

From: STARMAN WENDY <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>
To: "'mupj@igc.org'" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RSVP and contact information for the Rev. Canon Alan Geyer
Date: Fri, 8 Feb 2002 15:17:19 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Dear Howard,

First, I would like to RSVP for the special briefing on the NPR, Feb. 15. I will attend.

Second, I was speaking with my colleague the Reverend Canon Alan Geyer and learned that he was not a regular on your mailing list and is not on the new list serve. He expressed an interest in being informed about the ongoing activities and would like to be on the list. Could you please contact him at 301-652-7024 (home) or by e-mail at 75254.2405@compuserve.com. I'm not a hundred percent sure that this e-mail address is up-to-date, so you should probably give him a ring to double check.

Given Alan's depth of knowledge and experience with the moral dimensions of nuclear weapons issues, he would truly be a valuable addition to your list.

See you next Friday!

Best,

Wendy

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 6.0.1
Date: Mon, 11 Feb 2002 13:12:00 -0600
From: "Greg Laszakovits" <glaszakovits_gb@brethren.org>
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Questions on Nuclear Posture Review

Apologies--When and where is this meeting?
Greg

>>> "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> 02/05/02 09:42AM >>>
Dear Colleagues:

Our February 15 briefing on the Nuclear Posture Review by Frank Miller is intended to obtain information from the Bush Administration on the findings of the Nuclear Posture Review. It is not an occasion for us to confront or challenge the NPR head-on. However, we might raise some concerns in the form of clarifying questions.

In preparation I have drafted five sets of questions, shown below and contained in a separate attachment if that is easier for you to work with.

I would be interested in your evaluation of these questions and whether they are appropriate. I would also like to receive your suggestions for modifications and for other questions to ask.

If we agree on questions to ask Mr. Miller, we might want to decide who would ask which question.

I look forward to your reply.

Howard

###

Suggested questions on Nuclear Posture Review, based upon Pentagon outline
Draft by Howard Hallman, 2-5-02.

1. MAD doctrine

Under "New Environment and President's Direction" it states: (a) "Cold War approach to deterrence no longer appropriate" and (b) "End relationship with Russia based on MAD", that is, mutually assured destruction. However, under the NPR plan 1,700 to 2,200 "operationally deployed warheads"

will remain in service in 2012. Based upon the pattern of the present SIOF (single integrated operating plan), which the NPR doesn't seem to change, most of these will be available to strike targets in Russia. That's enough to destroy Russia several times over. Doesn't this mean that MAD will still be in effect in 2012?

Note: I asked the Public Affairs Office at the Pentagon what the composition of the operationally deployed warheads will be in 2012 and was told that this hasn't been determined. Bruce Blair of the Center for Defense Information has made his own estimates, and I have asked him to share them with us. I am trying to reach Stan Norris at the Natural Resources Defense Council for his estimates of targeting in 2012, for he has done an elaborate study on the likely pattern of the present SIOF.

2. Reserve

The NPR indicates that there will be a "force structure and downloaded warheads preserved for the responsive force." How large will that be? What is its composition? If the United States preserves a large reserve, will not Russia do likewise?

3. De-alerting

During the presidential election campaign, George W. Bush stated that "the United States should remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert, hair-trigger status -- another unnecessary of Cold War confrontation. Preparation for quick launch -- within minutes after warning of an attack -- was the rule during the era of superpower rivalry. But today, for two nations at peace, keeping so many weapons on high alert may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch." However, the Nuclear Posture Review says nothing about de-alerting. (a) Is President Bush no longer committed to de-alerting? (b) How many warheads will be on "high-alert, hair-trigger status" in 2012?

Note: Bruce Blair observes that the NPR's intent to take many warheads out of service and put them in reserve is a form of de-alerting (short of dismantlement) even though the NPR doesn't use this language. He has estimates on how many warheads are likely to be on hair-trigger alert in

2012 (ranging from 660 to 880, as I recall). I am seeking this information.

4. Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

Under "Sustainment of Current Nuclear Forces" the NPR indicates:

"current

force projection to remain until 2020 or longer." In contrast, under

Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty the United States

has an

obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament. This

was

reaffirmed in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review conference in

which

the United States and other nuclear-weapon states made "an unequivocal

undertaking...to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear

arsenals". Does the Nuclear Posture Review signal that the United

States

is in effect withdrawing from its NPT commitment?

5. Testing

The NPR indicates that the United States will "accelerate DOE's test

readiness". What does this mean in practical terms? Does this mean

that

the Bush Administration intends to resume testing?

