creating energy efficiency brigades and promoting renewable energy, from actions on the cooling towers to the totale blockade of the plant...nearly all tactics have been used. Now they have come to the point that international support is crucial.

For the last three summers Hnutí DUHA has organised non-violent blockades of the construction site. Every year the actions grew bigger and better and the enormous media attention made the Temelin case to one of the hottest Czech themes.

Last year 500 activists blocked the whole site (11 entries!!!) for over 3 days.

XXXX

This year we want to RECLAIM the Temelin construction site!!

XXXX

There will be theatre groups, concerts, bonfires, climbing courses on the cooling towers, organic vegetarian food (Rampenplan!!), many varieties of non-violent direct actions and more..

But: We need YOUR help.

What can you do?

*Put july 6th-14th in your agenda and come over!

*Spread this article in your own network.

If you want to be more involved in organising these actions, please contact the PIANO

(Prague International Anti Nuclear Office) office.

If you send us your address, we will send you the Temelin Action Handbook with more thorough background information and practical stuff as well.

We still need a lot of help and welcome all volunteer!

We would also be very happy if you would organise similar protests at nuclear sites in Germany! If we organise our actions at the same time we can help out with international media coverage.

In a separat cadre:

XXXXX

A similar evil NPP construction is happening in Slovakia, where \$IEMENS is constructing the Mochovce NPP (in an earthquake zone!!!) and doing the same experimental mix of east and west technology. The Slovaks are not ready

to have international activists on their actions in the second week of july.

This is mainly because their media reacts very negative on foreigners

destined for demolition this Spring, they will be forced from their homes with only a fraction of the house's value and will have lost their only trade - farming (they have been "relocated to an urban setting which doesn't allow farm animals)

Reacting to these injustices, villagers attempted to publicly protest. Unfortunately, the oppressive Communist regime of the 80s didn't allow organized movements and, in effect banned their protests. They responded by continuing to demonstrate their disapproval individually. Their most common response was to send letters of protest which gained little sympathy or consideration from the government. The only reaction on the side of the establishment was an official explanation describing how the plant will play an important role in helping the future construction of socialism. Soon, the local opposition was completely silent. There was little resistance in the years that followed because villagers felt it was nearly impossible to influence the government's centralized decision making policies.

Fortunately, a big opportunity for campaigners opened up after the political changes in 1989. Supported by Austrians, the region experienced their first public and mass protests. Huge gatherings took place at the Temelin construction site. As a result, a tradition of opposition was created. The biggest protest; a festival at the main gate of the plant, occurred in 1991 which was attended by nearly ten thousand Czechs and Austrians! This newborn movement did not go without detectable changes - in 1990, the regional government voted not to prolong the construction license for the 3rd and 4th reactors. This decision meant that the plant would now be half its original size. But despite this victory, chances for initiating a complete shut down of the project were vanishing quickly.

Although the numbers involved in the movement were rising, their influence was decreasing due to time pressures. The opposition experienced its peak in 1990. During this time, testing the new democracy with public protests were new and popular. As a consequence, many people actively participated in the campaign against Temelin which, combined with temporary hesitation on the part of the state institutions, greatly influenced decision makers.

However, numbers began decreasing monthly as people lost interest in participating in large scale demonstrations. As a consequence, decision makers became more self-assured and less fearful of public pressure. CEZ, the Czech electricity utility, ignoring the desires of the people, continued the construction of the plant, pretending its completion was never in question. It was not long before this second wave of opposition, discouraged by politicians who still made decisions regardless of public opinion, began to withdraw and diminish. With no culture of opposition, most people preferred to go back to their private lives than continue resisting a government which didn't seem to be listening.

In the middle of 1992, the government made their final decision on Temelin's future. These decisions again challenged opponents of the plant and, in response, a third wave of opposition was created. This time, its

core was formed by a wide coalition of several dozens of environmental organizations. Their aim was simple: to convince the government to reject Temelin. They organised actions, petitions, public debates, open letters and other media events. The newly elected (1992) government, lead by recent Prime Minister Klaus, was not interested in public opinion at all. Most requests for debates were simply ignored, petitions were not even formally answered, and open letters were thrown to the dust bins. By autumn 1992, despite clear opposition and obvious alternative resources, all ministers had agreed that Temelin was necessary and the best solution.

Studies that had proven Temelin was not the least cost solution to the Czech Republic's energy needs as claimed by the nuclear establishment and ministers of government. Eventhough these results were published in papers

and shown on TV, the ministers were already decided. In a formal decision in March 1993, all 18 voted in favor of Temelin. The announcement of this decision had a killing affect on the anti-nuclear movement - almost all the

groups cooperating in the coalition gave up, thinking that further efforts

would be a waste of time and resources. Consequently, they began focusing on other winnable issues. After another battle lost, only few decided to continue the war against Temelin.

Those few, still bravely opposing the plant, realized that without Western

players (i.e., ExIm Bank and Westinghouse) in the project would be defeated. Therefore, a holistic strategy using internationals to pressure

the Western players and a strong local civic movement with direct actions at its best targeting the Ministers at home was taken up by the opposition. As for western participation, the U.S. multinational corporation, Westinghouse, eventually won the contract for Temelin and formed a partnership with CEZ to upgrade Soviet technologies. The desire for western technology was inter-linked with a need for western money to pay for the modernization. Westinghouse offered to secure finances through loan guarantees provided by U.S. Export-Import Bank. Thus, both needs - technical and financial - were met by the United States. One of the campaign highlights was the move to stop Ex-Im's financing of the construction of Temelin in 1994. Extensive lobbying at the U.S. Congress,

whose members had the power to reject Ex-Im's decision, took place. In February and March 1994, with the help of several U.S. organizations, representatives of both Austrian and Czech movements opposed to Temelin travelled to the U.S. After many exhausting weeks in Washington, and despite the support of fifty Congressional representatives, the Ex-Im headquarters confirmed their decision to provide money for Temelin.

Today, there is a stronger focus on supporting the civic/direct action movement. The direct action movement, which still grows today, represents historically the fourth wave of opposition to Temelin. Our first blockade of the Temelin site took place in May 1993, with about 50 participants blocking one of the gates for a few hours. All were arrested. Nevertheless, it brought wide media attention to the problem of Temelin.

Then, in the summer, a protest camp was organized for the month of July. Both actions - blockades and camps - became the corner stones of the movement. Now, every year, a blockade and protest camp is organized. As the number of participants at the blockades grow (1993 - 50, 1994 - 150, 1995 - 250, 1996 - 350), and the length of the blockades increases (in 1996, it lasted 72 hours) these actions become more and more effective, making the life of nuclear proponents difficult. Furthermore, the yearly protests attract a considerable amount of public attention to the problem.

The blockades have also been supported by many well-known personalities : several singers, writers, and politicians (including Petr Pithart, former Prime Minister and recent Chair of Senate, and Petra Buzkova, the vice-chair of the House of representatives). We believe that the resistance will continue to grow. In fact, we are expecting at least 500 people at the blockade this July 1997. Everyone who wants to help and is willing to respect the non-violence guidelines, is welcome.

XXXXXX

This here is just some facts,
I hope I don't burn your email system with all this info...

Temelin Nuclear Power Plant ----- Temelin
nuclear power plant is based on old Soviet-design reactors (VVER-1000); its construction started in 1984. After the political changes, it was decided that the project would be upgraded to a certain extent by Westinghouse Corp. According to the original Communist plan, agreed upon by the Czech government, the plant's first reactor was to be finished by the end of 1990 and the budget was 35 billion CZK (\$1.2 billion). The new, democratic government decided in 1993 to go on with the construction of two reactors, stating the new deadline for the first reactor was the end of 1995 and budget as 68.8 billion Czech Crowns (\$2.5 billion).

Numerous independent studies have proven that the construction of a new 2,000 MW power plant was unnecessary. Among the authors of these studies, one can find such respected institutions as the World Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and Tractebel. There are also other independent studies, like that of Power International, that stress the fact that the Temelin project is not least-cost, because many linked costs have been ignored. As a conclusion, these studies suggest that other solutions to the electricity market in Czech Republic be implemented, which include potentials energy savings (1,200 to 5,000 MW), combined heat and electricity generation (1,500 to 6,000 MW), energy from independent producers (3,300-3,900 MW), and renewables (wind 300-600 MW, small scale water 400-800 MW, biomass 500-1,000 MW). Importantly, the Tractebel "least cost study was used to justify the Temelin project, but even this study showed that energy efficiency was more cost effective than Temelin, but the authors were not permitted to

use demand side solutions in their recommendations.

The Temelin project, even with Westinghouse's safety upgrades, could never be licensed according to the current safety standards valid in Western countries. There are many technical weak points than can never be upgraded at a reasonable cost, like insufficient containment, a small reactor vessel leading to early embrittlement and other serious defects. In 1992, an independent audit by Halliburton NUS discovered many problems on the site: poor organization; a weak quality control programme; improper and lacking documentation. Although these mistakes were supposed to be corrected promptly, as late as 1994 the SUJB (the Czech version of the NRC - Nuclear Regulatory Committee) lists the same problems.

There is a serious problem of failed democratic process at Temelin. The project is being built despite a request by the majority (58 of 65) villages in the region demanded that it be stopped. Petitions signed by over 60,000 people have never been commented on by the Czech government. The construction license is based on an old Soviet design, now modified to a large extent. There has never been a new licensing process for these modifications; the legality of the whole project is thus brought into question. And there has never been a public discussion about the environmental impact of the plant (EIA), that should be, according to current Czech laws, initiated as a result of the serious project modifications.

And last but not least, the public has been allowed basically no access to documentation linked with the project, from safety analyses to even studies of its environmental impact.

From disarmament@igc.org Thu Mar 13 04:02:53 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Mar 1997 12:58:52 -0800 (PST)
From: disarmament@igc.org
To: ctb-followers@igc.org
Subject: START Talking at SUMMIT

THE NEW HORIZON FOR ARMS CUTS
New York Times Editorial
March 11, 1997

President Clinton's meeting with President Boris Yeltsin of Russia in Helsinki later this month is a crucial opportunity to revive the lost momentum of nuclear weapons reduction. A welcome new bargaining decision recently announced by the Administration should make it easier to do so.

Washington, essentially, has agreed to look ahead to the terms of the next arms reduction treaty to insure that the last one is belatedly approved by Russia and put into force. The proposal, if accepted by Moscow, can lead to significant cuts in the nuclear

arsenals of both countries.

The last treaty reducing the number of nuclear weapons was signed during the Bush Administration but remains unratified by the Russian parliament. It would reduce the level of long-range nuclear warheads to between 3,000 and 3,500 for each side, one-third the level of a decade ago. The accord would also outlaw land-based multiple warhead missiles, which are particularly dangerous because they are considered the most tempting targets in a nuclear crisis.

Since Russia has more of these megaweapons than the United States, the destruction of them would leave Moscow well below the overall warhead ceiling. To maintain nuclear equality with the United States, Russia might feel compelled to initiate an expensive program of building single warhead missiles.

By proposing to begin negotiations at once on a new arms reduction treaty, with ceilings of 2,000 to 2,500 long-range warheads for each side, the Administration offers a good way around this problem. Levels that low would mean no new Russian missiles would have to be built. Washington should go even further by offering to sign a new agreement if doing so would assure Russian ratification of the last one. The Bush Administration set an appropriate precedent by signing the last treaty before the previous one was ratified.

The missile-building issue is not the only problem holding up Russian ratification. The collapse of Moscow's conventional forces has made many Russian legislators more reluctant to reduce nuclear weapons. Western plans to expand NATO closer to Russia's borders and America's programs to develop ballistic missile defense systems also increase Moscow's feelings of insecurity. But in reality Russia's security will be strengthened by continued nuclear missile reductions and its economy will be spared a taxing drain.

American and European security will benefit as well. The future dangers that inspire Washington's plans for ballistic missile defense and NATO expansion are hypothetical. No rogue regime is near developing reliable long-range missiles. Russia's weakened and demoralized land armies will not threaten central and eastern Europe anytime soon. But the thousands of nuclear warheads still sitting atop Russia's long-range missiles could once again become a danger to the American people if a less responsible Russian government comes to power.

The faster Washington and Moscow can move ahead with actual reductions in nuclear arms, the safer both countries will be. Working with the new American proposal, Mr. Clinton and Mr. Yeltsin have a chance to make real progress in Helsinki.

RTw 03/10 1935 Summit outcome said in doubt

By Carol Giacomo

WASHINGTON, March 10 (Reuter) - The United States has told Russia of its willingness to negotiate further reductions in strategic nuclear weapons but it was unclear if a framework for such talks would be ready for the Helsinki summit, U.S. officials said on Monday.

Despite recent visits to Moscow by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and deputy secretary Strobe Talbott "it's very difficult to predict what will be accomplished by way of concrete measures at Helsinki," State Department spokesman Nicholas Burns said.

President Bill Clinton aims to make progress on arms control as well as the thorny NATO expansion dispute when he meets Russian President Boris Yeltsin in the Finnish capital

on March 19-20 "but it's a little bit early to tell how much," Burns said.

As a result, the visit to Washington this weekend of Russian Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov is taking on more urgency and importance. Primakov is to hold a working lunch with Albright on Saturday and then meet Clinton at the White House on Monday.

"We'd like to make some progress there to ensure the success of the Helsinki meeting," Burns said of the Primakov visit.

As one piece of the summit package, the Americans would like the two leaders to agree on a framework or a declaration of principles asserting their intention to negotiate a new round of nuclear reductions to 2,000-2,500 warheads.

This would be down from the 3,500 level set by the START II, Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, signed by then President George Bush and Yeltsin in 1993.

The START III initiative is intended to improve U.S. and Russian security at a time when Russia is feeling vulnerable due to NATO expansion plans.

Experts said it would also remove the need for Moscow to add to its nuclear arsenal, something many Russian officials feel is needed to keep Russian force levels on a par with the U.S. arsenal under START II.

The Russian parliament has refused to ratify START II and Yeltsin, improving now after being ill for eight months, has not been in a position to fight on its behalf. Communist and nationalists in the Duma have argued that the START II treaty took advantage of Russia at a time of weakness.

They are further concerned about efforts by the U.S. Congress to push through approval of a national missile defence system and by administration plans to deploy highly-capable theatre missile defences.

A summit framework that commits Moscow and Washington to a goal of 2,000 nuclear warheads each "is possible" but more work needs to be done, one senior administration official told Reuters.

REUTER

From: Disarmament Clearinghouse

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

From disarmament@igc.org Thu Mar 13 04:02:53 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Mar 1997 13:09:26 -0800 (PST)
From: disarmament@igc.org
To: ctb-followers@igc.org
Subject: Pena, NIF

RTw 03/12 1358 Senate confirms Pena as energy secretary

WASHINGTON, March 12 (Reuter) - The Senate Wednesday confirmed Federico Pena as energy secretary, one of the last of President Bill Clinton's cabinet officers to be approved.

Pena's nomination had been stalled by Republican senators who complained that the White House was shirking its responsibility to take control of radioactive waste from nuclear power plants.

Pena, who served as transportation secretary in Clinton's first term, will take over the Energy Department, which oversees nuclear weapons programmes as well as energy programmes.

Senate Energy Committee Chairman Frank Murkowski delayed his committee's approval vote on Pena for several weeks as he tried to get concessions from the White House on his bill to set up a temporary dump in Nevada for radioactive waste from nuclear power reactors.

President Clinton has threatened to veto that bill, opting instead to pursue a permanent repository that will not be completed before 2010.

REUTER

RTw 03/11 1747 U.S. to start building lab for nuke weapons tests

WASHINGTON, March 11 (Reuter) - The Energy Department said on Tuesday it had approved construction of a \$1.2 billion stadium-sized laser centre to test nuclear weapons without exploding them.

The Clinton administration says the National Ignition Facility, which will be used to simulate reactions in nuclear warheads, is needed to maintain the ageing U.S. nuclear stockpile while abiding by a global ban on nuclear testing.

But disarmament advocates say the facility could help spawn a new generation of nuclear weapons far more powerful than today's, subverting the aim of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

The facility will have "50 times the energy of any laser now in existence and will produce, for the first time in a laboratory setting, conditions of matter close to those that occur in the centre of the sun," the Energy Department said.

"Just the appearance of the facility and common sense tells you that it's going to be useful for developing new weapons systems, even though you might not be able to deploy them without testing," said Edwin Lyman, scientific director of the Nuclear Control Institute.

He said the fact that Washington was pouring money into the facility would send the wrong signal to countries that it was trying to discourage from building nuclear weapons.

"They would just assume that the United States is doing this to circumvent the CTBT. The perception itself is destabilising," he said.

REUTER

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005
Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 Fax: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>
From disarmament@igc.org Thu Mar 13 04:02:53 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Mar 1997 13:20:16 -0800 (PST)
From: disarmament@igc.org
To: ctb-followers@igc.org
Subject: The World Wants Disarmament

RTw 03/12 0516 Indonesian parliament ratifies nuclear treaty

JAKARTA, March 12 (Reuter) - Indonesia's parliament ratified on Wednesday a treaty banning nuclear weapons from Southeast Asia, making it the seventh country in the region to do so.

The Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapons Free Zone was ratified during a plenary session attended by Foreign Minister Ali Alatas.

"Nuclear weapons are cruel mass annihilators," Alatas said during the session.

Southeast Asia officially became a nuclear weapons-free zone in 1995 when leaders of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) signed the treaty banning the possession, manufacture and purchase of nuclear arms.

The treaty, which was subject to ratification by the parliaments of regional nations, bans the testing or use of nuclear weapons and the dumping of nuclear waste in waters around ASEAN countries. It also sets out guidelines for monitoring nuclear power safety.

ASEAN groups Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam. Cambodia, Laos and Burma are expected to join, possibly as early as this year.

Indonesia follows Brunei, Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia, Burma and Vietnam in ratifying the treaty.

REUTER

RTna 03/11 0547 Swedish minister urges action by nuclear powers

GENEVA, March 11 (Reuter) - Sweden urged the five declared nuclear powers on Tuesday to take their nuclear forces off alert to lower the risk of an accidental weapons launch.

In a speech to the Conference on Disarmament, Foreign Minister Lena Hjelm-Wallen also called on Russia and the United States to ratify the 1993 Chemical Weapons Convention before the treaty ban enters into force at the end of April.

She urged the United Nations-backed body to launch

negotiations to halt production of nuclear bomb-making fissile material and to work toward a total ban on landmines.

Western countries hope the 61-member body will agree to launch negotiations on both fissile "cut-off" and landmines, blamed for killing 25,000 people a year, mainly civilians.

Non-aligned countries led by India and Pakistan are holding up consensus, demanding the five declared nuclear weapon states (Britain, China, France, Russia and the United States) pledge to set a firm timetable for total nuclear disarmament.

Hjelm-Wallen, addressing a plenary session, urged the conference to explore proposals by the "Canberra Commission" which set forth concrete steps for a world free of nuclear weapons.

"One step proposed by the Canberra Commission is to take nuclear forces off alert," she said.

"This step could and should be taken immediately by the nuclear-weapon states. Such a measure would greatly reduce the risk of an accidental or unauthorised nuclear weapons launch."

On the chemical weapons pact, negotiated by the Geneva forum to ban an entire category of weapons of mass destruction, Hjelm-Wallen said:

"It is a deplorable fact that the United States and Russia -- the two declared possessors of chemical weapons -- have not yet ratified the Convention.

"The absence of their ratifications would limit this important international treaty to a non-proliferation regime."

"The Swedish government strongly urges the United States and Russia to shoulder their responsibility and ratify the Convention before its entry into force," she said.

Secretary of State Madeleine Albright has pushed the U.S. Senate to approve the global treaty banning chemical weapons saying failure would put Washington "on the side of the thugs."

REUTER

From gdaniell@wt.com.au Thu Mar 13 04:02:53 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 07:06:56 +0800 (WST)
From: Graham Daniell <gdaniell@wt.com.au>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Cities Resolution

Is there a list somewhere of the Cities which have so far adopted the Cities Resolution?

Hoping someone can help.
Towards a nuclear-free millennium,
Graham Daniell
Perth, Western Australia
gdaniell@wt.com.au

From aslater@igc.apc.org Thu Mar 13 04:02:53 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Mar 1997 19:02:01 -0800 (PST)
From: ALICE SLATER <aslater@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Minutes of NPT PrepComm Working Group

>From disarmtimes Mon Mar 10 13:31:21 1997
Return-Path: <disarmtimes@pop.igc.apc.org>
X-Old-Sender: <disarmtimes@pop.igc.apc.org>
From: "Disarmament Times" <disarmtimes@igc.apc.org>
Organization: NGO Committee on Disarmament, Inc.
To: aslater@igc.apc.org, warpeace@interport.net, kcantw9473@aol.com,
falvo@nymc.edu, myriamm@aol.com, sfraser@igc.apc.org,
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@igc.apc.org,
worldfed@igc.apc.org, crramey@igc.apc.org, wedo@igc.apc.org,
psrnyc@igc.apc.org, paz4juf@aol.com, esrmetro@igc.apc.org,
ptasso@pipeline.com, flick@igc.apc.org, tovish@aol.com,
lcnp@aol.com,
srfnyusa@igc.apc.org, johanne@c+converge.com
Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 17:15:18 +0000

----- Enclosure number 1 -----

MINUTES OF THE ABOLITION 2000 STEERING
COMMITTEE FOR THE NPT PREPCOM - March 6, 1997:

Attending: Alice Slater, Babette Linfield, John Klotz, Mary Ellen
Singsen, Cheshire Frager, Stephanie Fraser, Alyn Ware, Roger
Smith, Ann Marie Corominas (facilitating), Selma Brackman,
Sonya Ostrom, Cathy Falvo, Grace from GRACE, Ann Lakhdir,
Hannah Wasserman, Melba Smith.
Ambassador Hasmy of Malaysia regretted that he could not attend
the meeting.

AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:

HOUSING - Sonya Ostrom is keeping a ledger of people offering
and desiring housing; Alyn Ware and Stephanie Fraser will prepare
copy for a free ad in a local health publication; Alice Slater will
notify international visitors of the housing available for them, and
asks that we continue finding hosts.

TAHITIAN COMING TO NEW YORK: American Friends
Service Committee is arranging an American tour for Gabriel
Tetiaraahi of Hiti Tau, host organization for the recent Abolition
2000 meeting in Tahiti. Gaby will stay in several cities, with his
trip stewarded by American attendees of the conference. He will
be in NYC for the first week of the NPT PrepCom. AFSC is
asking New York abolitionists to raise \$1000 to help pay Gaby's
expenses. Forty groups or individuals contributing \$25 each would
suffice. Three contributions were made at the meeting; Alice
Slater agreed to be the recipient. Gaby will be recommended for
an Abolition 2000 health panel.

TRAINING DAY: Stephanie Fraser will arrange an orientation

session on Sunday, April 6, which she conceives as a four-hour "who's who, where's where and how's how" meeting for incoming activists. She will find a suitable location and make contact with the peace activists planning a "1000 days to the year 2000" vigil on that day. Alyn Ware suggested that the idea of a creative presentation on using "Tools for Disarmament" (ICJ opinion, Canberra, generals' statement etc.) would be an appropriate addition to the program for the training day.

MORNING CAUCUS: The caucus intends to hold a daily briefing from 8 to 9am during the PrepCom. It was agreed that this meeting should take place outside the U.N. The location still needs to be arranged.

PANELS: Cathy Falvo is working on a health panel; Alice Slater has also requested input from Raj Mutalik of the Boston office of IPPNW. Alyn Ware proposed that a location outside the U.N. be arranged for a health panel since it can attract a large audience; Alice Slater would rather it be held inside the U.N. There was a similar lack of consensus on the proposed panel concentrating on laboratory testing; Ann Marie Corominas agreed to pursue a U.N. location for this meeting without the assistance of the NGO Committee on Disarmament, which is arranging space for general NGO use. Ann Lakhdhir pointed out that NGOs will, for the first time, incur costs for the use of U.N. spaces; a ballpark figure was \$40/hr. for daytime use, \$65/hr for evening -- unless the meeting were held without microphones. Regarding the scheduled panel on energy, Mary Olson of Nuclear Information Resource Service agreed to participate only if her costs of \$150 could be covered; Alice will talk to her about this. Selma Brackman and Stephanie Fraser both asked to be placed on this panel. As for the scheduled panel on the Nuclear Weapons Convention, Jurgen Scheffran and Jonathan Schell are confirmed participants, and Ambassador Hasmy is a maybe. Roger Smith proposed that the details of program planning be handled by a subcommittee outside the Thursday morning meeting.

OUTREACH: Babette Linfield is energizing the Professionals Network for Social Responsibility to ask groups to participate in the PrepCom. Selma Brackman agrees to send a mailing to peace and environment groups, and asked Roger Smith to draft a one-page letter urging groups to come to the U.N. and attend the PrepCom. Alice Slater urges outreach efforts to emphasize our need for more hands to help with organizing tasks, and more bodies at the Thursday morning meetings. There was not much interest among the group in planning a large public event outside the U.N.; Alyn Ware said the "1000 days to 2000" rally on April 6 fits with our campaign, and proposes that we organize a "human 6" at this demonstration to underscore the importance of Article 6 of the NPT.

MEDIA: Alyn handed out a draft media advisory, and reported that a media subgroup plans to meet every evening during the PrepCom, prepare press releases and distribute it to U.N.

correspondents in their offices and mailboxes. A list of radio talkshows was requested; T.J. Walker is the best contact for obtaining such a list. Cheshire Frager has a possible line to the Charlie Rose program. On March 20, the Earth Society Foundation will present an award to Abolition 2000. Stephanie Fraser is interested in working on media.

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT: Alyn has just returned from Europe, and reports that the European Parliament will vote next Thursday on an "urgency resolution" which asks for strong substantive results at the PrepCom, including a commitment to start negotiations on a Nuclear Weapons Convention. Alyn asked us to contact Europeans so they could urge their EPPs to vote for this urgency resolution.

LOBBYING: Several delegation meetings have been held and more are scheduled. Indonesia may be prepared to propose at the PrepCom that subsidiary bodies of the NPT be established to hold substantive discussions on nuclear disarmament between PrepComs. Alyn's group, the Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy, will do a delegation mailing next week, sending a statement similar to the media advisory as well as the Abolition 2000 statement. LCNP will follow-up with phone calls, and will be asking for volunteers to help on telephoning. Alice Slater is preparing a mailing involving the International Civilian Leaders statement, the sequel to the generals' statement drafted by Alan Cranston. Also, an effort is underway to lobby the New York City government to adopt the Abolition 2000 cities' resolution.