To: "Greg Laszakovits" <glaszakovits_gb@brethren.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Meeting on Nuclear Posture Review
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <sc67c9f1.013@mail.brethren.org>
References:

At 01:12 PM 2/11/02 -0600, you wrote:
>Apologies--When and where is this meeting?
>Greg

Greg,

It is on Friday, February 15 from 11:00 a.m. to 12 noon in Conference Room 3, Methodist Building.

Howard

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 6.0.1
Date: Mon, 11 Feb 2002 14:21:30 -0600
From: "Greg Laszakovits" <glaszakovits_gb@brethren.org>
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Meeting on Nuclear Posture Review

Thanks, I'll be there.

>>> "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> 02/11/02 03:11PM >>>
At 01:12 PM 2/11/02 -0600, you wrote:
>Apologies--When and where is this meeting?
>Greg

Greg,

It is on Friday, February 15 from 11:00 a.m. to 12 noon in Conference
Room
3, Methodist Building.

Howard

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

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

To: jgeorgieff@earthlink.net
From: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Information about MUPJ
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\mu.118.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Joyce,

Your request for an information fact sheet on Methodists United for Peace with Justice became buried on my desk and just emerged. Sorry it was delayed.

With the hope that I'm not too late, I'm sending a Word attachment about Methodists United for Peace with Justice. I also have a flyer that I could Fed-Ex to you. It is a couple of years old and the list of our National Advisory Committee is somewhat out of date, but the facts are still accurate. If you want it, tell me your address and how many copies to send.

Shalom,
Howard

X-Originating-IP: [63.215.152.239]

From: "Ira Shorr" <irashorr@hotmail.com>

To: mupj@igc.org

Subject: De-alerting Questions

Date: Mon, 11 Feb 2002 15:26:31 -0500

X-OriginalArrivalTime: 11 Feb 2002 20:26:32.0109 (UTC) FILETIME=[64A4EDD0:01C1B33A]

Thanks Howard--let me know what you hear:

Q – During his campaign President Bush stated that keeping nuclear weapons on high-alert “may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch,” and he added that the U.S. “should work with other nuclear nations to remove as many weapons as possible from hair-trigger status.” Is this still the position of the Bush administration?

Q - The Defense Authorization Conference Report for FY 2002 requested that the Nuclear Posture review look at the “The possibility of deactivating or dealerting nuclear warheads or delivery systems immediately, or immediately after a decision to retire any specific warhead...”

It appears that while the administration’s NPR calls for de-mating warheads from missiles slated for elimination, it’s slated to take up to ten years to happen. If we truly have a new relationship with Russia can’t we move more quickly to take these weapons off high-alert? Can’t we, as the Defense Authorization request states, deactivate these warheads “immediately”?

Q- Considering the on-going deterioration of Russian nuclear early warning systems, would it be in the security interest of the United States for Russia to remove their nuclear weapons from high-alert status?

Q - The Bush administration has stated that we have a new relationship with Russia, and that they want to want to move beyond the Cold War nuclear stand-off of “Mutual Assured Destruction.” Yet both nations are still threatening each other with a quick-launch of nuclear weapons on high-alert. If we do have a new relationship with Russia can’t the U.S. move quickly to remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert status and encourage the Russians to do the same?

Q- To help ensure that other nuclear nations, like India and Pakistan, don't move to put their nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert, should the U.S.--working with Russia--set an example for the world by removing their nuclear weapons from high-alert?

Chat with friends online, try MSN Messenger: <http://messenger.msn.com>

To: interfaithnd, ograbc@aol.com, jmatlack@erols.com, thart@episcopalchurch.org, gthunt@mdo.net, WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com, dave@paxchristiusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: NPR briefing on Friday, February 15
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\icnd.128.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues,

1. Reminder. There will a briefing on the Bush Nuclear Posture Review for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on Friday, February 15 from 11:00 a.m. to 12 noon in Conference Room 3, Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE. It will be led by Frank Miller from the National Security Council staff. Out of respect for his busy schedule, please arrive by 10: 55 so that the meeting can start on time.
2. If you have not RSVP'd, please let me know if you are coming.
3. As background, I have developed a set of questions on the Nuclear Posture Review. They are provide below and also sent as a Word attachment. You may want to draw on these to ask questions to Mr. Miller. This is not a script, so put the questions in your own words.

In the questions, page references are to the NPR outline presented at the Pentagon news conference on January 9. I will have copies available on Friday. If you have downloaded this outline, my numbering treats the first sheet as a cover and starts on the second sheet. If you want to see this outline in advance, go to <http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jan2002/020109-D-6570C-001.pdf>. If you can't get direct access in this manner, you can go to www.defenselink.mil/, then to DOD News, then to Special Briefing -- Nuclear Posture Review -- Jan. 9, then click on slides shown. The briefing has an explanation of the slides.

I look forward to seeing you on Friday.

Shalom,
Howard

###

QUESTIONS TO ASK ABOUT THE NUCLEAR POSTURE REVIEW
(Page numbers refer to "Findings of the Nuclear Posture Review",
issued by the Department of Defense on January 9, 2002)

A. SIZING THE NUCLEAR FORCE

The goal of the Nuclear Posture Review (p.9) is 1,700 to 2,200 "operationally deployed force" by 2012 for "immediate and unexpected contingencies". "Force structure and downloaded warheads" will be preserved in a "responsive force" for potential contingencies. "Preplanning is essential for immediate and potential contingencies."

1. Why will it take until 2012 to reach the 1,700 to 2,200 goal? Why can't it be accomplished much sooner?
2. How many warheads and delivery vehicles will be preserved in the responsive force, that is, held in reserved rather than be dismantled?
3. What will be the status of warheads and delivery vehicles placed in the responsive force in terms of how fast they

might be re-deployed? In what circumstances will this occur?

4. Is "preplanning" for immediate and potential contingencies in effect a new version of SIOP (single integrated operating plan)?

B. TARGETING

The NPR outline speaks (p. 7) of a "capabilities-based approach" that will not be country-specific but as a priority will maintain capabilities for unexpected and potential threat contingencies. The NPR outline (p. 9) also indicates that force sizing is not driven by an immediate contingency involving Russia.

1. If Russia is not an immediate contingency, is it still considered a potential threat that requires preplanning and targeting by the deployed operational force? If so, how many warheads in the operationally deployed force will be assigned to Russia?

2. What about China? Is it considered a potential threat requiring the targeting of nuclear weapons in preplanning? If so, how many warheads will be assigned to China?

3. In his State of Union address President Bush mentioned an "axis of evil" consisting of Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. Are they considered a potential threat that requires targeting of nuclear weapons? If so, how many warheads will be assigned to these states?

4. What other potential threats will be taken into account in preplanning? For instance, will nuclear weapons be committed to response to biological and chemical weapons?

5. Whereas previous administrations had a policy of no-first-use against any non-nuclear-weapons state (unless allied with a nuclear-weapons state), the NPR and statements by President Bush and others in his administration seem to indicate a willingness to use nuclear weapons against such states. Is this so? If this is the case, does not this expand the use of nuclear weapons in the military strategy of the United States beyond the deterrence of nuclear attack, which is the current primary justification?

6. Civil-sector analysts indicate that if Iraq, Iran, and North Korea are considered potential threats, they likely would have targets in the 10 to 20 range each and that potential targets in China might number in the low hundreds. This would leave 1,200 to 1,600 warheads to be assigned in preplanning to deal with Russia. Is this a reasonable estimate?

C. MAD DOCTRINE

The NPR outline (p. 5) indicates that the Cold War approach to deterrence is no longer appropriate, and it calls for an end to the relationship with Russia based on MAD (mutually assured destruction). During the past year President Bush, Secretary Rumsfeld, and Secretary Powell have all called for the end of MAD. However, the "preplanning" targeting of the 1,700 to 2,200 warheads in the operationally deployed force seems most likely to be directed primarily toward Russia.

1. In practical terms, will not the MAD doctrine still be in effect in 2012?

2. Furthermore, the NPR outline (p. 10) indicates that the current force is projected to remain until 2020 or longer. Does not this mean that MAD will prevail during the first two decades of the 21st century?

D. DEALING WITH TERRORISM

President Bush's State of the Union address focused primarily upon dealing with terrorism. He expressed a concern that terrorist organizations might acquire and use nuclear weapons. One place this might occur is Russia where nuclear warheads and fissile material seem to be less than totally secure. The Nunn-Lugar program and related elements of the Cooperative Nuclear Reduction Program are dealing with this. However, if the United States reserves a large number

of warheads in its responsive force, Russia is more likely to do likewise.

1. Since this would make more warheads available at risk for acquisition by terrorist organizations, would not the United States be better off to enter into a binding, verifiable agreement with Russia with a commitment that neither side would hold nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles in reserve?

E. NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY

According to the NPR outline (p. 10) the current force projection will remain until 2020 or longer. In contrast under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty the United States has an obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament. This was reaffirmed in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review conference in which the United States and other nuclear-weapon states made "an unequivocal undertaking...to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals".