NON-VIOLENT DIRECT ACTION: Pol D'Huyvetter of For Mother Earth in Belgium would like to hold a meeting on how direct action can produce pressure for a change in nuclear policies. Alyn reminded the group that the ICJ advisory opinion and the Nuremburg Principles form a basis for direct action against illegal policies, as done for years by Ploughshares activists and now being done by grassroots activists in Europe. Roger Smith agreed to contact Pol and the War Resisters League in NYC to see if they are willing to work together on this.

Next week's meeting will be facilitated by Cathy Falvo; Alyn will contact Ambassador Hasmy to see if he can brief us.

Minutes peacefully submitted by Roger Smith, Network Coordinator, NGO Committee on Disarmament.

Alice Slater
GRACE
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment
15 East 26 St., Room 915
New York, NY 10010
212-726-9161 (tel)
212-726-9160 (fax)
aslater@igc.apc.org <email>

From: prop1@prop1.org Thu Mar 13 04:02:53 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Mar 1997 22:06:01 -0500 (EST)
From: peace through reason <prop1@prop1.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Draft letter to Congress--and some thoughts--re HR-827

Dear Abolitionists --

Some thoughts:

Today, the Washington Times reports, the national debt is about \$5 trillion.

The Pentagon isn't saying exactly how much its nuclear arsenal cost, but some Pentagon officials last year "conservatively" estimated that the government has spent \$5 trillion on nuclear weapons since 1945.

Considering

the profit involved with figures of that magnitude, it's easy to understand

why converting destructive nuclear weapons industries and restoring the environment are going to "take time."

But time is passing and perceptions are changing. Retired generals and admirals are publicly proclaiming nuclear weapons "irrational," unsafe, and

unnecessary; many influential individuals and groups have recently begun calling for the elimination of nuclear weapons; and proceedings in the World

Court in November 1995 highlighted

the legal and moral nature of the issue. As global pressure for nuclear abolition mounts, right wing U.S. legislators are calling for a balanced budget, while their left wing counterparts decry the nation's inability to

provide basic necessities for an ever-lengthening poverty line.

Meanwhile,

many of their constituents wonder what happened to the "Peace Dividend."

Taken together, these factors indicate the time for Delegate Eleanor Holmes

Norton's bill, HR-827, the Nuclear Disarmament and Economic Conversion Act,

has come. As the congresswoman said, "You can't even begin to talk about providing for human needs without first tripping over a very big thing

....

the military budget."

Till now, efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons have focused largely on the

establishment of treaties. Many people find the treaty process complicated

-- they experience difficulty in comprehending the complexities or necessities of, for example, ratifying START III in order to encourage one

party to the treaty to ratify START II. Additionally, treaties do not

provide much opportunity for grassroots political action.

The Nuclear Disarmament / Economic Conversion Act is easy to understand -
-
it simply outlaws nuclear weapons and requires that the tremendous economic resources presently being squandered on those weapons be used to provide for conversion, clean-up, and human needs. If "law" has any value, the Disarmament/Conversion Act is obviously practical.

It also provides a focal point for timely political action. Delegate Norton's bill itself was the result of a grassroots voter initiative campaign. The concept could easily be incorporated into resolutions by various municipal, county, state, political and non-political organizations, or be used as the basis for initiative campaigns. H.R. 827 itself provides a vehicle for less time-consuming efforts.

It was not difficult to convince a number of Congressional leaders that the bill is in the best interests of their constituents, when they understood that domestically it would earmark funds for conversion and cleanup, and internationally it requires ALL countries with nuclear weapons to join the U.S. in disarming. Immediately after Delegate Norton first introduced her "Nuclear Disarmament and Economic Conversion Act" in 1994, eight Representatives co-sponsored the bill. Each co-sponsor signed on as the result of a single letter or visit from a constituent.

Individuals can have a real effect by writing letters, making phone calls, telling friends and colleagues. Politicians say they NEED to hear from their constituents. They need to be educated about the benefits of their active support for Del. Norton's Conversion/Disarmament Act.

It only takes 15 minutes to write a letter, an e-mail, or a fax. The more support this idea receives from around the country and around the world, the less time it is likely to take for it to come into fruition. It is indeed time for the United States to proclaim to the world, "Sure, we'll get rid of our nuclear weapons if everyone else does." And then do it.

Ellen Thomas

Proposition One Committee -- POB 27217, Washington, DC 20038 - 202-462-0757 -
202-265-5389 (fax) - prop1@prop1.org (e-mail) - <http://prop1.org> (Web Domain)

--1997 -- Draft LETTER TO REPRESENTATIVES re HR-827 -- for
adaptation--

The Hon. _____
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington DC 20515

Dear Representative _____

I ask you please to actively co-sponsor Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes
Norton's
"Nuclear Disarmament and Economic Conversion Act," which was re-
introduced on
February 27, 1997 as HR-827. In pertinent part, the proposed Act
requires that:

"The United States Government ... shall disable and dismantle all its
nuclear weapons
and refrain from replacing them at any time with any weapons of mass
destruction ...
and shall redirect resources that are currently being used for nuclear
weapons
programs to use .. in converting all nuclear weapons industry employees
... and
programs ... to constructive, ecologically beneficial peacetime
activities
... addressing human needs such as housing, health care, education,
agriculture, and environmental restoration. This Act shall take effect
when
the President certifies to the Congress that all foreign countries
possessing nuclear weapons have established legal requirements
comparable...
and those requirements have taken effect."

This legislation is a timely vehicle by which Congress can signal its
intent
to abide by Article 6 of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. With the
recent revelations by
retired generals and admirals that nuclear weapons are unsafe,
unnecessary, and
"irrational" -- with the World Court decision that nuclear weapons could
and
should be
illegal -- with the growing global pressure for abolition of nuclear
weapons
-- with
constituents everywhere still looking for the "Peace Dividend," this
bill's
time has
come.

You will find that the bill is in the best interest of all constituents, since domestically it marks for conversion and cleanup those funds formerly needed to produce and deploy nuclear weapons. Since it goes into effect when ALL countries possessing nuclear weapons join the U.S. in nuclear disarmament and conversion of their war machines, it offers very little security risk and a great deal of good public relations.

Please advise me that you have added your name to the list of co-sponsors on this very important legislation.

Sincerely,

Name: _____

Address: _____

email / fax / phone:

_____ drafted by:
Proposition One Committee, P.O. Box 27217, DC 20038 - 202-462-0757

prop1@prop1.org - http://prop1.org
From prop1@prop1.org Thu Mar 13 04:02:53 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Mar 1997 23:50:15 -0500 (EST)
From: peace through reason <prop1@prop1.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: German activist requests information

Can anyone help my friend, Conny Henschel, who is an activist who lives in Munchen (Munich), Germany (she came with me to the World Court hearings in 1995, some of you may remember her), and who writes that she hopes "someday to get information about contracts about nuclear weapons and history of Eurobomb. I don't know where to find this here in Munich." I assume she means by "contracts about nuclear weapons" any agreements for placement of nuclear weapons on European soil. I don't have that information.

Conny's address is:

Conny Henschel
Nanga-Parbat Str. 44
80992 Munchen, BRD

or you can write to me, and I'll convey your message.

Thanks so much!

Ellen Thomas
prop1@prop1.org
From billing@igc.org Thu Mar 13 04:02:53 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 03:02:55 -0800 (PST)
From: IGC Billing Department <billing@igc.org>
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: February use, acct: mupj

Get a custom Internet Domain Name for your organization, at IGC's new lower price! A custom Domain Name allows email to be addressed to you at <member@your_organization.org>, instead of <member@igc.org>. For information visit the IGC Product Center on the World Wide Web at <http://www.igc.org/igc/services>.

***** I N V O I C E *****

Howard W. Hallman
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th St., NW
Washington, DC 20036

February 1997 activity for your PeaceNet account
IGC Account: mupj Invoice date: 02/28/97
Invoice number: 9702-04914

Date	Time	Description	Qty	Cost

02/05/97	1937	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	14MN	0.00
02/06/97	1903	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	6MN	0.00
02/06/97	1910	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	22MN	0.00
02/09/97	1733	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	3MN	0.00
02/10/97	1853	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	11MN	0.00
02/11/97	1809	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	13MN	0.00
02/11/97	1826	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	8MN	0.00
02/12/97	1626	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	21MN	0.00
02/12/97	1718	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	17MN	0.00
02/13/97	1202	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	2MN	0.00
02/13/97	1617	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	17MN	0.00
02/15/97	0745	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	21MN	0.00
02/15/97	0836	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	10MN	0.00
02/17/97	1656	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	6MN	0.00
02/18/97	1419	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	17MN	0.00
02/18/97	1445	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	6MN	0.00
02/19/97	0506	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	5MN	0.00
02/19/97	1650	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	12MN	0.00
02/20/97	1559	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	19MN	0.00
02/22/97	1013	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	12MN	0.00
02/22/97	1735	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	4MN	0.00
02/22/97	1815	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	2MN	0.00
02/23/97	1346	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	7MN	0.00

02/24/97	1633	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	4MN	0.00
02/25/97	1653	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	4MN	0.00
02/26/97	1447	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	4MN	0.00
02/27/97	0455	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	3MN	0.00
02/27/97	1552	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	2MN	0.00
02/28/97	0539	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	2MN	0.00
02/28/97		Storage fee		1KC	0.00
02/28/97		Mar 1997 monthly service fee			12.50

		Total Current Charges			12.50
01/31/97		Previous Balance			22.92
02/01/97		Security Deposit			50.00
02/12/97		Credit Adjustment			-35.42
		(Reversing Nov/Dec/Jan fees (technical problems)-ch)			

		Grand Total Due			50.00

Summary for this period:	Minutes	Hourly rate	Charge
Storage fee			0.00
Subscription fee			12.50
Direct-dial	274	0.00	0.00

Totals:	274		\$ 12.50

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

From abolition@motherearth.knooppunt.be Thu Mar 13 04:02:53 1997
 Date: Wed, 12 Mar 97 19:16:29 +0100
 From: Motherearth Office Bel <abolition@motherearth.knooppunt.be>
 Reply to: krista@motherearth.knooppunt.be
 To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
 Subject: Stop Westinghouse constructing Temelin npp

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]
 [Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
 [Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

For immediate release

Photos available on request.

ANTI-NUCLEAR DIRECT ACTION CAMP

At Temelin Nuclear power plant, Czech Republic
July 6th - July 14th 1997

AN INVITATION FOR ALL ANTI NUCLEAR ACTIVISTS!

Since the catastrophe at Chernobyl in 1986, the western nuclear industry had many problems in continuing its work. Due to public opposition and financial problems no more new nuclear power plants(NPP) have been build in western Europe (with France as a glowing exception) nor have new NPP's been ordered in the United States. Thus the nuclear industry lost its market.

Not a surprise that they started to search for a new market and thought to have found this in eastern Europe.

Temelin NPP is a prime example of the western nuclear industry's expansion in the East; Situated 150 km from Prague, it is an unfinished VVER 1000/320, built and abandoned by the Soviets. Now CEZ (Czech electricity utility) and Westinghouse (an American multinational) are completing this unneeded NPP. The American government (through the Export-Import Bank, and thus tax-payers money) has just decided to grant Westinghouse a loan guarantee, despite high levels of public opposition. The mix of western and eastern technology is new and not tested on safety. Besides that the capacity to be created by the new NPP is unneeded. CEZ has run a campaign the last years to promote electrical heating. By severely subsidising the electricity prices and selling and installing the heaters nearly for free, they have created an electricity demand even higher than the proposed capacity for Temelin. In the mean time the government has, due to the costs-overrrun of Temelin, no money left over to make the existing brown coal plants more ecological sound i.e. filtersystems). Thus the brown coal plants are heavily polluting big areas of the Czech Republic and even Germany, affecting peoples health, life expectation and even birth rates.

Hnuti DUHA (Friends of the Earth - Friends of the Earth Czech Republic) has been running a campaign to stop the the construction of Temelin for

over 4 years now. Using the wide range of methods from lobbying and direct actions to creating energy efficiency brigades and promoting renewable energy, from actions on the cooling towers to the totale blockade of the plant...nearly all tactics have been used. Now they have come to the point that international support is crucial.

For the last three summers Hnutí DUHA has organised non-violent blockades of the construction site. Every year the actions grew bigger and better and the enormous media attention made the Temelin case to one of the hottest Czech themes.

Last year 500 activists blocked the whole site (11 entries!!!) for over 3 days.

XXXX

This year we want to RECLAIM the Temelin construction site!!

XXXX

There will be theatre groups, concerts, bonfires, climbing courses on the cooling towers, organic vegetarian food (Rampenplan!!), many varieties of non-violent direct actions and more..

But: We need YOUR help.

What can you do?

*Put july 6th-14th in your agenda and come over!

*Spread this article in your own network.

If you want to be more involved in organising these actions, please contact the PIANO

(Prague International Anti Nuclear Office) office.

If you send us your address, we will send you the Temelin Action Handbook with more thorough background information and practical stuff as well.

We still need a lot of help and welcome all volunteer!

We would also be very happy if you would organise similar protests at nuclear sites in Germany! If we organise our actions at the same time we can help out with international media coverage.

In a separat cadre:

XXXXX

A similar evil NPP construction is happening in Slovakia, where \$SIEMENS is constructing the Mochovce NPP (in an earthquake zone!!!) and doing the same experimental mix of east and west technology. The Slovaks are not ready

to have international activists on their actions in the second week of july.

This is mainly because their media reacts very negative on foreigners protesting in Slovakia. But they can use your help!!

The German government has decided to give a Hermes loan guarantee and the Kreditanstalt fur Wiederaufbau is a big financier for this dangerous project.

This is German taxmoney!!!

Please boycott Siemens products, like Siemens Nixdorf computers,
Bosch tools, Osram lightbulbs, Siemens kitchen equipment etc..
Send letters of protest to Siemens International:
Dr. Karl Hermann Baumann
Hd. Guenther Wilhelm
Wittelbacherplatz 2 80333 Munchen Germany
For a sample letter contact Za Matku Zem (For Mother Earth Slovakia)
zamatkuzem@seps.sanet.sk, visit the website of Global 2000:
[http://www.t0.or.at/~global 2000](http://www.t0.or.at/~global2000) or contact siemens-boycott@t-online.de
XXXXX
See you in Temelin!!!

For a nuclear free world!!!!

Krista van Velzen

PIANO
Praha International Anti Nuclear Office
Chvalova 3 13000 Praha 3 Czech Republic
+42-2-90031895 piano@ecn.cz
visit our website!!! <http://www.ecn.cz/private/piano>

xx

Dear editors,
This here is just for your information, but if you are
interested this is good to read!:

A Brief History of Anti-Temelín Movement

Public opposition to Temelín has quite a long history. Since the beginning of 80s, when the construction of Temelin first began, there have been several waves of oppostion. The first protests were organized by locals who were the first people to be dramatically effected by the construction: the villages of Kötinov, Temelínec and Bøezí were wiped-out and villagers resettled. Some people left immediatelly, others were forced out later, a few remained. Out of the 60 original inhabitants, only 7 still live in the village. The Pizinger family, who still remains exemplifies this struggle today. They were bought out by CEZ 13 years ago, given low state prices for their property. And now that their house is destined for demolition this Spring, they will be forced from their homes with only a fraction of the house's value and will have lost their only trade - farming (they have been "relocated to an urban setting which does'nt allow farm animals)

Reacting to these injustices, villagers attempted to publicly protest. Unfortunately, the oppressive Communist regime of the 80s didn't allow organized movements and, in effect banned their protests. They responded by continuing to demonstrate their disapproval individually. Their most common response was to send letters of protest which gained little sympathy or consideration from the government. The only reaction on the side of the establishment was an official explanation describing how the plant will play an important role in helping the future construction of socialism. Soon, the local opposition was completely silent. There was little resistance in the years that followed because villagers felt it was nearly impossible to influence the government's centralized decision making policies.

Fortunately, a big opportunity for campaigners opened up after the political changes in 1989. Supported by Austrians, the region experienced their first public and mass protests. Huge gatherings took place at the Temelin construction site. As a result, a tradition of opposition was created. The biggest protest; a festival at the main gate of the plant, occurred in 1991 which was attended by nearly ten thousand Czechs and Austrians! This newborn movement did not go without detectable changes - in 1990, the regional government voted not to prolong the construction license for the 3rd and 4th reactors. This decision meant that the plant would now be half its original size. But despite this victory, chances for initiating a complete shut down of the project were vanishing quickly.

Although the numbers involved in the movement were rising, their influence was decreasing due to time pressures. The opposition experienced its peak in 1990. During this time, testing the new democracy with public protests were new and popular. As a consequence, many people actively participated in the campaign against Temelin which, combined with temporary hesitation on the part of the state institutions, greatly influenced decision makers.

However, numbers began decreasing monthly as people lost interest in participating in large scale demonstrations. As a consequence, decision makers became more self-assured and less fearful of public pressure. CEZ, the Czech electricity utility, ignoring the desires of the people, continued the construction of the plant, pretending its completion was never in question. It was not long before this second wave of opposition, discouraged by politicians who still made decisions regardless of public opinion, began to withdraw and diminish. With no culture of opposition, most people preferred to go back to their private lives than continue resisting a government which didn't seem to be listening.

In the middle of 1992, the government made their final decision on Temelin's future. These decisions again challenged opponents of the plant and, in response, a third wave of opposition was created. This time, its core was formed by a wide coalition of several dozens of environmental organizations. Their aim was simple: to convince the government to reject Temelin. They organized actions, petitions, public debates, open letters and other media events. The newly elected (1992) government, led by recent Prime Minister Klaus, was not interested in public opinion at all.

Most requests for debates were simply ignored, petitions were not even formally answered, and open letters were thrown to the dust bins. By autumn 1992, despite clear opposition and obvious alternative resources, all ministers had agreed that Temelin was necessary and the best solution.

Studies that had proven Temelin was not the least cost solution to the Czech Republic's energy needs as claimed by the nuclear establishment and ministers of government. Eventhough these results were published in papers

and shown on TV, the ministers were already decided. In a formal decision in March 1993, all 18 voted in favor of Temelin. The announcement of this decision had a killing affect on the anti-nuclear movement - almost all the

groups cooperating in the coalition gave up, thinking that further efforts

would be a waste of time and resources. Consequently, they began focusing on other winnable issues. After another battle lost, only few decided to continue the war against Temelin.

Those few, still bravely opposing the plant, realized that without Western

players (i.e., ExIm Bank and Westinghouse) in the project would be defeated. Therefore, a holistic strategy using internationals to pressure

the Western players and a strong local civic movement with direct actions at its best targeting the Ministers at home was taken up by the opposition. As for western participation, the U.S. multinational corporation, Westinghouse, eventually won the contract for Temelin and formed a partnership with CEZ to upgrade Soviet technologies. The desire for western technology was inter-linked with a need for western money to pay for the modernization. Westinghouse offered to secure finances through loan guarantees provided by U.S. Export-Import Bank. Thus, both needs - technical and financial - were met by the United States. One of the campaign highlights was the move to stop Ex-Im's financing of the construction of Temelin in 1994. Extensive lobbying at the U.S. Congress,

whose members had the power to reject Ex-Im's decision, took place. In February and March 1994, with the help of several U.S. organizations, representatives of both Austrian and Czech movements opposed to Temelin travelled to the U.S. After many exhausting weeks in Washington, and despite the support of fifty Congressional representatives, the Ex-Im headquarters confirmed their decision to provide money for Temelin.

Today, there is a stronger focus on supporting the civic/direct action movement. The direct action movement, which still grows today, represents historically the fourth wave of opposition to Temelin. Our first blockade of the Temelin site took place in May 1993, with about 50 participants blocking one of the gates for a few hours. All were arrested.

Nevertheless, it brought wide media attention to the problem of Temelin. Then, in the summer, a protest camp was organized for the month of July. Both actions - blockades and camps - became the corner stones of the movement. Now, every year, a blockade and protest camp is organized. As the number of participants at the blockades grow (1993 - 50, 1994 - 150, 1995 - 250, 1996 - 350), and the length of the blockades increases (in

1996, it lasted 72 hours) these actions become more and more effective, making the life of nuclear proponents difficult. Furthermore, the yearly protests attract a considerable amount of public attention to the problem.

The blockades have also been supported by many well-known personalities : several singers, writers, and politicians (including Petr Pithart, former Prime Minister and recent Chair of Senate, and Petra Buzkova, the vice-chair of the House of representatives). We believe that the resistance will continue to grow. In fact, we are expecting at least 500 people at the blockade this July 1997. Everyone who wants to help and is willing to respect the non-violence guidelines, is welcome.

XXXXXX

This here is just some facts,
I hope I don't burn your email system with all this info...

Temelin Nuclear Power Plant ----- Temelin
nuclear power plant is based on old Soviet-design reactors (VVER-1000); its construction started in 1984. After the political changes, it was decided that the project would be upgraded to a certain extent by Westinghouse Corp. According to the original Communist plan, agreed upon by the Czech government, the plant's first reactor was to be finished by the end of 1990 and the budget was 35 billion CZK (\$1.2 billion). The new, democratic government decided in 1993 to go on with the construction of two reactors, stating the new deadline for the first reactor was the end of 1995 and budget as 68.8 billion Czech Crowns (\$2.5 billion).

Numerous independent studies have proven that the construction of a new 2,000 MW power plant was unnecessary. Among the authors of these studies, one can find such respected institutions as the World Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and Tractebel. There are also other independent studies, like that of Power International, that stress the fact that the Temelin project is not least-cost, because many linked costs have been ignored. As a conclusion, these studies suggest that other solutions to the electricity market in Czech Republic be implemented, which include potentials energy savings (1,200 to 5,000 MW), combined heat and electricity generation (1,500 to 6,000 MW), energy from independent producers (3,300-3,900 MW), and renewables (wind 300-600 MW, small scale water 400-800 MW, biomass 500-1,000 MW). Importantly, the Tractebel "least cost study was used to justify the Temelin project, but even this study showed that energy efficiency was more cost effective than Temelin, but the authors were not permitted to use demand side solutions in their recommendations.

The Temelin project, even with Westinghouse's safety upgrades, could never be licensed according to the current safety standards valid in Western countries. There are many technical weak points than can

never be upgraded at a reasonable cost, like insufficient containment, a small reactor vessel leading to early embrittlement and other serious defects. In 1992, an independent audit by Halliburton NUS discovered many problems on the site: poor organization; a weak quality control programme; improper and lacking documentation. Although these mistakes were supposed to be corrected promptly, as late as 1994 the SUJB (the Czech version of the NRC - Nuclear Regulatory Committee) lists the same problems.

There is a serious problem of failed democratic process at Temelin. The project is being built despite a request by the majority (58 of 65) villages in the region demanded that it be stopped. Petitions signed by over 60,000 people have never been commented on by the Czech government. The construction license is based on an old Soviet design, now modified to a large extent. There has never been a new licensing process for these modifications; the legality of the whole project is thus brought into question. And there has never been a public discussion about the environmental impact of the plant (EIA), that should be, according to current Czech laws, initiated as a result of the serious project modifications.

And last but not least, the public has been allowed basically no access to documentation linked with the project, from safety analyses to even studies of its environmental impact.

From disarmament@igc.org Thu Mar 13 04:02:53 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Mar 1997 12:58:52 -0800 (PST)
From: disarmament@igc.org
To: ctb-followers@igc.org
Subject: START Talking at SUMMIT

THE NEW HORIZON FOR ARMS CUTS
New York Times Editorial
March 11, 1997

President Clinton's meeting with President Boris Yeltsin of Russia in Helsinki later this month is a crucial opportunity to revive the lost momentum of nuclear weapons reduction. A welcome new bargaining decision recently announced by the Administration should make it easier to do so.

Washington, essentially, has agreed to look ahead to the terms of the next arms reduction treaty to insure that the last one is belatedly approved by Russia and put into force. The proposal, if accepted by Moscow, can lead to significant cuts in the nuclear arsenals of both countries.

The last treaty reducing the number of nuclear weapons was signed during the Bush Administration but remains unratified by the Russian parliament. It would reduce the level of long-range

nuclear warheads to between 3,000 and 3,500 for each side, one-third the level of a decade ago. The accord would also outlaw land-based multiple warhead missiles, which are particularly dangerous because they are considered the most tempting targets in a nuclear crisis.

Since Russia has more of these megaweapons than the United States, the destruction of them would leave Moscow well below the overall warhead ceiling. To maintain nuclear equality with the United States, Russia might feel compelled to initiate an expensive program of building single warhead missiles.

By proposing to begin negotiations at once on a new arms reduction treaty, with ceilings of 2,000 to 2,500 long-range warheads for each side, the Administration offers a good way around this problem. Levels that low would mean no new Russian missiles would have to be built. Washington should go even further by offering to sign a new agreement if doing so would assure Russian ratification of the last one. The Bush Administration set an appropriate precedent by signing the last treaty before the previous one was ratified.

The missile-building issue is not the only problem holding up Russian ratification. The collapse of Moscow's conventional forces has made many Russian legislators more reluctant to reduce nuclear weapons. Western plans to expand NATO closer to Russia's borders and America's programs to develop ballistic missile defense systems also increase Moscow's feelings of insecurity. But in reality Russia's security will be strengthened by continued nuclear missile reductions and its economy will be spared a taxing drain.

American and European security will benefit as well. The future dangers that inspire Washington's plans for ballistic missile defense and NATO expansion are hypothetical. No rogue regime is near developing reliable long-range missiles. Russia's weakened and demoralized land armies will not threaten central and eastern Europe anytime soon. But the thousands of nuclear warheads still sitting atop Russia's long-range missiles could once again become a danger to the American people if a less responsible Russian government comes to power.

The faster Washington and Moscow can move ahead with actual reductions in nuclear arms, the safer both countries will be. Working with the new American proposal, Mr. Clinton and Mr. Yeltsin have a chance to make real progress in Helsinki.

RTw 03/10 1935 Summit outcome said in doubt
By Carol Giacomo

WASHINGTON, March 10 (Reuter) - The United States has told Russia of its willingness to negotiate further reductions in strategic nuclear weapons but it was unclear if a framework for

such talks would be ready for the Helsinki summit, U.S. officials said on Monday.