1. Does the Nuclear Posture Review signal that the United States is in effect withdrawing from its NPT commitment?

F. DE-ALERTING

1. During presidential campaign George W. Bush stated that keeping nuclear weapons on high-alert "may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch". He added that the U.S. "should work with other nuclear nations to remove as many weapons as possible from hair-trigger status." Is this still President Bush's position? There seems to be nothing in the Nuclear Posture Review about de-alerting.

2. Under the policies of the Nuclear Posture Review, how many warheads will be on high-alert, hair-trigger status in 2012?

3. If we have a new relationship with Russia, why can't the U.S. move quickly to remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert status and encourage the Russians to do the same?

G. TESTING

1. The NPR outline (p. 10) indicates that the United States will "accelerate DOE's test readiness. What does this mean in practical terms?

2. Does this mean that the Bush Administration intends to resume testing?

H. TACTICAL NUCLEAR WEAPONS

1. The Nuclear Posture Review makes no mention of tactical nuclear weapons. What will be the status of tactical nuclear weapons in the next ten years?

2. Will such weapons now stored at air bases in Europe be returned to the United States?

3. Are there any plans to dismantle tactical nuclear weapons?

4. How will be United States deal with Russia's stockpile of tactical nuclear weapons?

To: bumc
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Food for thought
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

"It is not enough to prepare our children for the world;
we must also prepare the world for our children."
--Luis R. Rodriquez

This is an intriguing thought and a challenge.

Shalom,
Howard

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-4736742-10-1013522891-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com
X-Sender: GPowers@usccb.org
X-Apparently-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5.2
To: <interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com>
X-eGroups-From: "Gerard Powers" <GPowers@usccb.org>
From: "Gerard Powers" <gpowers@nccbuscc.org>
Mailing-List: list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com; contact interfaithnd-owner@yahoogroups.com
Delivered-To: mailing list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com>
Date: Tue, 12 Feb 2002 09:04:51 -0500
Subject: [interfaithnd] NPR briefing on Friday, February 15 -Reply
Reply-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

There's a chance I'll have to babysit, but I'll try to be there otherwise.

----- Yahoo! Groups Sponsor ----->
Get your FREE credit report with a FREE CreditCheck
Monitoring Service trial
<http://us.click.yahoo.com/ACHqaB/bQ8CAA/ySSFAA/nJ9qlB/TM>
----->

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:
interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5.2
Date: Tue, 12 Feb 2002 10:12:38 -0500
From: "Gerard Powers" <GPowers@usccb.org>
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Proposed web site -Reply

Howard:

Sorry for the delay in responding.

I'm afraid I can't co-sponsor something like a web site. That is the equivalent of formally joining a coalition, which we almost never do.

Jerry Powers

To: "Gerard Powers" <gpowers@nccbuscc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: NPR briefing on Friday, February 15
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <sc68daec.075@usccb.org>
References:

At 09:04 AM 2/12/02 -0500, you wrote:

>There's a chance I'll have to babysit, but I'll try to be there otherwise.

Jerry,

Bring your child with you. It's a new era!

Regarding the web site, I thought chances were low that you could be a sponsor. However, when I get it running, I would like to post the section on nuclear disarmament from The Harvest of Peace and to have linkage with other documents of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops.

Shalom,
Howard

From: Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fcnl.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] NPR briefing on Friday, February 15
Date: Tue, 12 Feb 2002 10:38:13 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Howard,
I'm sorry that I can't come to this. Our executive committee retreat begins at noon. I know that David will be there.
Best,
Kathy

Kathy Guthrie
Field Program Secretary
Friends Committee on National Legislation
245 Second Street NE
Washington, DC 20002
202-547-6000, ext. 144 (phone)
202-547-6019 (fax)
800-630-1330, ext. 144
www.fcnl.org

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, February 12, 2002 9:04 AM
To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com; ograbc@aol.com; jmatlack@erols.com; thart@episcopalchurch.org; gthunt@mdo.net; WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com; dave@paxchristiusa.org
Subject: [interfaithnd] NPR briefing on Friday, February 15

Dear Colleagues,

1. Reminder. There will a briefing on the Bush Nuclear Posture Review for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on Friday, February 15 from 11:00 a.m. to 12 noon in Conference Room 3, Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE. It will be led by Frank Miller from the National Security Council staff. Out of respect for his busy schedule, please arrive by 10: 55 so that the meeting can start on time.
2. If you have not RSVP'd, please let me know if you are coming.
3. As background, I have developed a set of questions on the Nuclear Posture Review. They are provide below and also sent as a Word attachment. You may want to draw on these to ask questions to Mr. Miller. This is not a script, so put the questions in your own words.

In the questions, page references are to the NPR outline presented at the Pentagon news conference on January 9. I will have copies available on Friday. If you have downloaded this outline, my numbering treats the first sheet as a cover and starts on the second sheet. If you want to see

this outline in advance, go to <http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jan2002/020109-D-6570C-001.pdf>. If you can't get direct access in this manner, you can go to www.defenselink.mil/, then to DOD News, then to Special Briefing -- Nuclear Posture Review -- Jan. 9, then click on slides shown. The briefing has an explanation of the slides.

I look forward to seeing you on Friday.

Shalom,
Howard

###

QUESTIONS TO ASK ABOUT THE NUCLEAR POSTURE REVIEW
(Page numbers refer to "Findings of the Nuclear Posture Review",
issued by the Department of Defense on January 9, 2002)

A. SIZING THE NUCLEAR FORCE

The goal of the Nuclear Posture Review (p.9) is 1,700 to 2,200 "operationally deployed force" by 2012 for "immediate and unexpected contingencies". "Force structure and downloaded warheads" will be preserved in a "responsive force" for potential contingencies. "Preplanning is essential for immediate and potential contingencies."

1. Why will it take until 2012 to reach the 1,700 to 2,200 goal? Why can't it be accomplished much sooner?
2. How many warheads and delivery vehicles will be preserved in the responsive force, that is, held in reserved rather than be dismantled?
3. What will be the status of warheads and delivery vehicles placed in the responsive force in terms of how fast they might be re-deployed? In what circumstances will this occur?
4. Is "preplanning" for immediate and potential contingencies in effect a new version of SIOP (single integrated operating plan)?

B. TARGETING

The NPR outline speaks (p. 7) of a "capabilities-based approach" that will not be country-specific but as a priority will maintain capabilities for unexpected and potential threat contingencies. The NPR outline (p. 9) also indicates that force sizing is not driven by an immediate contingency involving Russia.

1. If Russia is not an immediate contingency, is it still considered a potential threat that requires preplanning and targeting by the deployed operational force? If so, how many warheads in the operationally deployed force will be assigned to Russia?
2. What about China? Is it considered a potential threat requiring the targeting of nuclear weapons in preplanning? If so, how many warheads will

be assigned to China?

3. In his State of Union address President Bush mentioned an "axis of evil" consisting of Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. Are they considered a potential threat that requires targeting of nuclear weapons? If so, how many warheads will be assigned to these states?

4. What other potential threats will be taken into account in preplanning? For instance, will nuclear weapons be committed to response to biological and chemical weapons?

5. Whereas previous administrations had a policy of no-first-use against any non-nuclear-weapons state (unless allied with a nuclear-weapons state), the NPR and statements by President Bush and others in his administration seem to indicate a willingness to use nuclear weapons against such states. Is this so? If this is the case, does not this expand the use of nuclear weapons in the military strategy of the United States beyond the deterrence of nuclear attack, which is the current primary justification?

6. Civil-sector analysts indicate that if Iraq, Iran, and North Korea are considered potential threats, they likely would have targets in the 10 to 20 range each and that potential targets in China might number in the low hundreds. This would leave 1,200 to 1,600 warheads to be assigned in preplanning to deal with Russia. Is this a reasonable estimate?

C. MAD DOCTRINE

The NPR outline (p. 5) indicates that the Cold War approach to deterrence is no longer appropriate, and it calls for an end to the relationship with Russia based on MAD (mutually assured destruction). During the past year President Bush, Secretary Rumsfeld, and Secretary Powell have all called for the end of MAD. However, the "preplanning" targeting of the 1,700 to 2,200 warheads in the operationally deployed force seems most likely to be directed primarily toward Russia.

1. In practical terms, will not the MAD doctrine still be in effect in 2012?

2. Furthermore, the NPR outline (p. 10) indicates that the current force is projected to remain until 2020 or longer. Does not this mean that MAD will prevail during the first two decades of the 21st century?

D. DEALING WITH TERRORISM

President Bush's State of the Union address focused primarily upon dealing with terrorism. He expressed a concern that terrorist organizations might acquire and use nuclear weapons. One place this might occur is Russia where nuclear warheads and fissile material seem to be less than totally secure. The Nunn-Lugar program and related elements of the Cooperative Nuclear Reduction Program are dealing with this. However, if the United States reserves a large number of warheads in its responsive force, Russia is more likely to do likewise.

1. Since this would make more warheads available at risk for acquisition

by terrorist organizations, would not the United States be better off to enter into a binding, verifiable agreement with Russia with a commitment that neither side would hold nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles in reserve?

E. NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY

According to the NPR outline (p. 10) the current force projection will remain until 2020 or longer. In contrast under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty the United States has an obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament. This was reaffirmed in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review conference in which the United States and other nuclear-weapon states made "an unequivocal undertaking...to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals".