Despite recent visits to Moscow by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and deputy secretary Strobe Talbott "it's very difficult to predict what will be accomplished by way of concrete measures at Helsinki," State Department spokesman Nicholas Burns said.

President Bill Clinton aims to make progress on arms control as well as the thorny NATO expansion dispute when he meets Russian President Boris Yeltsin in the Finnish capital

on March 19-20 "but it's a little bit early to tell how much," Burns said.

As a result, the visit to Washington this weekend of Russian Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov is taking on more urgency and importance. Primakov is to hold a working lunch with Albright on Saturday and then meet Clinton at the White House on Monday.

"We'd like to make some progress there to ensure the success of the Helsinki meeting," Burns said of the Primakov visit.

As one piece of the summit package, the Americans would like the two leaders to agree on a framework or a declaration of principles asserting their intention to negotiate a new round of nuclear reductions to 2,000-2,500 warheads.

This would be down from the 3,500 level set by the START II, Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, signed by then President George Bush and Yeltsin in 1993.

The START III initiative is intended to improve U.S. and Russian security at a time when Russia is feeling vulnerable due to NATO expansion plans.

Experts said it would also remove the need for Moscow to add to its nuclear arsenal, something many Russian officials feel is needed to keep Russian force levels on a par with the U.S. arsenal under START II.

The Russian parliament has refused to ratify START II and Yeltsin, improving now after being ill for eight months, has not been in a position to fight on its behalf. Communist and nationalists in the Duma have argued that the START II treaty took advantage of Russia at a time of weakness.

They are further concerned about efforts by the U.S. Congress to push through approval of a national missile defence system and by administration plans to deploy highly-capable theatre missile defences.

A summit framework that commits Moscow and Washington to a goal of 2,000 nuclear warheads each "is possible" but more work needs to be done, one senior administration official told Reuters.

REUTER

From: Disarmament Clearinghouse
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005
Tel.: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 Fax.: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

From disarmament@igc.org Thu Mar 13 04:02:53 1997

Date: Wed, 12 Mar 1997 13:09:26 -0800 (PST)

From: disarmament@igc.org
To: ctb-followers@igc.org
Subject: Pena, NIF

RTw 03/12 1358 Senate confirms Pena as energy secretary

WASHINGTON, March 12 (Reuter) - The Senate Wednesday confirmed Federico Pena as energy secretary, one of the last of President Bill Clinton's cabinet officers to be approved.

Pena's nomination had been stalled by Republican senators who complained that the White House was shirking its responsibility to take control of radioactive waste from nuclear power plants.

Pena, who served as transportation secretary in Clinton's first term, will take over the Energy Department, which oversees nuclear weapons programmes as well as energy programmes.

Senate Energy Committee Chairman Frank Murkowski delayed his committee's approval vote on Pena for several weeks as he tried to get concessions from the White House on his bill to set up a temporary dump in Nevada for radioactive waste from nuclear power reactors.

President Clinton has threatened to veto that bill, opting instead to pursue a permanent repository that will not be completed before 2010.

REUTER

RTw 03/11 1747 U.S. to start building lab for nuke weapons tests

WASHINGTON, March 11 (Reuter) - The Energy Department said on Tuesday it had approved construction of a \$1.2 billion stadium-sized laser centre to test nuclear weapons without exploding them.

The Clinton administration says the National Ignition Facility, which will be used to simulate reactions in nuclear warheads, is needed to maintain the ageing U.S. nuclear stockpile while abiding by a global ban on nuclear testing.

But disarmament advocates say the facility could help spawn a new generation of nuclear weapons far more powerful than today's, subverting the aim of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

The facility will have "50 times the energy of any laser now in existence and will produce, for the first time in a laboratory setting, conditions of matter close to those that occur in the centre of the sun," the Energy Department said.

"Just the appearance of the facility and common sense tells you that it's going to be useful for developing new weapons systems, even though you might not be able to deploy them without testing," said Edwin Lyman, scientific director of the Nuclear Control Institute.

He said the fact that Washington was pouring money into the facility would send the wrong signal to countries that it was trying to discourage from building nuclear weapons.

"They would just assume that the United States is doing this to circumvent the CTBT. The perception itself is destabilising,"

he said.

REUTER

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005
Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 Fax: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>
From disarmament@igc.org Thu Mar 13 04:02:53 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Mar 1997 13:20:16 -0800 (PST)
From: disarmament@igc.org
To: ctb-followers@igc.org
Subject: The World Wants Disarmament

RTw 03/12 0516 Indonesian parliament ratifies nuclear treaty

JAKARTA, March 12 (Reuter) - Indonesia's parliament ratified on Wednesday a treaty banning nuclear weapons from Southeast Asia, making it the seventh country in the region to do so.

The Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapons Free Zone was ratified during a plenary session attended by Foreign Minister Ali Alatas.

"Nuclear weapons are cruel mass annihilators," Alatas said during the session.

Southeast Asia officially became a nuclear weapons-free zone in 1995 when leaders of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) signed the treaty banning the possession, manufacture and purchase of nuclear arms.

The treaty, which was subject to ratification by the parliaments of regional nations, bans the testing or use of nuclear weapons and the dumping of nuclear waste in waters around ASEAN countries. It also sets out guidelines for monitoring nuclear power safety.

ASEAN groups Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam. Cambodia, Laos and Burma are expected to join, possibly as early as this year.

Indonesia follows Brunei, Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia, Burma and Vietnam in ratifying the treaty.

REUTER

RTna 03/11 0547 Swedish minister urges action by nuclear powers

GENEVA, March 11 (Reuter) - Sweden urged the five declared nuclear powers on Tuesday to take their nuclear forces off alert to lower the risk of an accidental weapons launch.

In a speech to the Conference on Disarmament, Foreign Minister Lena Hjelm-Wallen also called on Russia and the United States to ratify the 1993 Chemical Weapons Convention before the treaty ban enters into force at the end of April.

She urged the United Nations-backed body to launch negotiations to halt production of nuclear bomb-making fissile material and to work toward a total ban on landmines.

Western countries hope the 61-member body will agree to launch negotiations on both fissile "cut-off" and landmines, blamed for killing 25,000 people a year, mainly civilians.

Non-aligned countries led by India and Pakistan are holding up consensus, demanding the five declared nuclear weapon states (Britain, China, France, Russia and the United States) pledge to set a firm timetable for total nuclear disarmament.

Hjelm-Wallen, addressing a plenary session, urged the conference to explore proposals by the "Canberra Commission" which set forth concrete steps for a world free of nuclear weapons.

"One step proposed by the Canberra Commission is to take nuclear forces off alert," she said.

"This step could and should be taken immediately by the nuclear-weapon states. Such a measure would greatly reduce the risk of an accidental or unauthorised nuclear weapons launch."

On the chemical weapons pact, negotiated by the Geneva forum to ban an entire category of weapons of mass destruction, Hjelm-Wallen said:

"It is a deplorable fact that the United States and Russia -- the two declared possessors of chemical weapons -- have not yet ratified the Convention.

"The absence of their ratifications would limit this important international treaty to a non-proliferation regime."

"The Swedish government strongly urges the United States and Russia to shoulder their responsibility and ratify the Convention before its entry into force," she said.

Secretary of State Madeleine Albright has pushed the U.S. Senate to approve the global treaty banning chemical weapons saying failure would put Washington "on the side of the thugs."

REUTER

From gdaniell@wt.com.au Thu Mar 13 04:02:53 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 07:06:56 +0800 (WST)
From: Graham Daniell <gdaniell@wt.com.au>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Cities Resolution

Is there a list somewhere of the Cities which have so far adopted the Cities Resolution?

Hoping someone can help.
Towards a nuclear-free millennium,
Graham Daniell
Perth, Western Australia
gdaniell@wt.com.au

From aslater@igc.apc.org Thu Mar 13 04:02:53 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Mar 1997 19:02:01 -0800 (PST)
From: ALICE SLATER <aslater@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Minutes of NPT PrepComm Working Group

>From disarmtimes Mon Mar 10 13:31:21 1997
Return-Path: <disarmtimes@pop.igc.apc.org>
X-Old-Sender: <disarmtimes@pop.igc.apc.org>
From: "Disarmament Times" <disarmtimes@igc.apc.org>

Organization: NGO Committee on Disarmament, Inc.
To: aslater@igc.apc.org, warpeace@interport.net, kcantw9473@aol.com,
falvo@nymc.edu, myriamm@aol.com, sfraser@igc.apc.org,
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@igc.apc.org,
worldfed@igc.apc.org, crramey@igc.apc.org, wedo@igc.apc.org,
psrnycc@igc.apc.org, paz4juf@aol.com, esrmetro@igc.apc.org,
ptasso@pipeline.com, flick@igc.apc.org, tovish@aol.com,
lcnp@aol.com,
srfnyusa@igc.apc.org, johanne@c+converge.com
Date: Mon, 10 Mar 1997 17:15:18 +0000

----- Enclosure number 1 -----

MINUTES OF THE ABOLITION 2000 STEERING
COMMITTEE FOR THE NPT PREPCOM - March 6, 1997:

Attending: Alice Slater, Babette Linfield, John Klotz, Mary Ellen
Singsen, Cheshire Frager, Stephanie Fraser, Alyn Ware, Roger
Smith, Ann Marie Corominas (facilitating), Selma Brackman,
Sonya Ostrom, Cathy Falvo, Grace from GRACE, Ann Lakhdhir,
Hannah Wasserman, Melba Smith.

Ambassador Hasmy of Malaysia regretted that he could not attend
the meeting.

AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:

HOUSING - Sonya Ostrom is keeping a ledger of people offering
and desiring housing; Alyn Ware and Stephanie Fraser will prepare
copy for a free ad in a local health publication; Alice Slater will
notify international visitors of the housing available for them, and
asks that we continue finding hosts.

TAHITIAN COMING TO NEW YORK: American Friends
Service Committee is arranging an American tour for Gabriel
Tetiaraahi of Hiti Tau, host organization for the recent Abolition
2000 meeting in Tahiti. Gaby will stay in several cities, with his
trip stewarded by American attendees of the conference. He will
be in NYC for the first week of the NPT PrepCom. AFSC is
asking New York abolitionists to raise \$1000 to help pay Gaby's
expenses. Forty groups or individuals contributing \$25 each would
suffice. Three contributions were made at the meeting; Alice
Slater agreed to be the recipient. Gaby will be recommended for
an Abolition 2000 health panel.

TRAINING DAY: Stephanie Fraser will arrange an orientation
session on Sunday, April 6, which she conceives as a four-hour
"who's who, where's where and how's how" meeting for incoming
activists. She will find a suitable location and make contact with
the peace activists planning a "1000 days to the year 2000" vigil on
that day. Alyn Ware suggested that the idea of a creative

presentation on using "Tools for Disarmament" (ICJ opinion, Canberra, generals' statement etc.) would be an appropriate addition to the program for the training day.

MORNING CAUCUS: The caucus intends to hold a daily briefing from 8 to 9am during the PrepCom. It was agreed that this meeting should take place outside the U.N. The location still needs to be arranged.

PANELS: Cathy Falvo is working on a health panel; Alice Slater has also requested input from Raj Mutalik of the Boston office of IPPNW. Alyn Ware proposed that a location outside the U.N. be arranged for a health panel since it can attract a large audience; Alice Slater would rather it be held inside the U.N. There was a similar lack of consensus on the proposed panel concentrating on laboratory testing; Ann Marie Corominas agreed to pursue a U.N. location for this meeting without the assistance of the NGO Committee on Disarmament, which is arranging space for general NGO use. Ann Lakhdhir pointed out that NGOs will, for the first time, incur costs for the use of U.N. spaces; a ballpark figure was \$40/hr. for daytime use, \$65/hr for evening -- unless the meeting were held without microphones. Regarding the scheduled panel on energy, Mary Olson of Nuclear Information Resource Service agreed to participate only if her costs of \$150 could be covered; Alice will talk to her about this. Selma Brackman and Stephanie Fraser both asked to be placed on this panel. As for the scheduled panel on the Nuclear Weapons Convention, Jurgen Scheffran and Jonathan Schell are confirmed participants, and Ambassador Hasmy is a maybe. Roger Smith proposed that the details of program planning be handled by a subcommittee outside the Thursday morning meeting.

OUTREACH: Babette Linfield is energizing the Professionals Network for Social Responsibility to ask groups to participate in the PrepCom. Selma Brackman agrees to send a mailing to peace and environment groups, and asked Roger Smith to draft a one-page letter urging groups to come to the U.N. and attend the PrepCom. Alice Slater urges outreach efforts to emphasize our need for more hands to help with organizing tasks, and more bodies at the Thursday morning meetings. There was not much interest among the group in planning a large public event outside the U.N.; Alyn Ware said the "1000 days to 2000" rally on April 6 fits with our campaign, and proposes that we organize a "human 6" at this demonstration to underscore the importance of Article 6 of the NPT.

MEDIA: Alyn handed out a draft media advisory, and reported that a media subgroup plans to meet every evening during the PrepCom, prepare press releases and distribute it to U.N. correspondents in their offices and mailboxes. A list of radio talkshows was requested; T.J. Walker is the best contact for obtaining such a list. Cheshire Frager has a possible line to the Charlie Rose program. On March 20, the Earth Society Foundation will present an award to Abolition 2000. Stephanie

Fraser is interested in working on media.

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT: Alyn has just returned from Europe, and reports that the European Parliament will vote next Thursday on an "urgency resolution" which asks for strong substantive results at the PrepCom, including a commitment to start negotiations on a Nuclear Weapons Convention. Alyn asked us to contact Europeans so they could urge their EPPs to vote for this urgency resolution.

LOBBYING: Several delegation meetings have been held and more are scheduled. Indonesia may be prepared to propose at the PrepCom that subsidiary bodies of the NPT be established to hold substantive discussions on nuclear disarmament between PrepComs. Alyn's group, the Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy, will do a delegation mailing next week, sending a statement similar to the media advisory as well as the Abolition 2000 statement. LCNP will follow-up with phone calls, and will be asking for volunteers to help on telephoning. Alice Slater is preparing a mailing involving the International Civilian Leaders statement, the sequel to the generals' statement drafted by Alan Cranston. Also, an effort is underway to lobby the New York City government to adopt the Abolition 2000 cities' resolution.

NON-VIOLENT DIRECT ACTION: Pol D'Huyvetter of For Mother Earth in Belgium would like to hold a meeting on how direct action can produce pressure for a change in nuclear policies. Alyn reminded the group that the ICJ advisory opinion and the Nuremburg Principles form a basis for direct action against illegal policies, as done for years by Ploughshares activists and now being done by grassroots activists in Europe. Roger Smith agreed to contact Pol and the War Resisters League in NYC to see if they are willing to work together on this.

Next week's meeting will be facilitated by Cathy Falvo; Alyn will contact Ambassador Hasmy to see if he can brief us.

Minutes peacefully submitted by Roger Smith, Network Coordinator, NGO Committee on Disarmament.

Alice Slater

GRACE

Global Resource Action Center for the Environment
15 East 26 St., Room 915

New York, NY 10010

212-726-9161 (tel)

212-726-9160 (fax)

aslater@igc.apc.org <email>

From: prop1@prop1.org Thu Mar 13 04:02:53 1997

Date: Wed, 12 Mar 1997 22:06:01 -0500 (EST)

From: peace through reason <prop1@prop1.org>

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Subject: Draft letter to Congress--and some thoughts--re HR-827

Dear Abolitionists --

Some thoughts:

Today, the Washington Times reports, the national debt is about \$5 trillion.

The Pentagon isn't saying exactly how much its nuclear arsenal cost, but some Pentagon officials last year "conservatively" estimated that the government has spent \$5 trillion on nuclear weapons since 1945.

Considering

the profit involved with figures of that magnitude, it's easy to understand

why converting destructive nuclear weapons industries and restoring the environment are going to "take time."

But time is passing and perceptions are changing. Retired generals and admirals are publicly proclaiming nuclear weapons "irrational," unsafe, and

unnecessary; many influential individuals and groups have recently begun calling for the elimination of nuclear weapons; and proceedings in the World

Court in November 1995 highlighted

the legal and moral nature of the issue. As global pressure for nuclear abolition mounts, right wing U.S. legislators are calling for a balanced budget, while their left wing counterparts decry the nation's inability to

provide basic necessities for an ever-lengthening poverty line.

Meanwhile,

many of their constituents wonder what happened to the "Peace Dividend."

Taken together, these factors indicate the time for Delegate Eleanor Holmes

Norton's bill, HR-827, the Nuclear Disarmament and Economic Conversion Act,

has come. As the congresswoman said, "You can't even begin to talk about providing for human needs without first tripping over a very big thing

....

the military budget."

Till now, efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons have focused largely on the

establishment of treaties. Many people find the treaty process complicated

-- they experience difficulty in comprehending the complexities or necessities of, for example, ratifying START III in order to encourage one

party to the treaty to ratify START II. Additionally, treaties do not provide much opportunity for grassroots political action.

The Nuclear Disarmament / Economic Conversion Act is easy to understand -

-

it simply outlaws nuclear weapons and requires that the tremendous economic resources presently being squandered on those weapons be used to provide for conversion, clean-up, and human needs. If "law" has any value, the Disarmament/Conversion Act is obviously practical.

It also provides a focal point for timely political action. Delegate Norton's bill itself was the result of a grassroots voter initiative campaign. The concept could easily be incorporated into resolutions by various municipal, county, state, political and non-political organizations, or be used as the basis for initiative campaigns. H.R. 827 itself provides a vehicle for less time-consuming efforts.

It was not difficult to convince a number of Congressional leaders that the bill is in the best interests of their constituents, when they understood that domestically it would earmark funds for conversion and cleanup, and internationally it requires ALL countries with nuclear weapons to join the U.S. in disarming. Immediately after Delegate Norton first introduced her "Nuclear Disarmament and Economic Conversion Act" in 1994, eight Representatives co-sponsored the bill. Each co-sponsor signed on as the result of a single letter or visit from a constituent.

Individuals can have a real effect by writing letters, making phone calls, telling friends and colleagues. Politicians say they NEED to hear from their constituents. They need to be educated about the benefits of their active support for Del. Norton's Conversion/Disarmament Act.

It only takes 15 minutes to write a letter, an e-mail, or a fax. The more support this idea receives from around the country and around the world, the less time it is likely to take for it to come into fruition. It is indeed time for the United States to proclaim to the world, "Sure, we'll get rid of our nuclear weapons if everyone else does." And then do it.

Ellen Thomas

Proposition One Committee -- POB 27217, Washington, DC 20038 - 202-462-0757 -
202-265-5389 (fax) - prop1@prop1.org (e-mail) - <http://prop1.org> (Web Domain)

--1997 -- Draft LETTER TO REPRESENTATIVES re HR-827 -- for adaptation--

The Hon. _____
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington DC 20515

Dear Representative _____

I ask you please to actively co-sponsor Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton's "Nuclear Disarmament and Economic Conversion Act," which was re-introduced on February 27, 1997 as HR-827. In pertinent part, the proposed Act requires that:

"The United States Government ... shall disable and dismantle all its nuclear weapons and refrain from replacing them at any time with any weapons of mass destruction ... and shall redirect resources that are currently being used for nuclear weapons programs to use .. in converting all nuclear weapons industry employees ... and programs ... to constructive, ecologically beneficial peacetime activities ... addressing human needs such as housing, health care, education, agriculture, and environmental restoration. This Act shall take effect when the President certifies to the Congress that all foreign countries possessing nuclear weapons have established legal requirements comparable... and those requirements have taken effect."

This legislation is a timely vehicle by which Congress can signal its intent to abide by Article 6 of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. With the recent revelations by retired generals and admirals that nuclear weapons are unsafe, unnecessary, and "irrational" -- with the World Court decision that nuclear weapons could and should be illegal -- with the growing global pressure for abolition of nuclear weapons -- with constituents everywhere still looking for the "Peace Dividend," this bill's time has come.

You will find that the bill is in the best interest of all constituents, since domestically it marks for conversion and cleanup those funds formerly

needed to produce and deploy nuclear weapons. Since it goes into effect when ALL countries possessing nuclear weapons join the U.S. in nuclear disarmament and conversion of their war machines, it offers very little security risk and a great deal of good public relations.

Please advise me that you have added your name to the list of co-sponsors on this very important legislation.

Sincerely,

Name: _____

Address: _____

email / fax / phone:

_____ drafted by: _____
Proposition One Committee, P.O. Box 27217, DC 20038 - 202-462-0757

prop1@prop1.org - <http://prop1.org>
From prop1@prop1.org Thu Mar 13 04:02:53 1997
Date: Wed, 12 Mar 1997 23:50:15 -0500 (EST)
From: peace through reason <prop1@prop1.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: German activist requests information

Can anyone help my friend, Conny Henschel, who is an activist who lives in Munchen (Munich), Germany (she came with me to the World Court hearings in 1995, some of you may remember her), and who writes that she hopes "someday to get information about contracts about nuclear weapons and history of Eurobomb. I don't know where to find this here in Munich." I assume she means by "contracts about nuclear weapons" any agreements for placement of nuclear weapons on European soil. I don't have that information.

Conny's address is:

Conny Henschel
Nanga-Parbat Str. 44
80992 Munchen, BRD

or you can write to me, and I'll convey your message.

Thanks so much!

Ellen Thomas
prop1@prop1.org
From billing@igc.org Thu Mar 13 04:02:53 1997

Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 03:02:55 -0800 (PST)
From: IGC Billing Department <billing@igc.org>
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: February use, acct: mupj

Get a custom Internet Domain Name for your organization, at IGC's new lower price! A custom Domain Name allows email to be addressed to you at <member@your_organization.org>, instead of <member@igc.org>. For information visit the IGC Product Center on the World Wide Web at <http://www.igc.org/igc/services>.

***** I N V O I C E *****

Howard W. Hallman
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th St., NW
Washington, DC 20036

February 1997 activity for your PeaceNet account
IGC Account: mupj Invoice date: 02/28/97
Invoice number: 9702-04914

Date	Time	Description	Qty	Cost

02/05/97	1937	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	14MN	0.00
02/06/97	1903	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	6MN	0.00
02/06/97	1910	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	22MN	0.00
02/09/97	1733	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	3MN	0.00
02/10/97	1853	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	11MN	0.00
02/11/97	1809	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	13MN	0.00
02/11/97	1826	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	8MN	0.00
02/12/97	1626	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	21MN	0.00
02/12/97	1718	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	17MN	0.00
02/13/97	1202	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	2MN	0.00
02/13/97	1617	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	17MN	0.00
02/15/97	0745	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	21MN	0.00
02/15/97	0836	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	10MN	0.00
02/17/97	1656	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	6MN	0.00
02/18/97	1419	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	17MN	0.00
02/18/97	1445	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	6MN	0.00
02/19/97	0506	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	5MN	0.00
02/19/97	1650	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	12MN	0.00
02/20/97	1559	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	19MN	0.00
02/22/97	1013	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	12MN	0.00
02/22/97	1735	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	4MN	0.00
02/22/97	1815	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	2MN	0.00
02/23/97	1346	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	7MN	0.00
02/24/97	1633	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	4MN	0.00
02/25/97	1653	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	4MN	0.00
02/26/97	1447	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	4MN	0.00

02/27/97	0455	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	3MN	0.00
02/27/97	1552	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	2MN	0.00
02/28/97	0539	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	2MN	0.00
02/28/97		Storage fee	1KC	0.00
02/28/97		Mar 1997 monthly service fee		12.50

		Total Current Charges		12.50
01/31/97		Previous Balance		22.92
02/01/97		Security Deposit		50.00
02/12/97		Credit Adjustment		-35.42
		(Reversing Nov/Dec/Jan fees (technical problems)-ch)		

		Grand Total Due		50.00

Summary for this period:	Minutes	Hourly rate	Charge
Storage fee			0.00
Subscription fee			12.50
Direct-dial	274	0.00	0.00

Totals:	274		\$ 12.50

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

From billing@igc.org Thu Mar 13 04:23:58 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 03:02:55 -0800 (PST)
From: IGC Billing Department <billing@igc.org>
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: February use, acct: mupj

Get a custom Internet Domain Name for your organization, at IGC's new lower price! A custom Domain Name allows email to be addressed to you at <member@your_organization.org>, instead of <member@igc.org>. For information visit the IGC Product Center on the World Wide Web at <http://www.igc.org/igc/services>.

***** I N V O I C E *****

Howard W. Hallman
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th St., NW
Washington, DC 20036

February 1997 activity for your PeaceNet account
IGC Account: mupj Invoice date: 02/28/97
Invoice number: 9702-04914

Date	Time	Description	Qty	Cost	Taxable
02/05/97	1937	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	14MN		0.00
02/06/97	1903	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	6MN		0.00
02/06/97	1910	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	22MN		0.00
02/09/97	1733	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	3MN		0.00
02/10/97	1853	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	11MN		0.00
02/11/97	1809	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	13MN		0.00
02/11/97	1826	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	8MN		0.00
02/12/97	1626	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	21MN		0.00
02/12/97	1718	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	17MN		0.00
02/13/97	1202	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	2MN		0.00
02/13/97	1617	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	17MN		0.00
02/15/97	0745	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	21MN		0.00
02/15/97	0836	Direct Dial: Washington DC Area	10MN		0.00

02/17/97	1656	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	6MN	0.00
02/18/97	1419	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	17MN	0.00
02/18/97	1445	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	6MN	0.00
02/19/97	0506	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	5MN	0.00
02/19/97	1650	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	12MN	0.00
02/20/97	1559	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	19MN	0.00
02/22/97	1013	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	12MN	0.00
02/22/97	1735	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	4MN	0.00
02/22/97	1815	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	2MN	0.00
02/23/97	1346	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	7MN	0.00
02/24/97	1633	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	4MN	0.00
02/25/97	1653	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	4MN	0.00
02/26/97	1447	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	4MN	0.00
02/27/97	0455	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	3MN	0.00
02/27/97	1552	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	2MN	0.00
02/28/97	0539	Direct Dial:	Washington DC Area	2MN	0.00
02/28/97		Storage fee		1KC	0.00
02/28/97		Mar 1997 monthly service fee			12.50
-----					-----
		Total Current Charges			12.50
01/31/97		Previous Balance			22.92
02/01/97		Security Deposit			50.00
02/12/97		Credit Adjustment			-35.42
		(Reversing Nov/Dec/Jan fees (technical problems)-ch)			
-----					-----
		Grand Total Due			50.00

Summary for this period:	Minutes	Hourly rate	Charge
Storage fee			0.00
Subscription fee			12.50
Direct-dial	274	0.00	0.00

Totals: 274 \$ 12.50

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

From abolition@motherearth.knooppunt.be Thu Mar 13 17:15:41 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Mar 97 12:18:46 +0100
From: Motherearth Office Bel <abolition@motherearth.knooppunt.be>
Reply to: krista@motherearth.knooppunt.be
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: tokai reproc. plant accident, japan

nuclear issues news from Japan #970313
+++++

More on PNC Tokai Accident
(*see the previous issue of MagpieNews #970311)

date: 13 March 1997

It now became evident that some 2,100,000 Bq of radioactive iodine had been released into the atmosphere during the fire and the explosion at the Tokai Reprocessing Plant, east Japan, on 11 March. This is an estimation made on the basis of the radiation monitor on the proper exhaust system and does NOT include the release through the broken windows of the Bitumen Solidification Facility building where the explosion took place.

The number of the plant workers contaminated by radioactivity (mainly cesium-134 and -137) increased to 35.

PNC admitted that they had failed to report the fact that the radiation alarm had been triggered during the incipient fire.

A PNC executive on site remarked that the sprinklers had been turned off too early "perhaps for fear of producing too much contaminated water". An interesting remark indeed!

The accident is probably assessed at Level 3 of the INES (International Nuclear Event Scale).

(STA says that the time of the explosion was 8:04pm JST (+900), rather than 8:14pm as reported earlier.)

sources: Yomiuri (March 12&13), Nikkei (March 13), Mainichi (March 12&13)

□\$B:42lBg3X□(B □\$BG@3XIt□(B □\$B;q8;<R2q4IM}3X9V:B□(B
□\$B!!!!<R2q?MN`3X8&5f<<□(B
□\$B!!!!:Y@n□(B □\$B90L@□(B (□\$B\$[\$=\$+\$o□(B □\$B\$3\$&\$a\$□(B)□\$B!□(B

E-mail: hosokawk@cc.saga-u.ac.jp
fax: 0952-28-8709□\$B!□(B
URL: <http://itak.AG.saga-u.ac.jp/>

□\$BM9JXMQ\$N4JN,\$"\$FL>□(B

□\$B")□(B840 □\$B:42lBg3X□(B □\$BG@3XIt#39f4[!J<R2q?MN`3X!K:Y@n□(B

End of forwarded message.

End of forwarded message.

From nirsnet@igc.apc.org Thu Mar 13 17:15:41 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 07:48:05 -0800 (PST)
From: Michael Mariotte <nirsnet@igc.apc.org>
To: krista@motherearth.knooppunt.be, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: Stop Westinghouse constructing Temelin npp

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

Krista, Hope you're well. Do send us the handbook, also photos! We can use them in the newsletter and on our web site. We will post this and beginning putting out the word.

Michael

At 07:16 PM 3/12/97 +0100, Motherearth Office Bel wrote:

>For immediate release
>Photos available on request.
>
>ANTI-NUCLEAR DIRECT ACTION CAMP
>At Temelin Nuclear power plant, Czech Republic
>July 6th - July 14th 1997
>
>AN INVITATION FOR ALL ANTI NUCLEAR ACTIVISTS!
>
>Since the catastrophe at Chernobyl in 1986, the western nuclear industry
>had many problems in continuing its work. Due to public opposition and
>financial problems no more new nuclear power plants (NPP) have been build
in
>western Europe (with France as a glowing exception) nor have new NPP's
been
>ordered in the United States. Thus the nuclear industry lost its market.
>
>Not a surprise that they started to search for a new market and thought
>to have found this in eastern Europe.
>
>
>Temelin NPP is a prime example of the western nuclear industry's
expansion
>in the East; Situated 150 km from Prague, it is an unfinished VVER
1000/320,
>built and abandoned by the Soviets. Now CEZ (Czech electricity utility)
and

>Westinghouse (an American multinational) are completing this unneeded NPP.
>The American government (through the Export-Import Bank, and thus taxpayers money) has just decided to grant Westinghouse a loan guarantee, despite high levels of public opposition.
>The mix of western and eastern technology is new and not tested on safety.
>Besides that the capacity to be created by the new NPP is unneeded.
>CEZ has run a campaign the last years to promote electrical heating.
>By severely subsidising the electricity prices and selling and installing the heaters nearly for free, they have created an electricity demand even higher than the proposed capacity for Temelin.
>In the mean time the government has, due to the costs-overrun of Temelin, no money left over to make the existing brown coal plants more ecological sound i.e. filtersystems). Thus the brown coal plants are heavily polluting big areas of the Czech Republic and even Germany, affecting peoples health, life expectation and even birth rates.
>
>
>
>
>Hnuti DUHA (Friends of the Earth - Friends of the Earth Czech Republic) has been running a campaign to stop the the construction of Temelin for over 4 years now. Using the wide range of methods from lobbying and direct actions to creating energy efficiency brigades and promoting renewable energy, from actions on the cooling towers to the totale blockade of the plant...nearly all tactics have been used. Now they have come to the point that international support is crucial.
>
>For the last three summers Hnuti DUHA has organised non-violent blockades of the construction site. Every year the actions grew bigger and better and the enormous media attention made the Temelin case to one of the hottest Czech themes.
>
>Last year 500 activists blocked the whole site (11 entries!!!) for over 3 days.
>XXXX
>This year we want to RECLAIM the Temelin construction site!!
>XXXX
>There will be theatre groups, concerts, bonfires, climbing courses on the cooling towers, organic vegetarian food (Rampenplan!!), many varieties of non-violent direct actions and more..
>But: We need YOUR help.
>

>
>What can you do?
>*Put july 6th-14th in your agenda and come over!
>*Spread this article in your own network.
>
>If you want to be more involved in organising these actions,
>please contact the PIANO
>(Prague International Anti Nuclear Office) office.
>If you send us your address, we will send you the Temelin Action
Handbook
>with more thorough background information and practical stuff as well.
>
>
>We still need a lot of help and welcome all volunteer!
>We would also be very happy if you would organise similar
>protests at nuclear sites in Germany! If we organise our
>actions at the same time we can help out with international media
coverage.
>
>In a separat cadre:
>XXXXX
>A similar evil NPP construction is happening in Slovakia, where \$SIEMENS
>is constructing the Mochovce NPP (in an earthquake zone!!!) and doing
the
>same experimental mix of east and west technology. The Slovaks are not
ready
>to have international activists on their actions in the second week of
july.
>This is mainly because their media reacts very negative on foreigners
>protesting in Slovakia. But they can use your help!!
>The German government has decided to give a Hermes loan guarantee and
the
>Kreditanstalt fur Wiederaufbau is a big financier for this dangerous
project.
>This is German taxmoney!!!
>Please boycott Siemens products, like Siemens Nixdorf computers,
>Bosch tools, Osram lightbulbs, Siemens kitchen equipment etc..
>Send lettters of protest to Siemens International:
>Dr. Karl Hermann Baumann
>Hd. Guenther Wilhelm
>Wittelbacherplatz 2 80333 Munchen Germany
>For a sample letter contact Za Matku Zem (For Mother Earth Slovakia)
>zamatkuzem@seps.sanet.sk, visit the website of Global 2000:
>[http://www.t0.or.at/~global 2000](http://www.t0.or.at/~global2000) or contact [siemens-boycott@t-](mailto:siemens-boycott@t-online.de)
>online.de
>XXXXX
>See you in Temelin!!!
>
>For a nuclear free world!!!!
>
>Krista van Velzen
>
>
>PIANO

>Praha International Anti Nuclear Office
>Chvalova 3 13000 Praha 3 Czech Republic
>+42-2-90031895 piano@ecn.cz
>visit our website!!! <http://www.ecn.cz/private/piano>
>
>
>
>
>XX
>

>Dear editors,
>This here is just for your information, but if you are
>interested this is good to read!:

>A Brief History of Anti-Temelín Movement

>Public opposition to Temelín has quite a long history. Since the
>beginning of 80s, when the construction of Temelin first began, there
>have
>been several waves of oppostion. The first protests were organized by
>locals who were the first people to be dramatically effected by the
>construction: the villages of Kötinov, Temelínek and Bøezí were wiped-
>out
>and villagers resettled. Some people left immediatelly, others were
>forced out later, a few remained. Out of the 60 original inhabitants,
>only
>7 still live in the village. The Pizinger family, who still remains
>exemplifies this struggle today. They were bought out by CEZ 13 years
>ago,
>given low state prices for their property. And now that their house is
>destined for demolition this Spring, they will be forced from their
>homes
>with only a fraction of the house's value and will have lost their only
>trade - farming (they have been "relocated to an urban setting which
>doesn't allow farm animals)

>Reacting to these injustices, villagers attempted to publicly protest.
>Unfortunately, the oppressive Communist regime ofthe 80s didn't allow
>organized movements and, in effect banned their protests. They responded
>by continuing to demonstrate their disapproval individually. Their most
>common response was to send letters of protest which gained little
>sympathy or consideration from the government. The only reaction on the
>side of the establishment was an official explanation describing how the
>plant will play an important role in helping the future construction of
>socialism. Soon, the local opposition was completely silence. There was
>little resistance in the years that followed because villagers felt it
>was
>nearly impossible to influence the government's centralized decision
>making policies.

>Fortunately, a big opportunity for campaigners opened up after the
>political changes in 1989. Supported by Austrians, the region
>experienced

>their first public and mass protests. Huge gatherings took place at the
>Temelin construction site. As a result, a tradition of opposition was
>created. The biggest protest; a festival at the main gate of the plant,
>occurred in 1991 which was attended by nearly ten thousand Czechs and
>Austrians! This newborn movement did not go without detectable changes -
>in 1990, the regional government voted not to prolong the construction
>license for the 3rd and 4th reactors. This decision meant that the plant
>would now be half its original size. But despite this victory, chances
for
>initiating a complete shut down of the project were vanishing quickly.
>

>Although the numbers involved in the movement were rising, their
influence
>was decreasing due to time pressures. The opposition experienced its peak
>in 1990. During this time, testing the new democracy with public
protests
>were new and popular. As a consequence, many people actively
participated
>in the campaign against Temelin which, combined with temporary
hesitation
>on the part of the state institutions, greatly influenced decision
makers.

>However, numbers began decreasing monthly as people lost interest in
>participating in large scale demonstrations. As a consequence, decision
>makers became more self-assured and less fearful of public pressure.
>CEZ, the Czech electricity utility, ignoring the desires of the people,
>continued the construction of the plant, pretending its completion was
>never in question. It was not long before this second wave of
opposition,
>discouraged by politicians who still made decisions regardless of public
>opinion, began to withdraw and diminish. With no culture of opposition,
>most people preferred to go back to their private lives than continue
>resisting a government which didn't seem to be listening.

>
>In the middle of 1992, the government made their final decision on
>Temelin's future. These decisions again challenged opponents of the
plant
>and, in response, a third wave of opposition was created. This time, its
>core was formed by a wide coalition of several dozens of environmental
>organizations. Their aim was simple: to convince the government to
reject
>Temelin. They organised actions, petitions, public debates, open letters
>and other media events. The newly elected (1992) government, led by
>recent Prime Minister Klaus, was not interested in public opinion at
all.

>Most requests for debates were simply ignored, petitions were not even
>formally answered, and open letters were thrown to the dust bins. By
>autumn 1992, despite clear opposition and obvious alternative resources,
>all ministers had agreed that Temelin was necessary and the best
solution.

>Studies that had proven Temelin was not the least cost solution to the
>Czech Republic's energy needs as claimed by the nuclear establishment
and

>ministers of government. Eventhough these results were published in papers
>and shown on TV, the ministers were already decided. In a formal decision
>in March 1993, all 18 voted in favor of Temelin. The announcement of this
>decision had a killing affect on the anti-nuclear movement - almost all the
>groups cooperating in the coalition gave up, thinking that further efforts
>would be a waste of time and resources. Consequently, they began focusing
>on other winable issues. After another battle lost, only few decided to
>continue the war against Temelin.
>
>Those few, still bravely opposing the plant, realized that without Western
>players (i.e., ExIm Bank and Westinghouse) in the project would be
>defeated. Therefore, a holistic strategy using internationals to pressure
>the Western players and a strong local civic movement with direct actions
>at its best targeting the Ministers at home was taken up by the
>opposition. As for western participation, the U.S. multinational
>corporation, Westinghouse, eventually won the contract for Temelin and
>formed a partnership with CEZ to upgrade Soviet technologies. The desire
>for western technology was inter-linked with a need for western money to
>pay for the modernization. Westinghouse offered to secure finances
>through loan guarantees provided by U.S. Export-Import Bank. Thus, both
>needs - technical and financial - were met by the United States. One of
>the campaign highlights was the move to stop Ex-Im's financing of the
>construction of Temelin in 1994. Extensive lobbying at the U.S.
Congress,
>whose members had the power to reject Ex-Im's decision, took place. In
>February and March 1994, with the help of several U.S. organizations,
>representatives of both Austrian and Czech movements opposed to Temelin
>travelled to the U.S. After many exhausting weeks in Washington, and
>despite the support of fifty Congressional representatives, the Ex-Im
>headquarters confirmed their decision to provide money for Temelin.
>
>Today, there is a stronger focus on supporting the civic/direct action
>movement. The direct action movement, which still grows today, represents
>historically the fourth wave of opposition to Temelin. Our first
blockade
>of the Temelin site took place in May 1993, with about 50 participants
>blocking one of the gates for a few hours. All were arrested.
>Nevertheless, it brought wide media attention to the problem of Temelin.
>Then, in the summer, a protest camp was organized for the month of July.
>Both actions - blockades and camps - became the corner stones of the
>movement. Now, every year, a blockade and protest camp is organized. As
>the number of participants at the blockades grow (1993 - 50, 1994 - 150,
>1995 - 250, 1996 - 350), and the length of the blockades increases (in

>1996, it lasted 72 hours) these actions become more and more effective,
>making the life of nuclear proponents difficult. Furthermore, the yearly
>protests attract a considerable amount of public attention to the
>problem.

>The blockades have also been supported by many well-known personalities

:

>several singers, writers, and politicians (including Petr Pithart,
>former

>Prime Minister and recent Chair of Senate, and Petra Buzkova, the
>vice-chair of the House of representatives). We believe that the
>resistance will continue to grow. In fact, we are expecting at least
>500

>people at the blockade this July 1997. Everyone who wants to help and is
>willing to respect the non-violence guidelines, is welcome.

>

>

>

>XXXXXX

>This here is just some facts,

>I hope I don't burn your email system with all this info...

>

>

>

>

>Temelin Nuclear Power Plant ----- Temelin
>nuclear power plant is based on old Soviet-design reactors
>(VVER-1000); its construction started in 1984. After the political
>changes, it was decided that the project would be upgraded to a
>certain extent by Westinghouse Corp. According to the original
>Communist plan, agreed upon by the Czech government, the plant's
>first reactor was to be finished by the end of 1990 and the budget
>was 35 billion CZK (\$1.2 billion). The new, democratic government
>decided in 1993 to go on with the construction of two reactors,
>stating the new deadline for the first reactor was the end of 1995
>and budget as 68.8 billion Czech Crowns (\$2.5 billion).

>

>Numerous independent studies have proven that the construction of a
>new 2,000 MW power plant was unnecessary. Among the authors of these
>studies, one can find such respected institutions as the World Bank,
>the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and Tractebel.
>There are also other independent studies, like that of Power
>International, that stress the fact that the Temelin project is not
>least-cost, because many linked costs have been ignored. As a
>conclusion, these studies suggest that other solutions to the
>electricity market in Czech Republic be implemented, which include
>potentials energy savings (1,200 to 5,000 MW), combined heat and
>electricity generation (1,500 to 6,000 MW), energy from independent
>producers (3,300-3,900 MW), and renewables (wind 300-600 MW, small
>scale water 400-800 MW, biomass 500-1,000 MW). Importantly, the
>Tractebel "least cost study was used to justify the Temelin
>project, but even this study showed that energy efficiency was more
>cost effective than Temelin, but the authors were not permitted to
>use demand side solutions in their recommendations.

>

>The Temelin project, even with Westinghouse's safety upgrades, could
>never be licensed according to the current safety standards valid in
>Western countries. There are many technical weak points than can
>never be upgraded at a reasonable cost, like insufficient
>containment, a small reactor vessel leading to early embrittlement
>and other serious defects. In 1992, an independent audit by
>Halliburton NUS discovered many problems on the site: poor
>organization; a weak quality control programme; improper and lacking
>documentation. Although these mistakes were supposed to be corrected
>promptly, as late as 1994 the SUJB (the Czech version of the NRC -
>Nuclear Regulatory Committee) lists the same problems.

>

>There is a serious problem of failed democratic process at Temelin.
>The project is being built despite a request by the majority (58 of
>65) villages in the region demanded that it be stopped. Petitions
>signed by over 60,000 people have never been commented on by the
>Czech government. The construction license is based on an old
>Soviet
>design, now modified to a large extent. There has never been a new
>licensing process for these modifications; the legality of the whole
>project is thus brought into question. And there has never been a
>public discussion about the environmental impact of the plant (EIA),
>that should be, according to current Czech laws, initiated as a
>result of the serious project modifications.

>

>And last but not least, the public has been allowed basically no
>access to documentation linked with the project, from safety
>analyses
>to even studies of its environmental impact.

>

>

>

>

>

From disarmament@igc.orgThu Mar 13 17:15:41 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 09:27:37 -0800 (PST)
From: disarmament@igc.org
To: ctb-followers@igc.org
Subject: fissile materials, NATO -Summit

APO 03/13 1144 Study: Weapons Poorly Monitored

By EDITH M. LEDERER

Associated Press Writer

LONDON (AP) -- Tons of weapons-grade plutonium and uranium produced over the last 50 years are inadequately monitored, risking misuse by rogue states and terrorists, according to a three-year study published today.

The study, "Plutonium and Highly Enriched Uranium 1996: World Inventories, Capabilities and Policies" concludes there is too much nuclear material that is too easy to obtain.

International efforts to end production, increase information about stockpiles, and tighten controls "are currently being frustrated on many fronts," it said.

The three nuclear experts who wrote the study urged President Clinton and Russian President Boris Yeltsin to launch an international initiative to strengthen controls on weapons-grade plutonium and uranium. The two leaders are scheduled to meet March 20-21 in Helsinki, Finland.

It takes only a few pounds of plutonium or highly enriched uranium to make a bomb, said one of the authors, William Walker, a professor at the University of St. Andrews in Scotland.

"The controls of this material have to be absolutely watertight," he told a news conference today.

Iraq's nuclear weapons program before the Persian Gulf War showed that having just 44 pounds of nuclear material "can create a major crisis in an unstable region," Walker said.

Yet, according to the study, less than 1 percent of the material produced for military purposes is under international verification, leaving inventories susceptible to diversion and theft.

"And especially in Russia, but not only in Russia ... we don't know precisely what the size of the inventories are. They are under-protected and they are under-regulated," Walker said.

The study's other authors are David Albright, president of the Washington-based Institute for Science and International Security, and Frans Berkhout of the Science Policy Research Unit at Sussex University in England.

Their survey found that 1,750 tons of highly enriched uranium and 230 tons of plutonium have been produced for military purposes.

The authors estimate that less than 400 tons are now required to sustain the nuclear arsenals of the five declared nuclear powers -- the United States, Russia, Britain, France and China.

That means 1,600 tons can be counted as excess, they said.

An additional 1,000 tons of plutonium has been produced in civilian nuclear power reactors, and these stocks continue to grow at the rate of 70 tons annually, the authors said.

Albright said dealing with the problems of nuclear materials requires both technical and political solutions but the political ones are often the hardest.

"There's so much secrecy in this area that it inhibits the ability to come up with politically acceptable solutions to these problems," he said.

The authors said Clinton and Yeltsin should remove obstacles to the immediate opening of negotiations on a treaty to ban further production of weapons-grade uranium and plutonium.

The two presidents also should accelerate programs to reduce stockpiles and negotiate a new treaty that would open their massive surpluses to international inspection, the authors said.

The study provides a comprehensive assessment of Iraq's pre-Gulf War nuclear weapons program and notes that Iraq retains extensive expertise and ambition to reconstitute it.

North Korea's stock of plutonium remains unknown, which poses a threat to implementation of the U.S.-brokered agreement to freeze the country's nuclear program, the study said.

Although the five nuclear weapon states have ended production of weapons-grade material, the study noted that production is

continuing in Israel and India.

RTw 03/13 0838 Yeltsin goes to Helsinki summit with hopes high
By Timothy Heritage

MOSCOW, March 13 (Reuter) - President Boris Yeltsin heads for next week's Russia-U.S. summit in Helsinki ready to talk tough but with high hopes of a breakthrough over NATO's eastward expansion plans.

He is also confident of proving he is firmly in charge in the Kremlin after illness following a strong performance in the last week which has dispelled fears that the talks with U.S. President Bill Clinton on March 19 and 20 might be postponed.

"The talks will be as concrete as possible, firm and even tough because we are talking about protecting Russia's national interests," presidential press secretary Sergei Yastrzhembsky said in a radio interview on Thursday.

"We will see how ready U.S. partners are to put on paper the things they have been saying so nicely."

Yeltsin's return to the Kremlin has coincided with a spell of frenetic diplomacy between Moscow, NATO and Washington and what diplomats call a new realism in Russian diplomacy.

Officials on all sides now see a way opening to progress in the row over NATO's planned enlargement into eastern and central Europe which seemed unlikely at the start of this year.

"We have agreed to look for a compromise and I think we will find this compromise at the summit," the 66-year-old Kremlin leader declared late last month.

A Russian foreign ministry spokesman also expressed hope of progress at a briefing on Thursday.

Russian officials and Western diplomats in Moscow have declined to give firm details of what form any breakthrough might take, saying much depends on a last-minute trip to Washington this weekend by Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov

Any progress in Helsinki will not mean a final deal to bury Russia's concerns over the Western defence alliance's expansion into former communist-ruled eastern and central Europe. That is more likely closer to a NATO Summit in Madrid in July.

Moscow has kept up a barrage of opposition to the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation's enlargement, saying it threatens its security and would open new divisions in Europe.

The tough language is partly intended to satisfy Yeltsin's nationalist and communist opponents, who opposed NATO expansion in a resolution adopted by the lower house of parliament on Wednesday.

Western diplomats say Moscow has finally accepted behind the scenes that expansion will go ahead and has at last set out what it wants as the terms of enlargement.

"Russia has shown it is willing to compromise. I hope NATO will do the same," said Pavel Kandel, a foreign affairs expert at Moscow's Institute of Europe.

Yeltsin is expected to demand that any agreement with NATO is binding and must be ratified by all members of the alliance, and that NATO does not move nuclear missiles or its military infrastructure into new member states.

He is also expected to demand that a mechanism be created for giving Russia a say in issues touching on its security and may push for guarantees that NATO expansion will stop at the former Soviet Union's borders.

Yeltsin may also seek Russia's full membership of the Group of Seven industrial powers, but this is resisted by some members of the elite group.

Arms control will also be on the agenda, including limits on conventional weapons in Europe, and Yeltsin will seek assurances from Clinton that Washington is not developing weaponry that might violate the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty.

Economic issues will also be on the agenda but have received little attention in public in Moscow.

Another important issue, although not on any agenda, is Yeltsin's health. But his recovery in the last few weeks from pneumonia and the heart problems which forced him to have surgery on November 5 has already helped ease concern.

He looked firm on his feet when he stood for 25 minutes to deliver a speech to parliament on March 6 and has announced a major shake-up of the government to reassert his authority.

Helsinki provides the perfect stage to confirm his recovery. It will be his first trip abroad since China and Kazakhstan last April and his longest talks with a Western leader since his re-election last July, probably lasting more than three hours.

From: Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005

Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 Fax: 202 898 0172

<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

From dh3m@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de Thu Mar 13 17:15:41 1997

Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 19:52:53 +0100 (CET)

From: Martin Kalinowski <dh3m@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de>

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Subject: conference against nuclear energy and weapons in space

[The following text is in the "ISO-8859-1" character set]

[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]

[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

Announcement of the Symposium

Peace in Outer Space?
The Ambivalence of Space Technology

March 20/21, 1997

at the Technical University of Darmstadt

Cooperatively organized by

- IANUS (local host)
- Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space
- Friedens- und Begegnungsstelle Mutlangen
- International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation (INESAP)

Programme of the Scientific Workshop on Thursday, March 20:
organized by IANUS and INESAP

1. Weapons and Space (9:00-10:30 am)

- a) Goetz Neuneck (ISFH, Hamburg):
Counterproliferation, missile defense and the ABM treaty
- b) Karl Grossman (State University, New York):
The U.S. government's agenda to weaponize space

2. Dual-use of Space Technology (11:00-12:30 am)

Bernd W. Kubbig (PRIF, Frankfurt):
The planned European military satellite programmes
HELIOS II and HORUS: Are they necessary for
early warning of future conflicts?

- b) Wulf von Kries (DLR, Cologne):
Legal and political dimensions of military spaceflight
- c) Bruce Gagnon (Global Network Against Weapons and
Nuclear Power in Space, Florida):
NASA's future vision for space

3. Power Supply for Deep Space Missions (2:00-4:00 pm)

- a) Martin Kalinowski (IANUS, Institut f ür Kernphysik, Darms
Safety aspects of nuclear space projects - the Cassini case
- b) Gerhard Strobel (ASE, Heilbronn):
New developments in solar power for deep space missions

4. Resumee (4:30-6:00 pm)

Juergen Scheffran (IANUS/INESAP, Darmstadt):
Future space technology use and control

□

--

=====
=====

Martin Kalinowski, IANUS, c/o Institut fuer Kernphysik
Schlossgartenstr. 9, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany
Tel.: +49-6151-163016 FAX: +49-6151-166039
Internet, private: KALINOWSKI@HRZPUB.TH-DARMSTADT.DE
Internet, group: IANUS@HRZPUB.TH-DARMSTADT.DE

http://www.th-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/welcome.htm and
.../inesap.htm

=====
=====

□
From int@fme.knooppunt.be Thu Mar 13 17:15:41 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 20:54:27
From: Pol D'Huyvetter <int@fme.knooppunt.be>
To: a-days@knooppunt.be
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: NVDA in Germany

=====
Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days (NWAD) 1997
An International Campaign to uphold International Law
with Non-Violent Actions of Civil Defence

July 8th - NATO Summit Madrid
August 6th - NATO HQ Brussels
August 9th at 'sites of crime'

=====
Dear fellow Abolitionists,

We are encouraging people to post messages as the one forwarded on
<a-days@knooppunt.be>.