1. Does the Nuclear Posture Review signal that the United States is in effect withdrawing from its NPT commitment?

F. DE-ALERTING

1. During presidential campaign George W. Bush stated that keeping nuclear weapons on high-alert "may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch". He added that the U.S. "should work with other nuclear nations to remove as many weapons as possible from hair-trigger status." Is this still President Bush's position? There seems to be nothing in the Nuclear Posture Review about de-alerting.

2. Under the policies of the Nuclear Posture Review, how many warheads will be on high-alert, hair-trigger status in 2012?

3. If we have a new relationship with Russia, why can't the U.S. move quickly to remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert status and encourage the Russians to do the same?

G. TESTING

1. The NPR outline (p. 10) indicates that the United States will "accelerate DOE's test readiness.

What does this mean in practical terms?

2. Does this mean that the Bush Administration intends to resume testing?

H. TACTICAL NUCLEAR WEAPONS

1. The Nuclear Posture Review makes no mention of tactical nuclear weapons. What will be the status of tactical nuclear weapons in the next ten years?

2. Will such weapons now stored at air bases in Europe be returned to the United States?

3. Are there any plans to dismantle tactical nuclear weapons?

4. How will be United States deal with Russia's stockpile of tactical

nuclear weapons?

----- Yahoo! Groups Sponsor ----->

Get your FREE credit report with a FREE CreditCheck
Monitoring Service trial

<http://us.click.yahoo.com/ACHqaB/bQ8CAA/ySSFAA/nJ9qlB/TM>

----->

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:
interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1300601-712-1013565017-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com
X-Sender: CKozlowski2@netscape.net
X-Apparently-To: bumc@yahoogroups.com
To: bumc@yahoogroups.com
X-Mailer: Atlas Mailer 1.0
X-eGroups-From: CKozlowski2@netscape.net (C. Kozlowski)
From: Ckozlowski2@netscape.net
X-Yahoo-Profile: onesmartmama
Mailing-List: list bumc@yahoogroups.com; contact bumc-owner@yahoogroups.com
Delivered-To: mailing list bumc@yahoogroups.com
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:bumc-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com>
Date: Tue, 12 Feb 2002 20:50:04 -0500
Subject: [bumc] Bioethics task force meeting last week

Fellow BUMC-ers interested in stem cells:

I have been holding off writing you all about the second round of meetings by the Bioethics Task Force of the General Board of Church and Society because I was afraid I might say something I regretted later. The Task Force did hear from two proponents of stem cell research. I wrote to the American Society for Cell Biology to thank them for at least coming to talk to the task force--even if the Task Force didn't seem to be very grateful. Below is the response I got. I think this says it all. I will continue to monitor the meetings of the Task Force through this year. If the statement they draft comes out as I expect it will, I guess I'll pray on it, then be turning to you all for advice on what alternative action Methodists might take to voice a different opinion when it's time for the next General Conference.

all my thanks to BUMC for your wonderful support,
Celia Kozlowski

Dear Celia,

Well, we did send somebody but it wasn't me and it was a waste of time. Unable to round up a scientist, our Director of Public Policy went instead, more as a courtesy than anything else. He said it was like walking into a buzz saw. The committee was hostile to the point of rudeness. At one point, he was cut off in mid-response and asked if stem cell researchers were advocating anything different from what the Nazis were doing. This was from someone who claimed to be a trained Bioethicist (her ethical training, however, seems to have skipped over civility and rationality.)

The committee had long ago made up its collective mind. They seemed only to be interested in firing up their torches and paying another visit to Dr. Frankenstein. They were happily ignorant of the vast change in our knowledge of cellular process, how it does require rethinking traditional ethical concepts but with an open mind and willingness to learn some of the new science, and that finally it offers promise to real living human beings, those who suffer today from diabetes, spinal cord injury, and neurodegenerative disease.

I confess I was shocked by a church organization that was so hostile to bioscience and so hostile to guests.

I wish you luck.

John Fleischman
Science Writer
American Society for Cell Biology

--

Your favorite stores, helpful shopping tools and great gift ideas. Experience the convenience of buying online with Shop@Netscape! <http://shopnow.netscape.com/>

Get your own FREE, personal Netscape Mail account today at <http://webmail.netscape.com/>

----- Yahoo! Groups Sponsor ----->

Get your FREE credit report with a FREE CreditCheck
Monitoring Service trial

<http://us.click.yahoo.com/ACHqaB/bQ8CAA/ySSFAA/X.ewlB/TM>

----->

To unsubscribe from this list, send a message with "unsubscribe BUMC" in the message body to mingomae@aol.com
For further information about BUMC, go to our website at <http://www.gbgm-umc.org/bumc-md>

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

To: Teddy Crum <TCrum@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Peace with Justice Coordinator Information
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <619BD1E95646D311B69D0008C79FE32D6CC58F@church2.umc-gbcs.org>
References:

At 11:47 AM 2/7/02 -0500, you wrote:

....We are in the process of updating our information for all of our Peace with
>Justice Coordinators, and would appreciate your help by responding to this
>email with your updated mailing address, email address, phone number, annual
>conference & position.

It is:

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

phone/fax: 301 896-0013
e-mail: mupj@igc.org

We are a national association that works closely with the Peace with Justice Program. In 2000 we co-sponsored a peace with justice breakfast at General Conference. I attend the peace with justice coordinators' conference as a colleague and resource person. I look forward to the meeting in April.

Shalom,
Howard Hallman

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5.2
Date: Wed, 13 Feb 2002 09:58:46 -0500
From: "Gerard Powers" <GPowers@usccb.org>
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: NPR briefing on Friday, February 15 -Reply

2/13/02

You can put excerpts of Harvest of Justice on the web site, so long as you correctly identify the source and put the copyright information at the bottom. You can also, of course, cite our web site if folks want to come visit.

Thanks.

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-4736742-11-1013614531-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com
X-Sender: J._Daryl_Byler@mail.mcc.org
X-Apparently-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com
X-Lotus-FromDomain: MCC
To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com
X-eGroups-From: J._Daryl_Byler@mail.mcc.org
From: J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org
Mailing-List: list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com; contact interfaithnd-owner@yahoogroups.com
Delivered-To: mailing list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com>
Date: Wed, 13 Feb 2002 10:15:00 -0500
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] NPR briefing on Friday, February 15
Reply-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

To: interfaithnd @ yahoogroups.com
From: J. Daryl Byler
Date: 2/13/2002 10:14:47 AM
Subj: Re: [interfaithnd] NPR briefing on Friday, February 15

Hi Howard:

Yes, I'll plan to be there on Friday.

Warm regards,
Daryl

----- Yahoo! Groups Sponsor ----->
Get your FREE credit report with a FREE CreditCheck
Monitoring Service trial
<http://us.click.yahoo.com/ACHqaB/bQ8CAA/ySSFAA/nJ9qlB/TM>
----->

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:
interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

From: Sam Garman <sam@fcnl.org>
To: "'mupj@igc.org'" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: friday's briefing
Date: Wed, 13 Feb 2002 10:41:20 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Dear Howard,

David Culp and I will both be attending the Frank Miller briefing this Friday.

Sam Garman
Legislative Intern
Friends Committee on National Legislation
245 Second Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002-5795
phone: 202-547-6000, ext. 120
fax: 202-547-6019

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-4736742-12-1013636366-
mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com
X-Sender: dshank@sojo.net
X-Apparently-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com
To: "interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com" <interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com>
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
From: Duane Shank <dshank@sojo.net>
X-Yahoo-Profile: dshankdc
Mailing-List: list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com; contact interfaithnd-
owner@yahoogroups.com
Delivered-To: mailing list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com>
Date: Wed, 13 Feb 2002 16:44:10 -0500
Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] NPR briefing on Friday, February 15
Reply-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

Dear Howard.

With apologies, I do have a previous meeting scheduled for Friday.
Thanks for the invitation.
Peace,