Announcements, reports, and legal follow-up of non-violent direct
actions referring to the ICJ decision of July 8th 1996 will be
followed with care by activists and lawyers.

Thank you for your assistance,

Pol D'Huyvetter
contact
Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days 1997
For Mother Earth International Office

FORWARDED MAIL -----
From: cnd@gn.apc.org (The CND staff team)
Date: 13 Mar 97
Originally To: int@fme.knooppunt.be

INSPECTION OF N-WEAPONS STORE IN BUCHEL 18-20.4.97 Since letters and
other representatives to the German Govt have been ignored a team of
citizens will assist the authorities and inspect the site at Buchel,
near Koblenz, where nuclear weapons are stored and Tornado pilots
are trained to transport and drop US atom bombs. Their action follows
the

ICJ 8.7.96 Opinion.

Contacts: Roland Blach, Gewaltfreie Aktion Atomwaffen Abschaffen (Non-
Violent Action to Abolish Nukes), Bebelstr. 24, 70806 Kornwestheim,
Germany

Tel: (0) 7154 22026

Sources: Pax Report, Jan 97; Friedens Forum. Jan/Feb 97

In Peace and friendship,

Eirlys

The CND staff team (cnd@gn.apc.org)

Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament

162 Holloway Road

LONDON

N7 8DQ

tel: (uk)171 700 2393

fax: (uk)171 700 2357

Web Site <http://www.cnduk.org/cnd>

visit the CND General Election site via the 'Press & Parliamentary' page

CND is part of ABOLITION 2000 - A global network to eliminate nuclear weapons

From rwilcock@execulink.com Thu Mar 13 17:15:41 1997

Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 16:42:33 -0500

From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>

To: "Abolition Caucus List (E-mail)" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>

Subject: FW: Interesting news from the hill...

FYI

Ross Wilcock

rwilcock@web.net

<http://web.net.pgs/~pgs/>

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

From: Joanne Neuber [SMTP:joanne@aiha.com]

Sent: None

To: nis-health@igc.org

Subject: Interesting news from the hill...

U.S. ADMINISTRATION WANTS TO INCREASE AID TO FORMER SOVIET UNION. In testimony to Congress on 11 March, Ambassador Richard Morningstar called for a 44% increase in U.S. aid to the Newly Independent States next year. Aid spending would rise from \$625 million in 1997 to \$900 million in 1998, while spending on Russia alone would go from \$95 million to \$225 million. Total U.S. aid to the NIS peaked at \$2.5 billion in 1994, falling to \$850 million in 1995 and \$641 million in 1996. Rep. Benjamin Gilman, chairman of the House International Relations Committee, said he was doubtful Congress would support the requested increase, Reuters reported. Gilman said "We do not have any kind of 'partnership' at this point with the current government in Moscow," and objected to the idea of increasing aid in return for Russian acquiescence in NATO

expansion. Morningstar said the aid program "has nothing to do with NATO expansion," VOA reported.-Peter Rutland

From nirsnet@igc.apc.org Thu Mar 13 17:15:41 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 07:48:05 -0800 (PST)
From: Michael Mariotte <nirsnet@igc.apc.org>
To: krista@motherearth.knooppunt.be, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: Re: Stop Westinghouse constructing Temelin npp

[The following text is in the "iso-8859-1" character set]
[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]
[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

Krista, Hope you're well. Do send us the handbook, also photos! We can use them in the newsletter and on our web site. We will post this and beginning putting out the word.

Michael

At 07:16 PM 3/12/97 +0100, Motherearth Office Bel wrote:
>For immediate release
>Photos available on request.
>
>ANTI-NUCLEAR DIRECT ACTION CAMP
>At Temelin Nuclear power plant, Czech Republic
>July 6th - July 14th 1997
>
>AN INVITATION FOR ALL ANTI NUCLEAR ACTIVISTS!
>
>Since the catastrophe at Chernobyl in 1986, the western nuclear industry
>had many problems in continuing its work. Due to public opposition and
>financial problems no more new nuclear power plants (NPP) have been build
in
>western Europe (with France as a glowing exception) nor have new NPP's
been
>ordered in the United States. Thus the nuclear industry lost its market.
>
>Not a surprise that they started to search for a new market and thought
>to have found this in eastern Europe.
>
>
>Temelin NPP is a prime example of the western nuclear industry's
expansion
>in the East; Situated 150 km from Prague, it is an unfinished VVER
1000/320,
>built and abandoned by the Soviets. Now CEZ (Czech electricity utility)
and
>Westinghouse (an American multinational) are completing this unneeded
NPP.
>The American government (through the Export-Import Bank, and thus tax-
payers

>money) has just decided to grant Westinghouse a loan guarantee, despite high
>levels of public opposition.
>The mix of western and eastern technology is new and not tested on safety.
>Besides that the capacity to be created by the new NPP is unneeded.
>CEZ has run a campaign the last years to promote electrical heating.
>By severely subsidising the electricity prices and selling and installing
>the heaters nearly for free, they have created an electricity demand even
>higher than the proposed capacity for Temelin.
>In the mean time the government has, due to the costs-overrun of Temelin,
>no money left over to make the existing brown coal plants more ecological
>sound i.e. filtersystems). Thus the brown coal plants are heavily polluting
>big areas of the Czech Republic and even Germany, affecting peoples health,
>life expectation and even birth rates.
>
>
>
>
>Hnutí DUHA (Friends of the Earth - Friends of the Earth Czech Republic)
>has been running a campaign to stop the the construction of Temelin for
>over 4 years now. Using the wide range of methods from lobbying and direct
>actions to creating energy efficiency brigades and promoting renewable
>energy, from actions on the cooling towers to the totale blockade of the
>plant...nearly all tactics have been used. Now they have come to the
>point that international support is crucial.
>
>For the last three summers Hnutí DUHA has organised non-violent blockades
>of the construction site. Every year the actions grew bigger and better
>and the enormous media attention made the Temelin case to one of the
>hottest Czech themes.
>
>Last year 500 activists blocked the whole site (11 entries!!!) for
>over 3 days.
>XXXX
>This year we want to RECLAIM the Temelin construction site!!
>XXXX
>There will be theatre groups, concerts, bonfires, climbing courses
>on the cooling towers, organic vegetarian food (Rampenplan!!), many
>varieties of non-violent direct actions and more..
>But: We need YOUR help.
>
>
>What can you do?
>*Put july 6th-14th in your agenda and come over!
>*Spread this article in your own network.

>
>If you want to be more involved in organising these actions,
>please contact the PIANO
>(Prague International Anti Nuclear Office) office.
>If you send us your address, we will send you the Temelin Action
Handbook
>with more thorough background information and practical stuff as well.
>
>
>We still need a lot of help and welcome all volunteer!
>We would also be very happy if you would organise similar
>protests at nuclear sites in Germany! If we organise our
>actions at the same time we can help out with international media
coverage.
>
>In a separat cadre:
>XXXXX
>A similar evil NPP construction is happening in Slovakia, where \$IEMENS
>is constructing the Mochovce NPP (in an earthquake zone!!!) and doing
the
>same experimental mix of east and west technology. The Slovaks are not
ready
>to have international activists on their actions in the second week of
july.
>This is mainly because their media reacts very negative on foreigners
>protesting in Slovakia. But they can use your help!!
>The German government has decided to give a Hermes loan guarantee and
the
>Kreditanstalt fur Wiederaufbau is a big financier for this dangerous
project.
>This is German taxmoney!!!
>Please boycott Siemens products, like Siemens Nixdorf computers,
>Bosch tools, Osram lightbulbs, Siemens kitchen equipment etc..
>Send lettters of protest to Siemens International:
>Dr. Karl Hermann Baumann
>Hd. Guenther Wilhelm
>Wittelbacherplatz 2 80333 Munchen Germany
>For a sample letter contact Za Matku Zem (For Mother Earth Slovakia)
>zamatkuzem@seps.sanet.sk, visit the website of Global 2000:
><http://www.t0.or.at/~global> 2000 or contact [siemens-boykott@t-](mailto:siemens-boykott@t-online.de)
>[online.de](mailto:siemens-boykott@t-online.de)
>XXXXX
>See you in Temelin!!!
>
>For a nuclear free world!!!!
>
>Krista van Velzen
>
>
>PIANO
>Praha International Anti Nuclear Office
>Chvalova 3 13000 Praha 3 Czech Republic
>+42-2-90031895 piano@ecn.cz
>visit our website!!! <http://www.ecn.cz/private/piano>

>
>
>
>

>XX

>Dear editors,
>This here is just for your information, but if you are
>interested this is good to read!:

>
>
>A Brief History of Anti-Temelín Movement

>
>Public opposition to Temelín has quite a long history. Since the
>beginning of 80s, when the construction of Temelin first began, there
>have

>been several waves of opposition. The first protests were organized by
>locals who were the first people to be dramatically effected by the
>construction: the villages of Kötínov, Temelínec and Bøezí were wiped-

>out
>and villagers resettled. Some people left immediately, others were
>forced out later, a few remained. Out of the 60 original inhabitants,
>only

>7 still live in the village. The Pizinger family, who still remains
>exemplifies this struggle today. They were bought out by CEZ 13 years
>ago,

>given low state prices for their property. And now that their house is
>destined for demolition this Spring, they will be forced from their
>homes

>with only a fraction of the house's value and will have lost their only
>trade - farming (they have been "relocated to an urban setting which
>doesn't allow farm animals)

>
>Reacting to these injustices, villagers attempted to publicly protest.
>Unfortunately, the oppressive Communist regime of the 80s didn't allow
>organized movements and, in effect banned their protests. They responded
>by continuing to demonstrate their disapproval individually. Their most
>common response was to send letters of protest which gained little
>sympathy or consideration from the government. The only reaction on the
>side of the establishment was an official explanation describing how the
>plant will play an important role in helping the future construction of
>socialism. Soon, the local opposition was completely silence. There was
>little resistance in the years that followed because villagers felt it
>was

>nearly impossible to influence the government's centralized decision
>making policies.

>
>Fortunately, a big opportunity for campaigners opened up after the
>political changes in 1989. Supported by Austrians, the region
>experienced

>their first public and mass protests. Huge gatherings took place at the
>Temelin construction site. As a result, a tradition of opposition was
>created. The biggest protest; a festival at the main gate of the plant,
>occurred in 1991 which was attended by nearly ten thousand Czechs and

>Austrians! This newborn movement did not go without detectable changes -
>in 1990, the regional government voted not to prolong the construction
>license for the 3rd and 4th reactors. This decision meant that the plant
>would now be half its original size. But despite this victory, chances
for
>initiating a complete shut down of the project were vanishing quickly.
>
>Although the numbers involved in the movement were rising, their
influence
>was decreasing due to time pressures. The opposition experienced its peak
>in 1990. During this time, testing the new democracy with public
protests
>were new and popular. As a consequence, many people actively
participated
>in the campaign against Temelin which, combined with temporary
hesitation
>on the part of the state institutions, greatly influenced decision
makers.
>However, numbers began decreasing monthly as people lost interest in
>participating in large scale demonstrations. As a consequence, decision
>makers became more self-assured and less fearful of public pressure.
>CEZ, the Czech electricity utility, ignoring the desires of the people,
>continued the construction of the plant, pretending its completion was
>never in question. It was not long before this second wave of
opposition,
>discouraged by politicians who still made decisions regardless of public
>opinion, began to withdraw and diminish. With no culture of opposition,
>most people preferred to go back to their private lives than continue
>resisting a government which didn't seem to be listening.
>
>In the middle of 1992, the government made their final decision on
>Temelin's future. These decisions again challenged opponents of the
plant
>and, in response, a third wave of opposition was created. This time, its
>core was formed by a wide coalition of several dozens of environmental
>organizations. Their aim was simple: to convince the government to
reject
>Temelin. They organised actions, petitions, public debates, open letters
>and other media events. The newly elected (1992) government, lead by
>recent Prime Minister Klaus, was not interested in public opinion at
all.
>Most requests for debates were simply ignored, petitions were not even
>formally answered, and open letters were thrown to the dust bins. By
>autumn 1992, despite clear opposition and obvious alternative resources,
>all ministers had agreed that Temelin was necessary and the best
solution.
>Studies that had proven Temelin was not the least cost solution to the
>Czech Republic's energy needs as claimed by the nuclear establishment
and
>ministers of government. Eventhough these results were published in
papers
>and shown on TV, the ministers were already decided. In a formal
decision

>in March 1993, all 18 voted in favor of Temelin. The announcement of this
>decision had a killing affect on the anti-nuclear movement - almost all the
>groups cooperating in the coalition gave up, thinking that further efforts
>would be a waste of time and resources. Consequently, they began focusing
>on other winable issues. After another battle lost, only few decided to
>continue the war against Temelin.
>
>Those few, still bravely opposing the plant, realized that without Western
>players (i.e., ExIm Bank and Westinghouse) in the project would be
>defeated. Therefore, a holistic strategy using internationals to pressure
>the Western players and a strong local civic movement with direct actions
>at its best targeting the Ministers at home was taken up by the
>opposition. As for western participation, the U.S. multinational
>corporation, Westinghouse, eventually won the contract for Temelin and
>formed a partnership with CEZ to upgrade Soviet technologies. The desire
>for western technology was inter-linked with a need for western money to
>pay for the modernization. Westinghouse offered to secure finances
>through loan guarantees provided by U.S. Export-Import Bank. Thus, both
>needs - technical and financial - were met by the United States. One of
>the campaign highlights was the move to stop Ex-Im's financing of the
>construction of Temelin in 1994. Extensive lobbying at the U.S.
Congress,
>whose members had the power to reject Ex-Im's decision, took place. In
>February and March 1994, with the help of several U.S. organizations,
>representatives of both Austrian and Czech movements opposed to Temelin
>travelled to the U.S. After many exhausting weeks in Washington, and
>despite the support of fifty Congressional representatives, the Ex-Im
>headquarters confirmed their decision to provide money for Temelin.
>
>Today, there is a stronger focus on supporting the civic/direct action
>movement. The direct action movement, which still grows today, represents
>historically the fourth wave of opposition to Temelin. Our first
blockade
>of the Temelin site took place in May 1993, with about 50 participants
>blocking one of the gates for a few hours. All were arrested.
>Nevertheless, it brought wide media attention to the problem of Temelin.
>Then, in the summer, a protest camp was organized for the month of July.
>Both actions - blockades and camps - became the corner stones of the
>movement. Now, every year, a blockade and protest camp is organized. As
>the number of participants at the blockades grow (1993 - 50, 1994 - 150,
>1995 - 250, 1996 - 350), and the length of the blockades increases (in
>1996, it lasted 72 hours) these actions become more and more effective,
>making the life of nuclear proponents difficult. Furthermore, the yearly
>protests attract a considerable amount of public attention to the
problem.

>The blockades have also been supported by many well-known personalities
>:
>several singers, writers, and politicians (including Petr Pithart,
>former
>Prime Minister and recent Chair of Senate, and Petra Buzkova, the
>vice-chair of the House of representatives). We believe that the
>resistance will continue to grow. In fact, we are expecting at least
>500
>people at the blockade this July 1997. Everyone who wants to help and is
>willing to respect the non-violence guidelines, is welcome.

>
>
>

>XXXXXX

>This here is just some facts,
>I hope I don't burn your email system with all this info...

>
>
>
>

>Temelin Nuclear Power Plant ----- Temelin
>nuclear power plant is based on old Soviet-design reactors
>(VVER-1000); its construction started in 1984. After the political
>changes, it was decided that the project would be upgraded to a
>certain extent by Westinghouse Corp. According to the original
>Communist plan, agreed upon by the Czech government, the plant's
>first reactor was to be finished by the end of 1990 and the budget
>was 35 billion CZK (\$1.2 billion). The new, democratic government
>decided in 1993 to go on with the construction of two reactors,
>stating the new deadline for the first reactor was the end of 1995
>and budget as 68.8 billion Czech Crowns (\$2.5 billion).

>

>Numerous independent studies have proven that the construction of a
>new 2,000 MW power plant was unnecessary. Among the authors of these
>studies, one can find such respected institutions as the World Bank,
>the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and Tractebel.
>There are also other independent studies, like that of Power
>International, that stress the fact that the Temelin project is not
>least-cost, because many linked costs have been ignored. As a
>conclusion, these studies suggest that other solutions to the
>electricity market in Czech Republic be implemented, which include
>potentials energy savings (1,200 to 5,000 MW), combined heat and
>electricity generation (1,500 to 6,000 MW), energy from independent
>producers (3,300-3,900 MW), and renewables (wind 300-600 MW, small
>scale water 400-800 MW, biomass 500-1,000 MW). Importantly, the
>Tractebel "least cost study was used to justify the Temelin
>project, but even this study showed that energy efficiency was more
>cost effective than Temelin, but the authors were not permitted to
>use demand side solutions in their recommendations.

>

>The Temelin project, even with Westinghouse's safety upgrades, could
>never be licensed according to the current safety standards valid in
>Western countries. There are many technical weak points than can
>never be upgraded at a reasonable cost, like insufficient

>containment, a small reactor vessel leading to early embrittlement
>and other serious defects. In 1992, an independent audit by
>Halliburton NUS discovered many problems on the site: poor
>organization; a weak quality control programme; improper and lacking
>documentation. Although these mistakes were supposed to be corrected
>promptly, as late as 1994 the SUJB (the Czech version of the NRC -
>Nuclear Regulatory Committee) lists the same problems.

>

>There is a serious problem of failed democratic process at Temelin.
>The project is being built despite a request by the majority (58 of
>65) villages in the region demanded that it be stopped. Petitions
>signed by over 60,000 people have never been commented on by the
>Czech government. The construction license is based on an old
>Soviet
>design, now modified to a large extent. There has never been a new
>licensing process for these modifications; the legality of the whole
>project is thus brought into question. And there has never been a
>public discussion about the environmental impact of the plant (EIA),
>that should be, according to current Czech laws, initiated as a
>result of the serious project modifications.

>

>And last but not least, the public has been allowed basically no
>access to documentation linked with the project, from safety
>analyses
>to even studies of its environmental impact.

>

>

>

>

>

>

From disarmament@igc.org Thu Mar 13 17:15:42 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 09:27:37 -0800 (PST)
From: disarmament@igc.org
To: ctb-followers@igc.org
Subject: fissile materials, NATO -Summit

APO 03/13 1144 Study: Weapons Poorly Monitored

By EDITH M. LEDERER
Associated Press Writer

LONDON (AP) -- Tons of weapons-grade plutonium and uranium produced over the last 50 years are inadequately monitored, risking misuse by rogue states and terrorists, according to a three-year study published today.

The study, "Plutonium and Highly Enriched Uranium 1996: World Inventories, Capabilities and Policies" concludes there is too much nuclear material that is too easy to obtain.

International efforts to end production, increase information about stockpiles, and tighten controls "are currently being frustrated on many fronts," it said.

The three nuclear experts who wrote the study urged President Clinton and Russian President Boris Yeltsin to launch an international initiative to strengthen controls on weapons-grade plutonium and uranium. The two leaders are scheduled to meet

March 20-21 in Helsinki, Finland.

It takes only a few pounds of plutonium or highly enriched uranium to make a bomb, said one of the authors, William Walker, a professor at the University of St. Andrews in Scotland.

"The controls of this material have to be absolutely watertight," he told a news conference today.

Iraq's nuclear weapons program before the Persian Gulf War showed that having just 44 pounds of nuclear material "can create a major crisis in an unstable region," Walker said.

Yet, according to the study, less than 1 percent of the material produced for military purposes is under international verification, leaving inventories susceptible to diversion and theft.

"And especially in Russia, but not only in Russia ... we don't know precisely what the size of the inventories are. They are under-protected and they are under-regulated," Walker said.

The study's other authors are David Albright, president of the Washington-based Institute for Science and International Security, and Frans Berkhout of the Science Policy Research Unit at Sussex University in England.

Their survey found that 1,750 tons of highly enriched uranium and 230 tons of plutonium have been produced for military purposes.

The authors estimate that less than 400 tons are now required to sustain the nuclear arsenals of the five declared nuclear powers -- the United States, Russia, Britain, France and China.

That means 1,600 tons can be counted as excess, they said.

An additional 1,000 tons of plutonium has been produced in civilian nuclear power reactors, and these stocks continue to grow at the rate of 70 tons annually, the authors said.

Albright said dealing with the problems of nuclear materials requires both technical and political solutions but the political ones are often the hardest.

"There's so much secrecy in this area that it inhibits the ability to come up with politically acceptable solutions to these problems," he said.

The authors said Clinton and Yeltsin should remove obstacles to the immediate opening of negotiations on a treaty to ban further production of weapons-grade uranium and plutonium.

The two presidents also should accelerate programs to reduce stockpiles and negotiate a new treaty that would open their massive surpluses to international inspection, the authors said.

The study provides a comprehensive assessment of Iraq's pre-Gulf War nuclear weapons program and notes that Iraq retains extensive expertise and ambition to reconstitute it.

North Korea's stock of plutonium remains unknown, which poses a threat to implementation of the U.S.-brokered agreement to freeze the country's nuclear program, the study said.

Although the five nuclear weapon states have ended production of weapons-grade material, the study noted that production is continuing in Israel and India.

RTw 03/13 0838 Yeltsin goes to Helsinki summit with hopes high

By Timothy Heritage

MOSCOW, March 13 (Reuter) - President Boris Yeltsin heads for next week's Russia-U.S. summit in Helsinki ready to talk tough but with high hopes of a breakthrough over NATO's eastward expansion plans.

He is also confident of proving he is firmly in charge in the Kremlin after illness following a strong performance in the last week which has dispelled fears that the talks with U.S. President Bill Clinton on March 19 and 20 might be postponed.

"The talks will be as concrete as possible, firm and even tough because we are talking about protecting Russia's national interests," presidential press secretary Sergei Yastrzhembsky said in a radio interview on Thursday.

"We will see how ready U.S. partners are to put on paper the things they have been saying so nicely."

Yeltsin's return to the Kremlin has coincided with a spell of frenetic diplomacy between Moscow, NATO and Washington and what diplomats call a new realism in Russian diplomacy.

Officials on all sides now see a way opening to progress in the row over NATO's planned enlargement into eastern and central Europe which seemed unlikely at the start of this year.

"We have agreed to look for a compromise and I think we will find this compromise at the summit," the 66-year-old Kremlin leader declared late last month.

A Russian foreign ministry spokesman also expressed hope of progress at a briefing on Thursday.

Russian officials and Western diplomats in Moscow have declined to give firm details of what form any breakthrough might take, saying much depends on a last-minute trip to Washington this weekend by Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov

Any progress in Helsinki will not mean a final deal to bury Russia's concerns over the Western defence alliance's expansion into former communist-ruled eastern and central Europe. That is more likely closer to a NATO Summit in Madrid in July.

Moscow has kept up a barrage of opposition to the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation's enlargement, saying it threatens its security and would open new divisions in Europe.

The tough language is partly intended to satisfy Yeltsin's nationalist and communist opponents, who opposed NATO expansion in a resolution adopted by the lower house of parliament on Wednesday.

Western diplomats say Moscow has finally accepted behind the scenes that expansion will go ahead and has at last set out what it wants as the terms of enlargement.

"Russia has shown it is willing to compromise. I hope NATO will do the same," said Pavel Kandel, a foreign affairs expert at Moscow's Institute of Europe.

Yeltsin is expected to demand that any agreement with NATO is binding and must be ratified by all members of the alliance, and that NATO does not move nuclear missiles or its military infrastructure into new member states.

He is also expected to demand that a mechanism be created for giving Russia a say in issues touching on its security and may push for guarantees that NATO expansion will stop at the former Soviet Union's borders.

Yeltsin may also seek Russia's full membership of the Group of Seven industrial powers, but this is resisted by some members of the elite group.

Arms control will also be on the agenda, including limits on conventional weapons in Europe, and Yeltsin will seek assurances from Clinton that Washington is not developing weaponry that might violate the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty.

Economic issues will also be on the agenda but have received little attention in public in Moscow.

Another important issue, although not on any agenda, is Yeltsin's health. But his recovery in the last few weeks from pneumonia and the heart problems which forced him to have surgery on November 5 has already helped ease concern.

He looked firm on his feet when he stood for 25 minutes to deliver a speech to parliament on March 6 and has announced a major shake-up of the government to reassert his authority.

Helsinki provides the perfect stage to confirm his recovery. It will be his first trip abroad since China and Kazakhstan last April and his longest talks with a Western leader since his re-election last July, probably lasting more than three hours.

From: Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005

Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 Fax: 202 898 0172

<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

From dh3m@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de Thu Mar 13 17:15:42 1997

Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 19:52:53 +0100 (CET)

From: Martin Kalinowski <dh3m@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de>

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Subject: conference against nuclear energy and weapons in space

[The following text is in the "ISO-8859-1" character set]

[Your display is set for the "US-ASCII" character set]

[Some characters may be displayed incorrectly]

Announcement of the Symposium

Peace in Outer Space?

The Ambivalence of Space Technology

March 20/21, 1997

at the Technical University of Darmstadt

Cooperatively organized by

- IANUS (local host)
- Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space
- Friedens- und Begegnungsstelle Mutlangen
- International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation (INESAP)
- Naturwissenschaftler Initiative Verantwortung für den Frieden

Programme of the Scientific Workshop on Thursday, March 20:

organized by IANUS and INESAP

1. Weapons and Space (9:00-10:30 am)

- a) Goetz Neuneck (ISFH, Hamburg):
Counterproliferation, missile defense and the ABM treaty
- b) Karl Grossman (State University, New York):
The U.S. government's agenda to weaponize space

2. Dual-use of Space Technology (11:00-12:30 am)

- Bernd W. Kubbig (PRIF, Frankfurt):
The planned European military satellite programmes
HELIOS II and HORUS: Are they necessary for
early warning of future conflicts?
- b) Wulf von Kries (DLR, Cologne):
Legal and political dimensions of military spaceflight
- c) Bruce Gagnon (Global Network Against Weapons and
Nuclear Power in Space, Florida):
NASA's future vision for space

3. Power Supply for Deep Space Missions (2:00-4:00 pm)

- a) Martin Kalinowski (IANUS, Institut fuer Kernphysik, Darmstadt):
Safety aspects of nuclear space projects - the Cassini case
- b) Gerhard Strobel (ASE, Heilbronn):
New developments in solar power for deep space missions

4. Resumee (4:30-6:00 pm)

Juergen Scheffran (IANUS/INESAP, Darmstadt):
Future space technology use and control

□
--

=====
=====

Martin Kalinowski, IANUS, c/o Institut fuer Kernphysik
 Schlossgartenstr. 9, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany
 Tel.: +49-6151-163016 FAX: +49-6151-166039
 Internet, private: KALINOWSKI@HRZPUB.TH-DARMSTADT.DE
 Internet, group: IANUS@HRZPUB.TH-DARMSTADT.DE
<http://www.th-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/welcome.htm> and
[.../inesap.htm](http://www.th-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/welcome.htm)

=====
=====

□

From int@fme.knooppunt.be Thu Mar 13 17:15:42 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 20:54:27
From: Pol D'Huyvetter <int@fme.knooppunt.be>
To: a-days@knooppunt.be
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: NVDA in Germany

=====
Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days (NWAD) 1997
An International Campaign to uphold International Law
with Non-Violent Actions of Civil Defence

July 8th - NATO Summit Madrid
August 6th - NATO HQ Brussels
August 9th at 'sites of crime'
=====

Dear fellow Abolitionists,

We are encouraging people to post messages as the one forwarded on
<a-days@knooppunt.be>.

Announcements, reports, and legal follow-up of non-violent direct
actions referring to the ICJ decision of July 8th 1996 will be
followed with care by activists and lawyers.

Thank you for your assistance,

Pol D'Huyvetter
contact
Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days 1997
For Mother Earth International Office

FORWARDED MAIL -----
From: cnd@gn.apc.org (The CND staff team)
Date: 13 Mar 97
Originally To: int@fme.knooppunt.be

INSPECTION OF N-WEAPONS STORE IN BUCHEL 18-20.4.97 Since letters and
other representatives to the German Govt have been ignored a team of
citizens will assist the authorities and inspect the site at Buchel,
near Koblenz, where nuclear weapons are stored and Tornado pilots
are trained to transport and drop US atom bombs. Their action follows
the

ICJ 8.7.96 Opinion.

Contacts: Roland Blach, Gewaltfreie Aktion Atomwaffen Abschaffen (Non-
Violent Action to Abolish Nukes), Bebelstr. 24, 70806 Kornwestheim,
Germany

Tel: (0) 7154 22026

Sources: Pax Report, Jan 97; Friedens Forum. Jan/Feb 97

In Peace and friendship,

Eirlys

The CND staff team (cnd@gn.apc.org)
Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament
162 Holloway Road
LONDON
N7 8DQ
tel: (uk)171 700 2393
fax: (uk)171 700 2357

Web Site <http://www.cnduk.org/cnd>
visit the CND General Election site via the 'Press & Parliamentary' page

CND is part of ABOLITION 2000 - A global network to eliminate nuclear weapons

From rwilcock@execulink.com Thu Mar 13 17:15:42 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 16:42:33 -0500
From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>
To: "Abolition Caucus List (E-mail)" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>
Subject: FW: Interesting news from the hill...

FYI
Ross Wilcock
rwilcock@web.net
<http://web.net.pgs/~pgs/>

-----Original Message-----
From: Joanne Neuber [SMTP:joanne@aiha.com]
Sent: None
To: nis-health@igc.org
Subject: Interesting news from the hill...

U.S. ADMINISTRATION WANTS TO INCREASE AID TO FORMER SOVIET UNION. In testimony to Congress on 11 March, Ambassador Richard Morningstar called for a 44% increase in U.S. aid to the Newly Independent States next year. Aid spending would rise from \$625 million in 1997 to \$900 million in 1998, while spending on Russia alone would go from \$95 million to \$225 million. Total U.S. aid to the NIS peaked at \$2.5 billion in 1994, falling to \$850 million in 1995 and \$641 million in 1996. Rep. Benjamin Gilman, chairman of the House International Relations Committee, said he was doubtful Congress would support the requested increase, Reuters reported. Gilman said "We do not have any kind of 'partnership' at this point with the current government in Moscow," and objected to the idea of increasing aid in return for Russian acquiescence in NATO expansion. Morningstar said the aid program "has nothing to do with NATO expansion," VOA reported.-Peter Rutland

From DCulp@nrdc.org Fri Mar 14 04:48:19 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 20:47:11 -0500
From: David Culp <DCulp@nrdc.org>
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: CWC Meeting with Religious Community

Howard --

Here is the list of people to whom I sent invitations. If there are other people who you think should get invited, please give them a call. I am unlikely to have time tomorrow to fax out more invitations.

I would greatly appreciate it if you would make some calls Monday afternoon and Tuesday morning to encourage attendance. Ken Myers should be a good draw.

If you have time, you might want to come over to the CWC-CTBT Days training session on Sunday. We will be at the Marvin Center at George Washington University, 800 21st St., N.W., from 9:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.

We will have about 140 people coming from 35 states. It is going to be a great event.

Thanks for all your help!

Stan Hasteley, Alliance of Baptists
745-7609
Jeanette Holt, Alliance of Baptists
745-7609
Curtis Ramsey-Lucas, American Baptist Churches USA
544-3400
James H. Matlack, American Friends Service Committee
483-3341
John Harvey, Church of the Brethren
546-3202
Nancy Chupp, Church Women United
544-8747
Ann Delorey, Church Women United
544-8747
Ted Keating, Conference of Major Superiors of Men (301)
588-4030
Father Robert J. Brooks, Episcopal Church
547-7300
Mary Miller, Episcopal Peace Fellowship
783-3380
Kathy Guthrie, Friends Committee on National Legislation
547-6000
Bridget Moix, Friends Committee on National Legislation
547-6000
Joe Volk, Friends Committee on National Legislation

547-6000
Laurie O'Bryon, Jesuit Social Ministries
462-0400
Mark Brown, Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs
626-7932
Terence W. Miller, Maryknoll Justice & Peace Office
832-1780
Daryl Byler, Mennonite Central Committee
544-6564
Howard Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice (301)
896-0013
Lisa Wright, National Council of Churches
544-2350
Richelle Friedman, PBVM, NETWORK
547-5556, ext. 17
Barbara Green, Presbyterian Church (USA)
543-1126
William Yolton, Presbyterian Peace Fellowship
(703) 360-3657
Shara Abraham, Union of American Hebrew Congregations
387-2800
Jay Lintner, United Church of Christ
543-1517
Rameen Zahed, United Church of Christ
543-1517
Robin Ringler, United Methodist Gen. Bd. of Church and Society
488-5647
Jerry Powers, U.S. Catholic Conference
541-3196

From DCulp@nrdc.org Fri Mar 14 04:48:19 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 23:11:10 -0500
From: David Culp <DCulp@nrdc.org>
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Earlier Meeting Invite

Howard --

I did find the invitation for the earlier meeting on my computer.
It
is attached as a WordPerfect 5.1 (DOS) file.

David

[Part 2, "attachment; filename="hallman.doc"
Application/MSWORD 5.8KB]
[Unable to print this part]

From spearce@igc.apc.org Fri Mar 14 04:48:19 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 20:51:24 -0800 (PST)
From: Suzanne Pearce <spearce@igc.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

Cc: spearce@igc.org
Subject: Boston coalition supports CWC

ABOLISHING WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

Boston citizens' coalition urges ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention.

On March 8, participants in the day-long conference "You and the U.N.: Journey Toward Peoples Governance" organized by the Coalition for a Strong United Nations approved a resolution calling for U.S. ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention. This resolution was drafted out of a workshop on the topic of citizens working to abolish weapons of mass destruction. We are posting this on the abolition-caucus list because we think many people on the list understand how the political challenge of getting the CWC ratified is tied to the next challenge of getting the CTB ratified, and further down the line the herculean task of gaining acceptance for a nuclear abolition treaty. We are sending it to key senators and also to the governors of the states with chemical weapons stockpiles (Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Oregon and Utah). We hope that all of you on the abolition-caucus list will respond to this urgent issue and spread the appeal further.

Suzanne Pearce, for the Task Force on Common Security of the United Nations.
Coalition for a Strong United Nations.
To contact the Coalition office - call 617 576-3871 or send email to wfane@aol.com

Resolution Approved Unanimously
Coalition for a Strong United Nations
Conference, JF Kennedy Library
Boston, MA
March 8, 1997

Support for Ratification of Chemical Weapons Convention
and Safe, Environmentally Sound Destruction of
Chemical Weapons Stockpiles

WHEREAS, 160 nations have signed the Chemical Weapons Convention banning

the development, production, stockpiling, and use of chemical weapons;

WHEREAS, 67 signatories have now ratified the Convention, surpassing the threshold of 65 needed for entry into force;

WHEREAS, the Chemical Weapons Convention will enter into force on April 29, 1997, 180 days after its 65th ratification;

WHEREAS, the United States was one of the original signers of the convention in January 1993 and has unilaterally committed to full elimination of its 31,000 tons of chemical weapons;

WHEREAS, the Chemical Weapons Convention will globally ban a whole class of mass destruction weapons and thereby improve American and world security;

WHEREAS, the convention has been supported by a large bipartisan group of Senators, Representatives, military and other officials;

WHEREAS, former President George Bush has declared that "my longstanding commitment to banning chemical weapons has been shared by many others, on both sides of the aisle;"

WHEREAS, General Norman Schwarzkopf stated before the U.S. Senate in January 1997: "I'm very, very much in favor of the ratification of that treaty;"

WHEREAS, General John M. Shalikashvili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Colin Powell, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Elmo Zumwalt Jr., former Chief of Naval Operations, and General Brent Scowcroft, former National Security Advisor, among many others, all support ratification;

WHEREAS, ratification before entry into force on April 29, 1997 will afford the U.S. the opportunity to participate in the convention's management, implementation, and inspection regime;

WHEREAS, Senator Richard Lugar introduced on January 21, 1997 a Sense of the Senate Resolution on the Chemical Weapons Convention;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that the Coalition for a Strong United

Nations
and its members and supporters (hereinafter "Coalition") do hereby
support the timely U.S. ratification of the Chemical Weapons
Convention
and will appeal to the U.S. Senate through Majority Leader Trent
Lott
for a vote of ratification before the April 29, 1997 deadline;

BE IT ALSO RESOLVED, that the Coalition will contact Senators Edward
Kennedy and John Kerry to urge them to exert strong leadership to
bring
the CWC to the Senate floor for a positive vote of ratification before
April 29th; and,

BE IT ALSO RESOLVED, that the Coalition does hereby commit to work
towards the full destruction of all stockpiles worldwide, including
the
nine major U.S. and seven Russian CW stockpile sites, as well as
elimination and cleanup of all suspected buried CW sites, of all
production facilities, of all binary chemical weapons,
and other related CW materials in the most cost-effective, safe,
and
environmentally sound manner possible.

From int@fme.knooppunt.beFri Mar 14 04:48:19 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Mar 1997 05:57:28
From: Pol D'Huyvetter <int@fme.knooppunt.be>
To: induran@knooppunt.be, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: NPT PrepComm : Name the Indigenous Nations and Peoples (fwd)

Hello,

I forward following important request for info from Mary Olson.

A call for information about Indigenous Peoples affected by uranium
mining in past, present and future.

Mary Olson and myself will be present at the Nuclear Non-Proliferation
Treaty (NPT) PrepComm, and will follow meetings of Abolition 2000
at and around the UN in New York City next April 7-18.

An important moment towards nuclear disarmament (NPT Art. 6) and
to
demand the halt of the promotion of nuclear energy (NPT Art. 4) by
the United Nations International Atomic Energy Agency (Vienna),
and the creation of a UN International Clean Energy Agency.

Birds in the sky - fish in the water - uranium in the ground

Who can help us to fact-sheets ??

Please keep us informed through <induran@knooppunt.be>

Peace,

Pol

FORWARDED MAIL -----

From: maryo@igc.apc.org (Mary Olson)
Date: 13 Mar 97
Originally To: int@fme.knooppunt.be

Hi Pol-- I am thinking about a project for the IAEA panel at the UN on April 9th -- I get to be the "discussant" on a panel giving a 40 year "report card" on the peaceful atom -- really quite the opportunity... the project is this: I would like to compile the names of all the Indigenous People/Peoples that are affected by the uranium fuel chain. I don't know if I will have the opportunity to speak them all, but I would like to make a simple list and have copies available... with recognition given to the fact that radiation affects all human beings and all living things. Can you help?

I am also interested in hearing from folks what their current IAEA issues are -- the time I have will be limited, but I am honored to represent the NGO who has the task of speaking truth on that day, and people's thoughts are welcome.

Mary Olson
Mary Olson
Nuclear Information & Resource Service
1424 16th St. NW Suite 404 Washington, DC 20036
voice: (202)328-0002 fax: (202)462-2183
maryo@igc.apc.org website: www.nirs.org

From abolition@motherearth.knooppunt.be Fri Mar 14 04:48:19 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Mar 97 09:30:25 +0100
From: Motherearth Office Bel <abolition@motherearth.knooppunt.be>
Reply to: krista@motherearth.knooppunt.be
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Cc: fme@knooppunt.be
Subject: good news!!Nuclear convoy stopped on Hadrians

From: cndscot@dial.pipex.com (Scottish CND)
Subject: Nuclear convoy stopped on Hadrians wall

Nuclear convoy stopped on Hadrian's wall

A group of anti-nuclear protesters, many from Scotland, stopped a nuclear weapons convoy on the site of Hadrian's Wall, 8 miles West of Newcastle on Wednesday 26th February. The convoy was brought to a halt as it left Albermarle Barracks, heading towards Scotland. Fifty demonstrators carried Scottish flags and were beating drums. Many were dressed in tartan

and wearing blue and white face paint. Ten chained themselves onto the lorries to prevent them from moving, three were locked underneath the vehicles. Others climbed onto the roof. Nine people were arrested.

"We are standing on the site of Hadrian's wall to keep Trident out of Scotland. We have travelled down here to show that the people of Scotland will never accept these barbaric and illegal weapons of mass destruction. If a Scottish parliament had control over this issue it would not allow these weapons in Scotland, they are being forced on us against our will."

Said John Ainslie, Administrator of the Scottish Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament.

The convoy was carrying nuclear warheads for Trident submarines which are based on the Clyde. There are probably ten warheads in the convoy, each of which is eight times more powerful than atom bomb which destroyed Hiroshima. The number of bombs deployed North of the border is dramatically increasing. Scottish CND estimates that there were 100 atom bombs on the Clyde in 1992 and there could be 300 by next year. From 1998 onwards all British nuclear weapons will be based in Scotland.

Many of who took part in the protest live at Faslane Peace Camp, outside the nuclear submarine base. In addition to those from Scotland, other people from the North of England joined in the demonstration.

There is a photo of the protest at

<http://ds.dial.pipex.com/cndscot/news/970227.htm>

.....
this message was send to you by
Krist@

*For Mother Earth Belgium
Gewad 15 9000 Gent Belgium
tel +32-9-2334924 fax 2337302
<http://www.knooppunt.be/~fme>

*PIANO: Praha International Anti Nuclear Office
Chvalova 3 Praha 3 13000 Praha Czech Republic
NEW tel +42-2-90031895
<http://www.ecn.cz/private/piano>
(info on Temelin and ACTIONS in july 97!)

always reply to: krista@motherearth.knooppunt.be
unless you are sure I am @ PIANO: piano@ecn.cz
.....

End of forwarded message.

From DCulp@nrdc.orgFri Mar 14 04:48:19 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 20:47:11 -0500
From: David Culp <DCulp@nrdc.org>
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: CWC Meeting with Religious Community

Howard --

Here is the list of people to whom I sent invitations. If there are other people who you think should get invited, please give them a call. I am unlikely to have time tomorrow to fax out more invitations.

I would greatly appreciate it if you would make some calls Monday afternoon and Tuesday morning to encourage attendance. Ken Myers should be a good draw.

If you have time, you might want to come over to the CWC-CTBT Days training session on Sunday. We will be at the Marvin Center at George Washington University, 800 21st St., N.W., from 9:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. We will have about 140 people coming from 35 states. It is going to be a great event.

Thanks for all your help!

Stan Hasteley, Alliance of Baptists	745-7609	
Jeanette Holt, Alliance of Baptists	745-7609	
Curtis Ramsey-Lucas, American Baptist Churches USA		544-3400
James H. Matlack, American Friends Service Committee		483-3341
John Harvey, Church of the Brethren	546-3202	
Nancy Chupp, Church Women United	544-8747	
Ann Delorey, Church Women United	544-8747	
Ted Keating, Conference of Major Superiors of Men		
(301) 588-4030		
Father Robert J. Brooks, Episcopal Church	547-7300	
Mary Miller, Episcopal Peace Fellowship	783-3380	
Kathy Guthrie, Friends Committee on National Legislation		
547-6000		
Bridget Moix, Friends Committee on National Legislation		
547-6000		
Joe Volk, Friends Committee on National Legislation		
547-6000		
Laurie O'Bryon, Jesuit Social Ministries	462-0400	
Mark Brown, Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs		626-7932
Terence W. Miller, Maryknoll Justice & Peace Office		832-1780
Daryl Byler, Mennonite Central Committee	544-6564	
Howard Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice		
(301) 896-0013		
Lisa Wright, National Council of Churches	544-2350	
Richelle Friedman, PBVM, NETWORK	547-5556, ext. 17	
Barbara Green, Presbyterian Church (USA)	543-1126	

William Yolton, Presbyterian Peace Fellowship (703) 360-3657
Shara Abraham, Union of American Hebrew Congregations
387-2800
Jay Lintner, United Church of Christ 543-1517
Rameen Zahed, United Church of Christ 543-1517
Robin Ringler, United Methodist Gen. Bd. of Church and Society
488-5647
Jerry Powers, U.S. Catholic Conference 541-3196

From DCulp@nrdc.orgFri Mar 14 04:48:19 1997
Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 23:11:10 -0500
From: David Culp <DCulp@nrdc.org>
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Earlier Meeting Invite

Howard --

I did find the invitation for the earlier meeting on my computer.
It
is attached as a WordPerfect 5.1 (DOS) file.

David

[Part 2, "attachment; filename="hallman.doc"
Application/MSWORD 5.8KB]
[Unable to print this part]

From cnd@gn.apc.org Sun Mar 16 13:53:34 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Mar 1997 13:24:19 GMT
From: The CND staff team <cnd@gn.apc.org>
To: cndscot@dial.pipex.com, cndyorks@gn.apc.org,
jbbloomfield@gn.apc.org,
 adiroche@indigo.ie, midsomerset.cnd@ukonline.co.uk,
 stephen@congress.demon.co.uk, 106351.1634@CompuServe.COM,
 mfrisch@gn.apc.org, Jenny.Wmcnd@btinternet.com,
nan@gn.apc.org,
 nfznscc@gn.apc.org
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, disarmament@igc.apc.org,
CTB@igc.apc.org,
 npotech@infomanage.com,
alt.activism.nuclear-test.d@igc.apc.org,
 basic.press@conf.gn.apc.org, basic.prolifer@conf.gn.apc.org,
 end.convention@conf.gn.apc.org, motherearth@conf.gn.apc.org,
 ctb.clips@conf.gn.apc.org, basic.europe@conf.gn.apc.org,
 ippnw.campaign@conf.gn.apc.org, nfla.news@conf.gn.apc.org,
 fhit.newstr@conf.gn.apc.org
Subject: UK GENERAL ELECTION - web site update

UK GENERAL ELECTION

CND have updated their web site with information about the
CND - General
Election Campaign.

The new pages include information about key nuclear issues to ask
Prospective Parliamentary Candidates, a map of nuclear sites and
transport
routes in the UK and details of the main parties election manifestos.

There is a message from Dave Knight - CND Chair, outlining the
challenge
facing the next government. (The article first appeared in the Spring
1997/1
issue of CND's membership magazine CND Today)

CND have also teamed up with GreenNet & Charter 88 with a web site
that
provides 'visitors' with details of 'Who Wants My Vote?' and
information
about each organisations campaigning activities in their
constituency. The
visitor simply enters their post code to release this information.

The CND staff team (cnd@gn.apc.org)
Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament
162 Holloway Road
LONDON
N7 8DQ
tel: (uk)171 700 2393
fax: (uk)171 700 2357

Web Site <http://www.cnduk.org/cnd>
visit the CND General Election site via the 'Press & Parliamentary'
page

CND is part of ABOLITION 2000 - A global network to eliminate nuclear
weapons

From nfzns@gn.apc.orgSun Mar 16 13:53:34 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Mar 1997 13:50:46 GMT
From: Stewart Kemp <nfzns@gn.apc.org>
To: nfla.news@conf.gn.apc.org
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: UK Nuclear News 13 March 1997

>From: GMR@MCR1.poptel.org.uk
>Date: Thu, 13 Mar 1997 14:49:17 GMT
>Subject: NPU Bull;etin 13 Mar
>To: nfzns@gn.apc.org
>
>DAILY INFORMATION BULLETIN - NUCLEAR POLICY
>
>Thurs 13 Mar 1997
>
>97-8293 AEA Technology forming 50-50 joint venture company with
> Sumitomo of Japan to provide services to owners of ageing
> n/reactors. T
>97-8294 Director of Brookhaven National Laboratory in US to retire
> following row over leak of tritium. NewSc 15 Mar
>97-8295 Japan admits 'inadequate' handling of accident in n/waste

> works: accident reinforces people's distrust of
> n/technology. Ind,T
>97-8296 France's highest court refuses to allow Superphenix reactor
to
> be converted to research site and n/waste incinerator.
NewSc
> 15 Mar
>97-8297 Howe told that Gulf war veterans have been intimidated and
> harassed by people they believe to be officials. Ind
>97-8298 Britain has left itself open to an electronic attack on
> critical computer systems ('Information Warfare'), unlike
US.
> Christopher Bellamy reports. Ind
>
>
>GM Research, Metropolitan House, Hobson Street, Oldham, OL1 1QD.
>Tel: 0161-911 4179. Fax: 0161-627 1736.
>Internet: gmr@mcr1.poptel.org.uk
>
>

Stewart Kemp (nfzns@gn.apc.org)
From nfzns@gn.apc.orgSun Mar 16 13:53:34 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Mar 1997 13:50:37 GMT

From: Stewart Kemp <nfznscc@gn.apc.org>
To: Graham Daniell <gdaniell@wt.com.au>
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, ellen.sharp@Leeds.Gov.Uk
Subject: Re: Cities Resolution

Graham,

I will ask Leeds City Council to send you the half dozen or so UK councils which have backed the Local Authorities Resolution. In so far as the organisation of UK NFLAs have endorsed the abolition 2000 original statement, you could say our membership of 117 councils is behind it.

Good wishes

Stewart Kemp

so Is there a list somewhere of the Cities which have so far adopted the Cities

>Resolution?

>

>Hoping someone can help.

>Towards a nuclear-free millennium,

>Graham Daniell

>Perth, Western Australia

>gdaniell@wt.com.au

>

>

>

Stewart Kemp (nfznscc@gn.apc.org)

From sfcny@igc.apc.orgSun Mar 16 13:53:34 1997

Date: Fri, 14 Mar 1997 07:17:53 -0800 (PST)

From: SANE/Freeze of Central New York <sfcny@igc.apc.org>

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, induran@knooppunt.be, int@fme.knooppunt.be

Subject: Re: NPT PrepComm : Name the Indigenous Nations and Peoples (fwd)

In response for the request for info on peoples affected by uranium - do you know

Claus Biegart, journalist from Munich, Germany, who organized the World

Uranium Hearing in Ger// in Austria in 1991? That was a gathering of indigenous

peoples from around the world and others concerned. The address I have for

the World Uranium Hearing in Munchen is:

Praterinsel 4 D-8000 Munchen 22. I am not sure if they are still in that office.

They produced a booklet, a global survey of uranium mining, atomic

bomb tests,
and nuclear waste storage.

There was also a US contact, Paul Brown, at 100 West 12th St. 3-s, NY,
NY 10011
212-627-4846. I will try to locate DDmore info as to how they can
be reached
now. I hope this helps.

Diane Swords
Peace Action of Central New York
From LCNP@aol.com Sun Mar 16 13:53:34 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Mar 1997 13:12:06 -0500 (EST)
From: LCNP@aol.com
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Cc: peace-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: World Court Opinion; US Congress Sign-On Letter

US House of Representatives member Major Owens has initiated a House
sign-on
letter on follow-up to the World Court opinion, and also referring
to the
NPT, CTBT and Generals and Admirals statement.

The text is below.

Action: Ask your congressional representative to sign on to the
letter.

March 14, 1997

The Honorable Bill Clinton
President
The White House
Washington DC 20500

Dear Mr President

On December 5, 1996, General Lee Butler (Ret.) and over 50 other
generals and
admirals released a statement that "the continuing existence of
nuclear
weapons in the armories of nuclear powers, and the ever present threat
of
acquisition of these weapons by others, constitutes a peril to global
peace
and security and to the safety and survival of the people we are
dedicated to
protect." They noted that "in the post-Cold War security environment,
the
most commonly postulated nuclear threats are not susceptible to
deterrence or
are simply not credible." The statement concluded that the threat
will not

finally recede "...unless nuclear weapons are eliminated."

On July 8, 1996, the International Court of Justice (ICJ), in response to a request from the United Nations, concluded that "the threat or use of nuclear weapons would generally be contrary to the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict", 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 under strict and effective international control."

On December 10, 1996, the United Nations General Assembly adopted resolution 51/45 M following up on the ICJ decision. The UN called for the beginning in 1997 of negotiations leading to the conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention which would prohibit the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination.

This letter is designed to respectfully urge you to enhance the security of the United States and respond to the decision of the ICJ by:

i) Initiating a review of nuclear policy to consider which aspects of current policy may need to be modified in order to conform with our obligations to adhere to international humanitarian law as indicated by the Court.

ii) Initiating negotiations for nuclear disarmament in all its aspects leading to the conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention.

If the U.S. does not take the lead in negotiating to achieve complete nuclear disarmament, other steps towards disarmament such as the Non Proliferation Treaty and Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), may unravel. Certain non-nuclear countries have indicated that if the nuclear states do not implement their obligations under the NPT, they may reconsider their membership of the NPT. India has stated that they refuse to sign the CTBT until the Nuclear Weapon States announce their willingness to negotiate a

program for complete nuclear disarmament, and without India the CTBT will not be able to enter into force.

Mr President, at the 51st United Nations General Assembly you spoke about the desirability of a 21st Century free from the threat of nuclear weapons. We call upon you to make such a dream real.

Sincerely yours,

Major R Owens
Member of Congress
From LCNP@aol.comSun Mar 16 13:53:34 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Mar 1997 13:10:32 -0500 (EST)
From: LCNP@aol.com
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Cc: peace-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: NPT briefing

NPT Prep Com 1997: An Opportunity for Nuclear Disarmament

A Briefing Paper for Delegations to the 1997 Non Proliferation Treaty Preparatory Committee Meeting

Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy

Summary

The Non Proliferation Treaty Preparatory Committee Meeting (NPT Prep Com) in New York, April 7-18, provides an opportunity to make further progress in implementing the Article VI obligation to pursue negotiations in good faith on nuclear disarmament.

States parties to the NPT should take the following steps to make the most of this opportunity:

1. Call for negotiations to begin in 1997 leading to the conclusion of a Nuclear Weapons Convention, which would provide for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons under international verification and control,
2. Call for the immediate implementation by the nuclear weapon States of the initial disarmament steps recommended by the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, the Generals and Admirals Statement and the Group of 21,
3. Establish an intersessional working group on nuclear disarmament,
4. Remind the nuclear weapon States that if progress is not made towards complete nuclear disarmament, the non-proliferation regime is likely to unravel.

Nuclear Weapons Convention

The only complete security against the use of nuclear weapons is their complete elimination under an international treaty which would provide for international verification and control. The International Court of Justice,

on July 8, 1996, declared unanimously 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."

On July 9, the day after the ICJ's decision, Philippines President Ramos called for "the immediate convening of the states parties to the Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty to negotiate a comprehensive Nuclear Weapons Convention pursuant to their obligation and responsibility under Article VI of the said treaty."

United Nations General Assembly resolution 51/45M, welcoming the ICJ opinion, called upon all States "...to fulfill that obligation by commencing multilateral negotiations in 1997 leading to an early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention..."

Such negotiations could include a step-by-step approach, i.e. the negotiation of steps towards nuclear disarmament, as long as the final objective is constantly in view and under consideration.

There is no reason for the nuclear States not to begin such negotiations. Any concerns regarding verification, security, technical questions etc... would be discussed in the negotiations.

An international consortium of lawyers, disarmament experts and scientists is currently drafting a Model Nuclear Weapons Convention which addresses the security and verification concerns surrounding nuclear disarmament, and outlines a regime for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. A discussion draft of the Model NWC will be released during the NPT Prep Com. First Steps

Immediate steps towards nuclear disarmament which the nuclear weapon States should take have been recently recommended by the Canberra Commission for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, and in the Generals and Admirals Statement.

Adopting these steps would move the world back from the nuclear precipice and set the scene for concluding a nuclear weapons convention.

These steps include:

- * Taking nuclear forces off alert
- * Removing warheads from delivery vehicles
- * Ending deployment of non-strategic nuclear weapons
- * Negotiating further reductions in nuclear stockpiles
- * Concluding agreements on no-first-use of nuclear weapons and non-use against non-nuclear weapons States.

The Group of 21 recommended additional immediate steps including:

- * Closure of all nuclear test sites
- * Ending nuclear weapons research and modernization
- * Ending the production of nuclear warheads

Principles and Objectives

The 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference adopted a set of principles and objectives for implementing the treaty. These included calls for concluding a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty no later than 1996, and for further steps towards the elimination of nuclear weapons.

The nuclear weapon States should be made to report on progress they have made towards elimination of nuclear weapons and what next steps they are planning to take. In addition, the 1997 NPT Prep Com should update and strengthen the principles and objectives along the lines of the first steps indicated above.

Intersessional working group

In 1995, the NPT Review and Extension Conference adopted a resolution on Strengthening the Review Process for the Treaty, which "agreed that subsidiary bodies could be established...for specific issues relevant to the Treaty, so as to provide for a focused consideration of such issues."

The 1997 Prep Com should establish an intersessional working group to undertake substantive work towards the elimination of nuclear weapons.

The working group would need to meet between Prep Coms as the time necessary for the work would be much longer than would be available at the

Prep Coms.

The working group's agenda could include:

- i) consideration of a program for nuclear disarmament culminating in a nuclear weapons convention,
- ii) consideration of verification measures necessary for a nuclear weapons convention.

A working group on nuclear disarmament is especially important at this time because the Conference on Disarmament has been unable to establish an ad hoc working group on nuclear disarmament as requested by several UN General Assembly resolutions including Resolution 50/70 P, and Resolution 51/45 O.

Nuclear Disarmament is necessary to prevent proliferation

The refusal of certain States to join the NPT or Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty because of the lack of action by the nuclear weapons States towards nuclear abolition demonstrates the direct link between nuclear disarmament and non proliferation.

The Canberra Commission concluded that "The possession of nuclear weapons by any states is a constant stimulus to other states to acquire them."

The Nuclear weapons States have not yet recognized this link. They have expressed considerable concern about the prospect of nuclear proliferation, including the possibility of States withdrawing from the NPT, but have not expressed any hurry to get rid of their own weapons.

The nuclear weapons States should be reminded that if they don't agree to negotiate the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, as they are obligated to do under Article VI, other countries may reconsider their commitment to non-acquisition of nuclear weapons.

Mexico, for example, has made statements to this effect to the International Court of Justice, Conference on Disarmament and United Nations General Assembly.

From rwilcock@execulink.comSun Mar 16 13:53:34 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Mar 1997 13:21:32 -0500
From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>
To: 'Pol D'Huyvetter' <int@fme.knooppunt.be>,
"induran@knooppunt.be" <induran@knooppunt.be>,
"abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>
Subject: RE: NPT PrepComm : Name the Indigenous Nations and Peoples
(fwd)

There seem to be problems of this kind also in Canada, at least going by a recent newspaper comment that requires further investigation.

I have begun a new item via our WWW Abolition 2000 section called The Nuclear Legacy and I welcome input, links and advice about this difficult problem area. The intent is to provide responsible and reliable scientific information, not to conduct some kind of funeral. Discussing recently with a scientific expert about what should be done about nuclear power I found that the critical issue in his mind was whether militarism can be laid to rest. Power stations as potential accidents is a problem that can be addressed, but power stations as military targets is a problem of a different kind.

In fact these problems also impinge on the whole problem of global pollution which according to System Dynamics Monitoring models is proportional to total global human population levels. This leads inexorably to the predictions of impeding food supply dilemmas. A recent review of the World Three Model (used by the Club of Rome) apparently shows it is only 2% off - surely within the statistical limits of prediction. This is rather bad news for what it implies regarding the predicted food catastrophe.

I haven't begun yet under Nuclear Legacy anything about the psychological, spiritual and ethical aspects - but when one thinks about it, this is where some of the most serious damage happened.

I think the proposed report card is an excellent idea. The 1996 Abolition 2000 Report Card is available at the WWW address below under the A2000 Documents heading.

Ross Wilcock
rwilcock@web.net
<http://web.net.pgs/~pgs/>

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

From: Pol D'Huyvetter [SMTP:int@fme.knooppunt.be]
Sent: 14 March, 1997 0:57
To: induran@knooppunt.be; abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: NPT PrepComm : Name the Indigenous Nations and Peoples
(fwd)

Hello,

I forward following important request for info from Mary Olson.

A call for information about Indigenous Peoples affected by uranium mining in past, present and future.

Mary Olson and myself will be present at the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) PrepComm, and will follow meetings of Abolition 2000 at and around the UN in New York City next April 7-18.

An important moment towards nuclear disarmament (NPT Art. 6) and to demand the halt of the promotion of nuclear energy (NPT Art. 4) by the United Nations International Atomic Energy Agency (Vienna), and the creation of a UN International Clean Energy Agency.

Birds in the sky - fish in the water - uranium in the ground

Who can help us to fact-sheets ??

Please keep us informed through <induran@knooppunt.be>

Peace,

Pol

FORWARDED MAIL -----

From: maryo@igc.apc.org (Mary Olson)

Date: 13 Mar 97

Originally To: int@fme.knooppunt.be

Hi Pol-I am thinking about a project for the IAEA panel at the UN on April 9th-I get to be the "discussant" on a panel giving a 40 year "report card" on the peaceful atom-really quite the opportunity... the project is this: I would like to compile the names of all the Indigenous People/Peoples that are affected by the uranium fuel chain. I don't know if I will have the opportunity to speak them all, but I would like to make a simple list and have copies available... with recognition given to the fact that radiation affects all human beings and all living things. Can you help?

I am also interested in hearing from folks what their current IAEA issues are-the time I have will be limited, but I am honored to represent the NGO who has the task of speaking truth on that day, and people's thoughts are welcome.

Mary Olson

Nuclear Information & Resource Service
1424 16th St. NW Suite 404 Washington, DC 20036

voice: (202)328-0002 fax: (202)462-2183

maryo@igc.apc.org website: www.nirs.org

From rwilcock@execulink.com Sun Mar 16 13:53:34 1997

Date: Fri, 14 Mar 1997 13:57:46 -0500

From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>

To: "Abolition Caucus List (E-mail)"

<abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>,

"Abolition Canada LIST (E-mail)"

<abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>

Subject: RUSSIAN PRESS ELECTRONIC COURIER

Some clippings from today's Russian Press Electronic Courier issued via the CivSoc Listserver.

Addresses are provided for those wishing to keep in touch with the publication.

Ross Wilcock

rwilcock@web.net

<http://web.net.pgs/~pgs/>

From: Tver InterContact Group
Sent: Friday, March 14, 1997 6:12 AM
To: sasha@SOLAR.RTD.UTK.EDU
Subject: RPEC #40, part I, March 14, 1997

RUSSIAN PRESS ELECTRONIC COURIER [No. 40, March 14, 1997]

The RPEC is a daily index digest compiled by the Tver InterContact Group's Translation and Communication Support Unit. We review the daily publications of Russia's foremost press-monitoring agency, "What the Paper's Say," and provide you with a detailed listing of the most recent news materials available from Russia, covering essentially all topics and areas of interest. The RPEC is a complete menu of what is available on any given date and can be delivered to you upon your request.

WPS monitors thousands of periodicals and all of the major radio and TV broadcasts in Russia and the CIS, and provides invaluable information for diplomats, newsmakers, academic analysts and businessmen. If it's important for you to have up-to-the-minute access to complete information, consider subscribing to one of the WPS digests.

If your information needs fall beyond the realm of the digests, please consider WPS's topical monitoring and clipping services. WPS can provide any article on any topic from all the republics of the FSU as per your request.

Introducing
THE RUSSIAN BUSINESS MONITOR

a new English-language weekly electronic publication featured by the FSU's foremost press monitoring agency, "What The Papers Say," and the Tver InterContact Group, a Russian NGO, specializing in international communication, research and cultural exchange.

THE RUSSIAN BUSINESS MONITOR provides a concise and comprehensive survey of the up-to-date business and economic information compiled from daily reviews of over 1,000 national and regional newspapers, as well as the 12 major television and radio channels.

Each issue contains a topical selection of articles and/or abstracts translated from Russian media sources, focusing on federal and local governments' official policies, initiatives and statistics;

major macro-economic developments;

privatization and legislation;

banking and finance;

stock and commodities exchanges and securities markets;

industry profiles, construction projects, communications and transportation;

international trade and customs;

military and defense production;

agribusiness;

international business cooperation and investment opportunities;

legal issues and business security;

demographic and job market data;

exhibitions, business travel, community news, etc.

THE RUSSIAN BUSINESS MONITOR will contain interviews with policy-makers, economists and prominent businessmen, analytical reviews and forecasts, marketing activities' reports, industry projects and company profiles, news briefs and press releases. WHY SUBSCRIBE TO THE RUSSIAN BUSINESS MONITOR? The number of new publications and information resources in Russia continues to grow rapidly, making the flood of information sometimes overwhelming and confusing. If you want to stay tuned to the most important events and trends shaping Russia's contemporary business and economic scene, consider subscribing to THE RUSSIAN BUSINESS MONITOR.

SUBSCRIPTION POLICY

You can start receiving THE RUSSIAN BUSINESS MONITOR today. Upon receipt of your subscription request the next three issues will be forwarded to you at no charge.

Subscription fees:

\$58 a month, discounts for long-term subscriptions

#24\WPS\031497\WE DO NOT WANT CONFRONTATION, BUT...

Sum-up: Russia has numerous options to resist NATO expansion, including a comprehensive strategy to demilitarize international relations

Reference: Pravda-5, March 13, 1997, p. 3

#32\WPS\031497\SEVERODVINSK SHIPYARDS ASK THE GOVERNMENT'S PERMISSION TO SELL SEVERAL NUCLEAR SUBMARINES TO A FOREIGN COUNTRY

Reference: Komsomolskaya Pravda, March 13, 1997, p. 2

#ITALY IS READY TO SPEND \$1 BILLION IN RUSSIA'S ECONOMY

Italian-Russian House of Trade President Rosario Alis Lendrello announced his desire to start negotiating approximate \$1 billion in investments for the Russian economy, Federation Council Chairman Yegor Stroyev stated. Previously granted funds are already working with many joint companies, including 200 spaghetti-manufacturing factories, Stroyev stressed.

Reference: Russian Television, Delovaya Rossia, March 5, 1997, 11:25

March 14, 1997

THE KREMLIN STARS

#For an entire year Russians will reconcile themselves and agree Today President Boris Yeltsin signed a decree to create a state commission to organize the Year of Reconciliation and Agreement. The President suggested that the current year be such a year, a long time ago. According to the decree, the commission is organized with the goal of consolidating Russian society. (Independent Television)

#Just an ordinary visit

In early February, Viktor Chernomyrdin visited America on 3 airplanes. It was just an ordinary visit. However, as the Premier himself often said, Russia is a great country. Really, 160 useful deputy ministers and varying degrees of officials and businessmen were in the delegation. Their flight alone cost Russia \$400,000. Our delegation rented rooms in "The Watergate," "The Savoy," "The

Westin," and "The Blair House," and part of them huddled in the Russian Embassy. Listed among the "Environmental Protection Committee" delegates was General Staff Deputy Head Georgy Polishchuk, which again testifies to our delegation's extremely peaceful nature. (Moskovskaya Pravda)

PROFESSOR GADGET

#Russians will stop snoring and grinding their teeth
Technical University of Bauman scientists designed a special method to keep from snoring, which will help keep hundreds of families intact. Professor Vladimir Loshchilov's creation is constructed from high-quality polymers and is shaped like a baby pacifier. Due to special devices, the "grown up" pacifier is well-secured in the mouth and, besides snoring, helps the sleeper to stop grinding his teeth. (Komsomolskaya Pravda)

PEACEFUL ATOM

#Purse or life

The Krasnoyarsk ecological organizations collected the 100,000 required signatures to organize a referendum, "On Banning Nuclear Fuel Processing Sites' Construction in the Krasnoyarsk Krai." The waste processing enterprise directors think that the referendum is part of the plan to discredit Russian nuclear energy. As Valery Lebedev, mining-chemical enterprise director, said, when Russia started to actively offer its services to process nuclear wastes, the opponents of this course act in the interests of Russia's competitors. Thus, Krasnoyarsk authorities will have to choose between the potential profit, and the regional population's safety. (Independent Television, ITAR-TASS)

THE WILD, WILD EAST

#An unexpected guest

A quiet dinner in one of the Kremenchug houses was interrupted when a minibus broke through the wall and drove into the room. This wall was not the only obstacle the intoxicated driver overcame. Previously, he had broken through a fence and severed the gas pipeline. Militia personnel said that they had never seen such achievements before. (Trud)

#We can always destroy what we have built

The Simferopol and Djankoi transport repair plant workers were paid wages with railroad passenger cars. However, it is difficult to take this pay home, and serious organizations do not buy passenger cars from individuals. This is why, the workers decided to dismantle the cars that they had built themselves and sell the cars for parts. Fortunately, some people are buying shelves, doors, glass and decorative materials. (Krasnaya Zvezda)

How to contact the RPEC editors

If you ever have any questions about your RPEC subscription, or need assistance in placing an order, you can always reach an RPEC editor at wps@ic.redline.ru or rpec@extranet.ru

From aslater@igc.apc.org Sun Mar 16 13:53:34 1997

Date: Fri, 14 Mar 1997 11:19:23 -0800 (PST)
From: ALICE SLATER <aslater@igc.apc.org>
To: warpeace@interport.net, falvo@nymc.edu, myriamm@aol.com,
sfraser@igc.org,
cmtinnitus@aol.com, jklotz@ibm.net, wrl@igc.org,
paintl@igc.org,
metropeace@aol.com, worldfed@igc.org, crramey@igc.org,
wedo@igc.org,
psrnyc@igc.org, esrmetro@aol.com, disarmtimes@igc.org,
ptasso@pipeline.com, tovish@aol.com, lcnp@aol.com,
srfnyusa@igc.org,
kcantw9473@aol.com, jem@igc.org, nypaxchristi@igc.org,
paz4juf@aol.com,
gkarlsson@igc.org, johanne@ctconverge.com,
tcox@law.columbia.edu,
abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: NPT Working Group Minutes

MINUTES OF THE ABOLITION 2000 WORKING GROUP FOR THE NPT PREPCOM - March
13th, 1997

Attending: Alice Slater (GRACE), Alyn Ware (LCNP), Vince Comiskey
(Pax
Christi Int'l), Jack Klotz (Sierra Club), Cora Weiss (Peace
Action/IPB),
Lars Allen (LCNP), Chris West (GRACE), Pam Ransom (WEDO), Mary Ellen
Singsen
(SCPCS), Cathy Falvo (PSR), Doris Miller (PNS), Roger Smith (NGOCD),
Mardia Stone (WEDO), Kevin Sanders (War & Peace Found.),
Ambassador Hasmy
(Malaysian Embassy).

AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSED:

HOUSING: Alyn Ware said we should think about special housing for
Gabriel
Tetiarahi on his stay in New York for the CTB Prep Com. Gaby will
be
staying at the Quaker Mission at the start of his visit but may need
a place
later in the week, preferably with someone who speaks French.

CHANGE OF MEETING PLACE NEXT WEEK : On March 20th, we will not meet
at the
Church Center. Members will attend the U.N. Peace Bell Ceremony
on Earth
Day at the time of the Spring Equinox, where Alyn and Alice will
accept an
award on behalf of Abolition 2000 at 8:30 AM. Following the Peace
Bell
ceremony, His Excellency Razali Ismail, President of the UNGA will
introduce a film, People vs. The Bomb, in the Dag Hammarskjold
Auditorium at
9:30 AM. We may meet in the UN after the film if necessary. Guests

without

UN passes need to RSVP to 212-818-1773. (See enclosed invitation.)

Roger

Smith will post a note at 777 UN Plaza to alert people that the meeting has moved to the UN on March 20th.

TRAINING DAY: Orientation for out-of -towners in afternoon of April 6th.

(Details to follow)

REPORT ON MISSIONS : Alice reported on a small group meeting with the Mexican Mission. Alyn is continuing to arrange meetings with Missions.

ROUNDTABLE: Alice reported on the roundtable meeting arranged by the NGO Committee on Disarmament which included about 10 Missions and 10-15 NGO's.

ADDITIONAL CALL FOR PARTICULAR ACTION AT PREPCOMM: Alyn proposed that we include in our strategy a call for the delegates to meet in inter-sessional working groups to continue the work between PrepComs. Alyn will post the fact sheet he prepared for delegates on the Internet to the abolition-caucus and the peace caucus. It will be included in the upcoming mailing to follow up on the Parliamentarians for Global Action mailing .

Alyn reported that the European Parliament is scheduled to vote on strengthening the NPT Process by establishing inter-sessional meetings, not as strong a proposal as ours for working groups but which can be useful in our work. John urged the importance of making the case here in the U.S.

Alice offered to write a letter for use in the US. John reported that

Congressman Major Owens was preparing a letter to be circulated in Congress

which John said he would use with the membership of the Sierra Club.

This

letter calls for the review of US nuclear policy in view of the World Court

decision and the statement from the Generals and Admirals. Alice will

contact Sonya for the Owens letter.

VISIT BY MALAYSIAN AMBASSADOR HASMY: Ambassador Hasmy stressed the

importance of NGO's in helping to move towards abolition. He thought that the non-aligned states have not yet developed a substantive position for the PrepComm and are still discussing procedural issues. Ambassador Hasmy expressed hope that the procedural issues will not overshadow the more substantive issues which this conference gives us an opportunity to address. The nuclear states would be pleased if we spent the precious conference hours discussing procedure. He noted the unwillingness of the nuclear states to address the serious questions raised by India about stockpile stewardship and computer simulations, the lack of a time frame for the elimination of nuclear weapons, and the pressure for a fissile-cut off in isolation from the total context of nuclear disarmament. He proposed that the CD should establish an ad hoc committee to address nuclear disarmament.

.
LITERATURE FOR THE NPT PREP COM: Cora stressed the need to have materials which non-sophisticated lobbyists could use to help them during the PrepComm. Roger suggested that this had already been done in the documents we have, but needed to be "boiled down a bit" to make them more accessible.

PANELS:

HEALTH: Cathy will talk to Raj Mutali of IPPNW who Alice reported was interested in working with us to arrange for speakers and co-sponsoring the panel. We will hold it in the UN on Tuesday April 8th, from 1:00 to 3:00. Gaby will be a participant. Cathy and Roger will work on getting the room..

NATO: Cora reported that we have a Russian NGO for the NATO panel on April 12, a doctor in Princeton. The National Woman's Network is seeking a woman in Congress, willing to oppose the expansion of NATO and open up public discussion on the issue. A delegation of six people will go to Europe to counter the perception that all Americans support this destructive and regressive policy of the US government..

POL HUYVETTER Roger will talk to Dave Reynolds of the War Resisters League and will get back to Pol about setting up a meeting to discuss civil disobedience in light of the World Court Decision . Alyn thought that a training and information meeting on direct action could be tentatively scheduled for Tuesday April 8th, at the Church Center, from 3-5 PM.

Alice Slater
GRACE

Global Resource Action Center for the Environment
15 East 26 St., Room 915
New York, NY 10010
212-726-9161 (tel)
212-726-9160 (fax)

aslater@igc.apc.org <email>

From nfnzsc@gn.apc.org Sun Mar 16 13:53:34 1997

Date: Sat, 15 Mar 1997 11:23:19 GMT

From: National Steering Ctte Nuclear Free Local Authorities
<nfnzsc@gn.apc.org>

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Subject: UK Nuclear News 14 March 1997

/* Written 1:51 PM Mar 14, 1997 by nfnzsc in gn:nfla.news */
/* ----- "UK Nuclear News 14 March 1997" ----- */
From: nfnzsc (Stewart Kemp)

>From: GMR@MCR1.poptel.org.uk

>Date: Fri, 14 Mar 1997 10:50:14 GMT

>Subject: NPU 14 Mar

>To: nfnzsc@gn.apc.org

>

>DAILY INFORMATION BULLETIN - NUCLEAR POLICY

>

>Fri 14 Mar 1997

>

>97-1968 Gvt about to give #2bn order for n/subs to GEC's VSEL shipyard
> at Barrow. G,FT

>97-8304 Letter (Jean Kaye) demanding that MoD stops road transport
of

> n/materials in light of this week's m/way multiple accidents
> and fires. G

>97-8305 More than 2,000 tonnes of weapons-grade plutonium and
uranium

> are in military stockpiles around the world, often with
> inadequate controls, according to new study. FT,T

>97-8306 US and Russia will discuss move to slash their nuclear
arsenals

> at Helsinki summit next week. DT

>

>

>GM Research, Metropolitan House, Hobson Street, Oldham, OL1 1QD.
>Tel: 0161-911 4179. Fax: 0161-627 1736.
>Internet: gmr@mcr1.poptel.org.uk
>
>

Stewart Kemp (nfznsnc@gn.apc.org)
From shundahai@saltmine.radix.netSun Mar 16 13:53:34 1997
Date: Sat, 15 Mar 1997 12:33:17 -0500 (EST)
From: The Shundahai Network <shundahai@saltmine.radix.net>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: MEDIA HELP NEEDED for NTS

To: Abolition 2000 supporters around the world.

We are asking for your assistance in making sure that the world knows of the continued nuclear weapons development by the U.S. Government and of the actions taken by world citizens in the struggle to shut down the Nevada Test Site. Many of you are familiar with the events and actions planned for this spring (please see included press release).

We ask you to:

- 1: Contact Press agencies to make sure they are aware of the planned events and of the issues that will be addressed.
- 2: Fax the press release to groups or individuals in your region that may be interested, but may not be on the internet.
- 3: Sign on to our Media network, we will then directly email you updates and press information.

Contact:

ACTION FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION!
5007 Elmhurst, Las Vegas, NV 89108 Phone: (702)
647-3095
Fax: (702)647-9385 Email: shundahai@radix.net

<http://www.macronet.org/macronet/shundahai/shutdown.html>

APRIL 1st CALL IN DAY ACTION ALERT COMING SOON TO A LIST SERVER NEAR YOU!

XX
XXXXXXXXXX
MEDIA ADVISORY

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
March 11, 1997

CONTACT:
Reinard Knutsen (702)

647-3095

DIVERSE GROUPS FROM AROUND THE WORLD TO GATHER AT THE NEVADA TEST SITE TO DEMAND NUCLEAR ABOLITION, AN END TO NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTING AND WASTE DUMPING.

MARCH 23 - 30, LENTEN DESERT EXPERIENCE

The Lenten Desert Experience and Holy Week Walk are organized and hosted by Nevada Desert Experience. Through prayer, reflection, sharing and action, participants will explore nonviolent approaches to the violence of nuclear proliferation.

Please Call: (702) 646-4814 for more information or nde@igc.apc.org

MARCH 26 - 27, A COUNCIL OF WOMEN TO END THE NUCLEAR AGE

The meeting will include presentations on current struggles in this nation and elsewhere related to all kinds of nuclear facilities and transport, and focus on strategies and techniques for organizing women to end the nuclear age.

Please Call Susan Lee Solar (512)-447-6222 or nukemuse@igc.org,

MARCH 27 - 31, HEALING GLOBAL WOUNDS

All Peoples' gathering to break the nuclear chain. To be effective human beings, we need to develop our 4 aspects: body, spirit, heart and mind. The HGW four day program includes: Indigenous panel on key nuclear issues, Multi cultural Alliance Building Training, International delegations, daily spiritual ceremony, and nonviolent action. Network with key leaders and groups in the anti-nuclear movement.

Please call Jennifer Viereck (408) 338-0147 or hgw@scruznet.com

MARCH 31 - APRIL 4, ACTION FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION!

Five days of creative nonviolent direct action including blockades, parades, and actions to SHUT THE TEST SITE DOWN!

March 31: Critical Mass Action at Nevada Test Site. Day of Unity to Shut the Test Site Down.

April 1: Nuclear Fools Day of Action. We are calling for a National Call in

Day to the White house to cancel the "subcritical" nuclear weapons tests

currently planned to begin this spring. In Las Vegas we will organize a

Nuclear Fools Day Parade through Downtown to the Foley Federal Building.

April 2-4: Blockades, parades and actions to Shut the Test Site Down! We

will attempt to block the three main entrances to NTS to stop the preparations for Sub Critical nuclear weapons testing and nuclear waste

transportation and dumping

Please call Reinard Knutsen (702) 647-3095

shundahai@intermind.net

SPONSORING ORGANIZATIONS: Action for Nuclear Abolition!, Alliance of Atomic

Veterans, American Friends Service Committee, Atomic Mirror, Bay Area

Action, Center for Energy Research, Common Ground Magazine, Eco-Services,

Inc., Fitzpatrick Lodge, Foundation for a Compassionate Society, Healing

Global Wounds Alliance, Macrocosm USA, Montana Coffee Traders, Nuke Watch,

P.A.R.A.N.O.I.D.S., Shamans Drum, Shundahai Network, ENDORSING ORGANIZATIONS: European Peace Pilgrimage (Belgium), For Mother Earth,

Foundation for Peace (New Zeland), Global Anti-Nuclear Alliance (Netherlands), Global Resource Action Center for the Environment, Greenpeace

USA, Geinsuikin (Japan), International Peace Bureau (Switzerland), Lawyers

Committee on Nuclear Policy, Mouvmnt De La Paix (France), Nuclear Resister, Oregon Peace Works, Proposition One Committee, Peace Action,

Peace Action Education Fund, Peace House, Peace Farm, Save Ward Valley,

Seeds of Peace, S.M.A.R.T., Student Nonviolent Action Coalition, Tri-Valley

Cares, War Resisters League, Western States Legal Foundation, Women Strike

for Peace, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

XX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Page 2

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: SPRING GATHERINGS AT NEVADA TEST SITE

"Global opposition has stopped nuclear testing temporarily, but deadly

nuclear wastes continue to accumulate, and nuclear weapons development

proceeds unchecked," warns a coalition of nuclear abolition activists

who
are sponsoring a series of anti-nuclear events this spring at the
infamous
Nevada Test Site (NTS), near Las Vegas, Nevada. The purpose of the
gatherings--being organized by Shundahai Network, Healing Global
Wounds,
Nevada Desert Experience, and others--is to convince the Department
of
Energy (DOE) and the nuclear industry to start cleaning up their
messes and
stop making more of them.

The coalition selected the NTS as the focus of the spring
gatherings for
several reasons. The site is located on land illegally appropriated
from
the Western Shoshone Nation by the U.S. government in the early 1950s;
it is
the most frequently bombed place in the U.S. (more than a thousand
nuclear
bombs have been exploded there above and below ground); and it is
being
turned into world's largest nuclear waste dump.

Although there is a moratorium on nuclear testing at the NTS,
the site is
being kept in full readiness for future testing under the DOE's new
Stockpile Stewardship and Management (SS&M) program. In fact, the
U.S.
recently announced that despite having signed a Comprehensive Test
Ban
Treaty (CTBT)--which must still be ratified by forty-four
weapons-capable
nations--it intends to continue nuclear weapons development at the
NTS this
Spring, and to keep the facility ready to resume full-scale nuclear
testing
with six months notice.

The SS&M program will involve using computer technology to
design and test
new developments in nuclear weaponry. As part of this program,
"subcritical" nuclear weapons tests are already being planned for
the spring
of 1997. These "test" detonations are expected to explode before
"critical
mass" is reached, and therefore, are not supposed to set off a nuclear
chain
reaction. Nevertheless, the devices to be tested will contain
plutonium--and there is no guarantee that critical mass will not
be reached.
Even if a chain reaction doesn't occur, these tests would undermine
efforts
to implement the CTBT. If the U.S. continues developing its nuclear
weapons
program, other nuclear-weapons-capable nations may refrain from
ratifying

the treaty.

The NTS already has the dubious distinction of being the largest nuclear waste site in the U.S--a nation that generates six tons of nuclear waste a day. In 1995 alone, more than 960 shipments of nuclear waste--averaging nearly three loads per day--were dumped into shallow, unlined trenches located above southern Nevada's largest underground aquifer. By 1998, the DOE intends to transport more than 15,600 more shipments of nuclear waste through forty-three states to the NTS.

The DOE has itself admitted that anywhere from seventy to three hundred accidents could occur during shipping, and that a single accident could contaminate as much as forty-two square miles. Nuclear abolitionists believe it is sheer madness to continue transporting tons of extremely toxic wastes in unsafe containers, along unsafe railways and highways, through populated communities and beautiful natural settings, to unsafe dumpsites.

The organizers of the spring events believe it is imperative that people speak out and convince the nuclear industry to realistically address the monumental problem of what to do with its waste products--not just assign those wastes to government-controlled sites which operate as if they were exempt from normal environmental regulations. People must also pressure the nuclear industry to stop generating more wastes--and the government to cease its nuclear development programs.

Organizers of the spring events are optimistic that--by using a combination of prayer and ceremony, trainings, workshops, and nonviolent direct action--"activists and organizations working together can generate significant groundswells of public opinion and political pressure." The coalition and Corbin Harney, spiritual leader of the Newe (Western Shoshone) Nation and founder of Shundahai Network, invite all peoples to join them, physically or in spirit.

February, 12, 1997 CONTACT: Reinard Knutsen (702) 647-3095

Action for Nuclear Abolition!
A Project of Shundahai

Network

SHUNDAHAI NETWORK
"Peace and Harmony with all Creation"
Breaking the Nuclear Chain

5007 Elmhurst St., Las Vegas, NV 89108 ph(702)647-3095
Fax: (702)647-9385 Email: shundahai@radix.net

ACTION FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION!
5007 Elmhurst, Las Vegas, NV 89108 Phone: (702) 647-3095
Fax: (702)647-9385 Email: shundahi@intermind.net

SHUT THE TEST SITE DOWN!
NONVIOLENT DIRECT ACTION CAMP
March 31 - April 4, 1997

<http://www.macronet.org/macronet/shundahai/shutdown.html>

"It's in our backyard...its in our front yard.
This nuclear contamination is shortening all life.
Were going to have to unite as a people and say no more!
We, the people, are going to have to put our thoughts
together to save our planet here.

We only have One Water...One Air...One Mother Earth."
Corbin Harney, Newe (Western Shoshone) Spiritual Leader;
Founder and Executive Director, Shundahai Network

From shundahai@saltmine.radix.netSun Mar 16 13:53:34 1997
Date: Sat, 15 Mar 1997 12:32:54 -0500 (EST)
From: The Shundahai Network <shundahai@saltmine.radix.net>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: APRIL 1st call in day

Dear Friends, Please: Forward, Print, Post and Mass Distribute the
following
Action Alert. If you would like a flyer with graphic faxed to you
please
email us or contact us at the number below.

NUCLEAR FOOL'S DAY ACTION ALERT
April 1st, 1997

Let the United States Federal Government know that we are
"NUCLEAR FOOLS NO MORE!"

Call President Clinton at the White House (202) 456-1111
and your state senators (202) 224 - 3121 (Capital Switchboard)

Government lines may be very busy on April 1st so start calling now
and as
often as possible.

Demand that the United States:

CANCEL THE "SUB-CRITICAL" NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS!!!

SHUT THE TEST SITE DOWN!!!

HALT ALL NUCLEAR WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT!!!

STOP ALL NUCLEAR WASTE TRANSPORTATION, PRODUCTION AND DUMPING!!!

Join in Solidarity Actions to support the international activists gathered for Action for Nuclear Abolition! Nonviolent Direct Action Camp at the Nevada Test Site, March 31 - April 4, 1997.

For more information email Shundahai Network at: shundahai@radix.net or

check out our web site at:

<http://www.macronet.org/macronet/shundahai>

SHUNDAHAI NETWORK

"Peace and Harmony with all Creation"

Breaking the Nuclear Chain

5007 Elmhurst St., Las Vegas, NV 89108 ph(702)647-3095
Fax: (702)647-9385 Email: shundahai@radix.net

ACTION FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION!

5007 Elmhurst, Las Vegas, NV 89108 Phone: (702) 647-3095
Fax: (702)647-9385 Email: shundahi@intermind.net

SHUT THE TEST SITE DOWN!
NONVIOLENT DIRECT ACTION CAMP
March 31 - April 4, 1997

<http://www.macronet.org/macronet/shundahai/shutdown.html>

"It's in our backyard...its in our front yard.

This nuclear contamination is shortening all life.

Were going to have to unite as a people and say no more!

We, the people, are going to have to put our thoughts together to save our planet here.

We only have One Water...One Air...One Mother Earth."

Corbin Harney, Newe (Western Shoshone) Spiritual Leader;

Founder and Executive Director, Shundahai Network

From rwilcock@execulink.comSun Mar 16 13:53:34 1997

Date: Sat, 15 Mar 1997 12:16:35 -0500

From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>

To: "Abolition Caucus List (E-mail)" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>

Cc: "Abolition Canada LIST (E-mail)"

<abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>

Subject: NATO Peace Plan by Nobel Peace Laurate

Nobel Peace Laureate Lech Walesa speaks of NATO Peace Plan
Ross Wilcock
rwilcock@web.net
<http://web.net.pgs/~pgs/>

Wary of a weakened Russia, Walesa urges NATO expansion [extracting comments related to NATO; an edited conversation with the Globe and Mail's editorial board, published March 14, 1997]. Do you think Russia's fear of, or sense of opposition to NATO's expansion are understandable, and are you in support of an agreement what would bind Russia more closely to NATO? If I were in Boris Yeltsin's position I would be doing a similar thing, although slightly differently. I would like to be a big power in this world and, being Yeltsin, I would like Europe to be the Russian United States of Europe. Only I would have adopted craftier methods... When you look at NATO you can look at it in two different ways. The first way is confrontational... a war one. The revolution that I led had the goal of establishing one security system in Europe. First of all it was to defeat communism, and then to establish one security system. Along this approach, the peaceful one, NATO expansion is a peaceful process. It does not involve any money and it does not involve any armament.

Russia too weak

When the Warsaw pact existed, there was a military balance, of course, between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Once the Warsaw Pact had been dissolved, there was this enormous military superiority on the side of NATO. What is now to do is to gradually insert new countries, new members, which are ready for it, which have internal peace and which have a democratic system... Whoever does not expand NATO today when there are such advantages, when it is the appropriate moment, is in favor of confrontation and conflict tomorrow...

Right now, Russia is not powerful enough when it comes to the economy, so it is too weak to enter any kind of confrontation; but being so weak, it now causes so much fear among NATO countries. So what will happen tomorrow, once the economy of Russia increases and its position gets stronger?

Today, you don't have to send young Canadian boys, or young American boys to Europe once Europe is expanded. Tomorrow, if NATO is not expanded, those young Canadian or young Americans will have to go to Europe in order to protect the interests of Canada and the United States. Why should we retain this uncertain situation? We do not want to humiliate Russia in any way; we want to live with Russia. But with a Russia who does not cause fear among any other nations, who does not want to threaten anybody...

NATO always needed

Of course, once NATO is expanded to the extent that we can forget about confrontation, it will be used for other purposes. Forces like NATO, organized forces will always be needed in the world. The higher the civilization and its development, the greater the dangers that emerge. Things like chemical disasters, ecological disasters--and

for that purpose such swiftly acting organizations will be needed... Are you saying that Russia would be a threat, a clear threat, to the sovereignty and independence of Poland?

It is not just Poland that I have in mind. Russia is not interested mainly in Poland. Poland is coping with similar problems as Russia, perhaps on a smaller scale. Russia always reaches further. Today's conception ... is that Russia is the United States of Europe.

I was there at the time, precisely for such an attitude that is represented by some [saying] "Oh, we shouldn't speak against the Russia; Russia is undergoing such problems; "Yeltsin had some problems"--this way of thinking. Already in 1944-45 there was an agreement for free elections in Poland, for democracy in Poland and other countries, and what came of it? We don't need to repeat the same situation...

In Poland and other post communist countries, Canada is perceived as a powerful country, but in a way impartial. Therefore Canada's voice may really make a real change when there is this balance of opinions, and it may make a real change for the course of history for the coming centuries...

Awaiting the Generals

NATO does not want to humiliate Russia, neither does Poland. We do not reproach anything for the past, although we have been murdered, although we have been imprisoned. What happens is that Poland is located in the heart of Europe and it has always been a disadvantageous position when there has been a confrontation of some kind.

Once the confrontational approach is over, Poland will find itself in an extremely good position for good business in Europe. Poland is awaiting your Generals - and I mean General Motors and General Electric! They are reluctant to enter Poland until there is a really stable situation in the country, and they are anxious about Russia: how will it evolve, how the situation in Poland will be?

Let us decide once and forever, for good--put the war behind us. So we do not want NATO expansion out of fear; we just want it for our security and for the possibility of our economy to increase. We are not really afraid of Russia. Russia has always had problems with us. We have always caused them so many problems. I am sure that had they not included Poland within their sphere of influence, the Soviet Union would have continued to exist. It was us who caused the changes within Poland, and it was us who caused the split of all communist countries and the dissolution of the Soviet Union as such...

Can't choose brothers

You have to have certain understandings, but if we provide very special rights [for Russia], I'm sure I can predict the following: The situation will be all right for 10 years, all the world will be at peace. Then after 10 years of peace, all the countries will have a democratically approved resolution that Canada and other countries can withdraw from Europe because they are no longer needed there. Everybody will be in favor of that, and that will be the end of the United States of Europe, and we will have the Russian United States of Europe at that point. This is the course of events that I don't want to happen....

We can't change our position in Europe. You don't choose your brothers; you are born with them. We are between Germany and Russia. We will have domination of both sides in Poland; therefore from the political point of view we need a third side. A third voice. That is why we want to have your companies based in Poland. Many countries are reluctant to get involved, are reluctant to accept such [third] forces, whereas we are willing to take the third force. It is safer for us and it is more convenient. Of course we do want both Russia and Germany, but we feel much safer once we have a third force in as well; therefore we advocate so much this cause in Canada and in other countries before we join the European Union...

....

From shundahai@saltmine.radix.netSun Mar 16 13:53:34 1997
Date: Sat, 15 Mar 1997 15:42:58 -0500 (EST)
From: The Shundahai Network <shundahai@saltmine.radix.net>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: This Week in Review

THIS WEEK IN REVIEW:

March 7: 20,000 protesters block path of nuclear waste shipment near Gorleben Germany. 30,000 police officers respond in the most expensive government action since World War II.

March 11: Nuclear waste catches fire then explodes at Takainura reprocessing near Tokyo. Radiation is released and at least 30 workers exposed.

March 13: Low tides expose leaks at French nuclear waste processing plant. Exposure to local population runs as high as 3,000 times the normal dose.

AT THE INTERNATIONAL ANTI-NUCLEAR MOVEMENT PREPARES TO GATHER

NEVADA NUCLEAR TEST SITE TO STOP
PLANNED "SUBCRITICAL" NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS AND
DAILY NUCLEAR WASTE SHIPMENTS!

SHUNDAHAI NETWORK
"Peace and Harmony with all Creation"
Breaking the Nuclear Chain

5007 Elmhurst St., Las Vegas, NV 89108 ph(702)647-3095
Fax: (702)647-9385 Email: shundahai@radix.net

ACTION FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION!
5007 Elmhurst, Las Vegas, NV 89108 Phone: (702) 647-3095
Fax: (702)647-9385 Email: shundahi@intermind.net
SHUT THE TEST SITE DOWN!

NONVIOLENT DIRECT ACTION CAMP
March 31 - April 4, 1997

<http://www.macronet.org/macronet/shundahai/shutdown.html>

"It's in our backyard...its in our front yard.
This nuclear contamination is shortening all life.
Were going to have to unite as a people and say no more!
We, the people, are going to have to put our thoughts
together to save our planet here.
We only have One Water...One Air...One Mother Earth."
Corbin Harney, Newe (Western Shoshone) Spiritual Leader;
Founder and Executive Director, Shundahai Network

From LCNP@aol.comSun Mar 16 13:53:34 1997
Date: Fri, 14 Mar 1997 13:12:06 -0500 (EST)
From: LCNP@aol.com
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Cc: peace-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: World Court Opinion; US Congress Sign-On Letter

US House of Representatives member Major Owens has initiated a House sign-on letter on follow-up to the World Court opinion, and also referring to the NPT, CTBT and Generals and Admirals statement.

The text is below.

Action: Ask your congressional representative to sign on to the letter.

March 14, 1997

The Honorable Bill Clinton
President
The White House
Washington DC 20500

Dear Mr President

On December 5, 1996, General Lee Butler (Ret.) and over 50 other generals and admirals released a statement that "the continuing existence of nuclear weapons in the armories of nuclear powers, and the ever present threat of acquisition of these weapons by others, constitutes a peril to global peace and security and to the safety and survival of the people we are dedicated to protect." They noted that "in the post-Cold War security environment, the most commonly postulated nuclear threats are not susceptible to deterrence or are simply not credible." The statement concluded that the threat will not finally recede "...unless nuclear weapons are eliminated."

On July 8, 1996, the International Court of Justice (ICJ), in response to a request from the United Nations, concluded that "the threat or use of nuclear weapons would generally be contrary to the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict", 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 under strict and effective international control."

On December 10, 1996, the United Nations General Assembly adopted resolution 51/45 M following up on the ICJ decision. The UN called for the beginning in 1997 of negotiations leading to the conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention which would prohibit the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination. This letter is designed to respectfully urge you to enhance the security of the United States and respond to the decision of the

ICJ by:

i) Initiating a review of nuclear policy to consider which aspects of current policy may need to be modified in order to conform with our obligations to adhere to international humanitarian law as indicated by the Court.

ii) Initiating negotiations for nuclear disarmament in all its aspects leading to the conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention.

If the U.S. does not take the lead in negotiating to achieve complete nuclear disarmament, other steps towards disarmament such as the Non Proliferation Treaty and Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), may unravel. Certain non-nuclear countries have indicated that if the nuclear states do not implement their obligations under the NPT, they may reconsider their membership of the NPT. India has stated that they refuse to sign the CTBT until the Nuclear Weapon States announce their willingness to negotiate a program for complete nuclear disarmament, and without India the CTBT will not be able to enter into force.

Mr President, at the 51st United Nations General Assembly you spoke about the desirability of a 21st Century free from the threat of nuclear weapons. We call upon you to make such a dream real.

Sincerely yours,

Major R Owens
Member of Congress

From acronym@gn.apc.org Sun Mar 16 14:24:32 1997
Date: Sun, 16 Mar 1997 20:56:40 GMT
From: Rebecca Johnson <acronym@gn.apc.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, mosnex@online.ru,
joachim.euchner@student.uni-tuebingen.de, foesydney@peg.apc.org,
achin@unv.ernet.in, cmj_msp6@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu, mapw@ozemail.com.au,
Tom.Sauer@soc.kuleuven.ac.be, shundahai@radix.net,
hiro-tsugu.aida@itu.ch, goldblat@ties.itu.ch, klas.lundius@alinks.se,
lars.lindskog@alinks.se, pbatch@ccr.uct.ac.za, vineeta@nii.ernet.in,
guardian@peg.apc.org, iakim@glas.apc.org, gensuikin@igc.apc.org,
cnic-jp@po.iiijnet.or.jp, tgrimwood@ucsusa.org, lancaste@bnl.gov,
EBT4EVR@aol.com, vpgupta@sandia.gov
Subject: CTBT update

To DisInt receivers,
16 March, 1997
DisInt Report # 2: CTBT Update

So, Geneva at last waves goodbye to the CTBT!
This is a short summary of the CTBT resumed PrepCom, which finally took the decision to set up the implementing organisation in Vienna.

The resumed Preparatory Commission of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organisation (CTBTO), chaired by Ambassador Jacob Selebi of South Africa, concluded its meeting in Geneva, March 3-11, by agreeing the budget and establishment of the CTBTO, to be headed by Wolfgang Hoffmann. After the difficulties and disappointments of New York in November 1996, Hoffmann was clearly relieved that the PrepCom passed off so successfully this time. Preparing to leave Geneva, where he has been the Disarmament Ambassador since 1993, Hoffmann said that the PrepCom had 'done everything it should do, with nothing left open.'

The successful decisions followed weeks of intensive behind-the-scenes consultations to resolve the problems over structure, staffing and budget that had prevented agreement four months earlier. In New York the decisions on how the CTBTO should be structured became tangled with different states' bids for their personnel to be appointed to key positions in the new hierarchy. Some countries, including Iran and France, retained serious reservations about the way in which the CTBTO was to be constituted, but in the end Selebi managed to forge agreement, enabling work to begin. After much debate, a budget of \$28 million was agreed for the first nine months. This will enable the Provisional Technical Secretariat (PTS) to be established at the Vienna International Centre (VIC). The budget is also intended to cover the initial setting up costs for the international monitoring system (IMS) and the international data centre (IDC). However, some of the scientists most closely involved with the verification regime have expressed concern that cuts in investment earmarked for the seismic

network could have an adverse effect on the ability of the verification regime to be fully operational by September 1998, as planned.

Hoffmann, who also chaired the Nuclear Test Ban Committee's working group on

Verification during the CTBT negotiations in 1994, was appointed Executive

Secretary of the PTS. He will sign the Host Country Agreement with Austria

on March 18 and take up his new post in Vienna immediately. The directors

of the five divisions were agreed as follows:

Administration: William B Davitte (USA),

Legal and External Relations: Masabumi Sato (Japan),

On-site Inspections: Vladimir Kryuchenkov (Russian Federation),

Verification - International Monitoring System: Gerardo Suarez (Mexico),

Verification - International Data Centre: Rashad M Kebeasy (Egypt).

The Administration Division will cover general services, finance, personnel,

conference services and procurement. In addition to legal services and external relations, the Legal and External Relations Division will cover

will cover public information and international cooperation. The OSI

Division will have to be responsible for developing the procedures and equipment for geophysical and radionuclide inspections, drilling,

transport,

overflights and training. The IDC Division will cover monitoring,

scientific methods and data fusion, communications and infrastructure, and

training in IDC-related technology and interpretation. The IMS Division

will also cover training and the setting up of seismic, hydroacoustic, radionuclide and infrasound monitoring stations as specified in the

treaty.

In addition to the office of the Executive Secretary, monitoring of progress

towards establishing the CTBTO will be overseen by teams responsible for internal auditing and evaluation of the verification regime.

Two working groups were also convened, comprising representatives from countries which have signed the treaty. As of March 1, 142 countries including the P-5 nuclear weapon states (Britain, China, France, Russia and

the United States) and Israel. Of the 44 countries whose ratification is required by article XIV before the Treaty can enter into force, only three

have not signed: India, Pakistan and North Korea. In view of India's stated

objections to the CTBT, which it had blocked in the CD, a large number of delegates in November queried the urgency of setting up the verification

regime, reflecting doubt that the entry into force conditions would be met

any time soon. This sentiment was less in evidence in Geneva in March (or

at least further below the surface), as CTBT signatories looked forward to moving the test ban treaty out of Geneva and setting up the new organisation in Vienna.

The two working groups are Working Group A on Budgetary and Administrative Matters, chaired by Tibor Toth of Hungary and Working Group B on Verification, chaired by Ola Dahlman of Sweden. Dr Dahlman was formerly the Chair of the Group of Scientific Experts (GSE) which studied seismic verification under the auspices of the CD's NTB Committee, culminating in the third technical test of a provisional worldwide seismic network, known as GSETT-3. According to preliminary assessments, the IMS primary seismic network, some of which is based on GSETT-3, is 64 percent complete, with the auxiliary seismic network covering 32 percent of the stations identified in the CTBT verification protocol. However, there is still a long way to go on the other three technologies which comprise the IMS: the hydroacoustic network is estimated to be 27 percent in place; the radionuclide network about 15 percent complete; but only 2 percent of the proposed infrasound network is set up. Fourteen countries earmarked to host stations in the IMS have not yet signed the treaty. In June 1996, at the height of the battle over the CTBT's entry into force, India withdrew its three stations, which appeared as 'to be determined' in the adopted treaty text. It is understood that there have not yet been any discussion of the implications of this and other gaps due to any country's failure to sign.

It will be the task of Working Group B during 1997 to develop technical specifications, requirements, policies, guidelines, procedures and documentation (including manuals and training) relating to inspections, as well as the IMS, IDC and communications. Working Group A, chaired by Tibor Toth, focused on a programme of work for the rest of 1997, according to which it will prioritise the development of staffing and financial regulations, rules of procedure for the CTBTO and the 1998 draft budget. Smaller expert groups may also be convened to work out details on particular issues.

With these historic decisions, Geneva has now waved farewell to the 'the longest sought, hardest fought prize in arms control history'. The CTBT goes to Vienna, with the hope that all the work and resources put into

setting up the verification regime will be justified by its timely implementation and entry into force. However, with India adamantly opposed, and Pakistan waiting on India's decision, the prospect does not look very optimistic. Resolving their altercation over the intended meaning of the term 'anniversary' in the text, signatories have agreed that the entry-into-force conference described in article XIV may be held after September 1999. However, with understandings in the negotiating record that this conference will not be empowered to waive the entry into force conditions nor impose sanctions on any hold-outs, there is considerable cynicism that this 'handwringing conference' will be able to bring the treaty into effect if the political will remains lacking. All in all, the best hope for the CTBT's entry into force is irreversible nuclear arms reduction, further progress on nuclear disarmament, and greater regional security and confidence building in South Asia.

ends

=====

email: acronym@gn.apc.org
Disarmament Intelligence Review
24, Colvestone Crescent
London E8 2LH
England
Tel/fax until April 1: +44 171 241 4691
Please note: from April 1, 1997 the telephone and fax numbers will be
changed, as follows: telephone (UK +44) (0) 171 503 8857
fax (0) 171 503 9153
The address and email remain the same.

=====