Duane

~~~~~  
Duane Shank                      Sojourners/Call to Renewal  
Issues and Policy Adviser      2401 15th Street, NW  
202-328-8842, ext. 226      Washington, DC 20009  
FAX: 202-328-6797

*"Our being Christian today will be limited to two things:  
prayer and righteous action among humanity."  
Dietrich Bonhoeffer*

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

**From:** Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 12, 2002 9:04 AM  
**To:** interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com; ograbc@aol.com; jmatlack@erols.com;  
thart@episcopalchurch.org; gthunt@mdo.net;  
WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com; dave@paxchristiusa.org  
**Subject:** [interfaithnd] NPR briefing on Friday, February 15

Dear Colleagues,

1. Reminder. There will a briefing on the Bush Nuclear Posture Review for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on Friday, February 15 from 11:00 a.m. to 12 noon in Conference Room 3, Methodist Building, 100

Maryland Avenue, NE. It will be led by Frank Miller from the National Security Council staff. Out of respect for his busy schedule, please arrive by 10: 55 so that the meeting can start on time.

2. If you have not RSVP'd, please let me know if you are coming.

3. As background, I have developed a set of questions on the Nuclear Posture Review. They are provide below and also sent as a Word attachment.

You may want to draw on these to ask questions to Mr. Miller. This is not a script, so put the questions in your own words.

In the questions, page references are to the NPR outline presented at the Pentagon news conference on January 9. I will have copies available on Friday. If you have downloaded this outline, my numbering treats the first sheet as a cover and starts on the second sheet. If you want to see this outline in advance, go to

<http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jan2002/020109-D-6570C-001.pdf>. If you can't get direct access in this manner, you can go to [www.defenselink.mil/](http://www.defenselink.mil/), then to DOD News, then to Special Briefing -- Nuclear Posture Review -- Jan. 9, then click on slides shown. The briefing has an explanation of the slides.

I look forward to seeing you on Friday.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

QUESTIONS TO ASK ABOUT THE NUCLEAR POSTURE REVIEW  
(Page numbers refer to "Findings of the Nuclear Posture Review",  
issued by the Department of Defense on January 9, 2002)

#### A. SIZING THE NUCLEAR FORCE

The goal of the Nuclear Posture Review (p.9) is 1,700 to 2,200 "operationally deployed force" by 2012 for "immediate and unexpected contingencies". "Force structure and downloaded warheads" will be preserved in a "responsive force" for potential contingencies. "Preplanning is essential for immediate and potential contingencies."

1. Why will it take until 2012 to reach the 1,700 to 2,200 goal? Why can't it be accomplished much sooner?

2. How many warheads and delivery vehicles will be preserved in the responsive force, that is, held in reserved rather than be dismantled?

3. What will be the status of warheads and delivery vehicles placed in the responsive force in terms of how fast they might be re-deployed? In what circumstances will this occur?

4. Is "preplanning" for immediate and potential contingencies in effect a new version of SIOP (single integrated operating plan)?

## B. TARGETING

The NPR outline speaks (p. 7) of a "capabilities-based approach" that will not be country-specific but as a priority will maintain capabilities for unexpected and potential threat contingencies. The NPR outline (p. 9) also indicates that force sizing is not driven by an immediate contingency involving Russia.

1. If Russia is not an immediate contingency, is it still considered a potential threat that requires preplanning and targeting by the deployed operational force? If so, how many warheads in the operationally deployed force will be assigned to Russia?

2. What about China? Is it considered a potential threat requiring the targeting of nuclear weapons in preplanning? If so, how many warheads will be assigned to China?

3. In his State of Union address President Bush mentioned an "axis of evil" consisting of Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. Are they considered a potential threat that requires targeting of nuclear weapons? If so, how many warheads will be assigned to these states?

4. What other potential threats will be taken into account in preplanning? For instance, will nuclear weapons be committed to response to biological and chemical weapons?

5. Whereas previous administrations had a policy of no-first-use against any non-nuclear-weapons state (unless allied with a nuclear-weapons state), the NPR and statements by President Bush and others in his administration seem to indicate a willingness to use nuclear weapons against such states. Is this so? If this is the case, does not this expand the use of nuclear weapons in the military strategy of the United States beyond the deterrence of nuclear attack, which is the current primary justification?

6. Civil-sector analysts indicate that if Iraq, Iran, and North Korea are considered potential threats, they likely would have targets in the 10 to 20 range each and that potential targets in China might number in the low hundreds. This would leave 1,200 to 1,600 warheads to be assigned in

preplanning to deal with Russia. Is this a reasonable estimate?

### C. MAD DOCTRINE

The NPR outline (p. 5) indicates that the Cold War approach to deterrence is no longer appropriate, and it calls for an end to the relationship with Russia based on MAD (mutually assured destruction). During the past year President Bush, Secretary Rumsfeld, and Secretary Powell have all called for the end of MAD. However, the "preplanning" targeting of the 1,700 to 2,200 warheads in the operationally deployed force seems most likely to be directed primarily toward Russia.

1. In practical terms, will not the MAD doctrine still be in effect in 2012?

2. Furthermore, the NPR outline (p. 10) indicates that the current force is projected to remain until 2020 or longer. Does not this mean that MAD will prevail during the first two decades of the 21st century?

### D. DEALING WITH TERRORISM

President Bush's State of the Union address focused primarily upon dealing with terrorism. He expressed a concern that terrorist organizations might acquire and use nuclear weapons. One place this might occur is Russia where nuclear warheads and fissile material seem to be less than totally secure. The Nunn-Lugar program and related elements of the Cooperative Nuclear Reduction Program are dealing with this. However, if the United States reserves a large number of warheads in its responsive force, Russia is more likely to do likewise.

1. Since this would make more warheads available at risk for acquisition by terrorist organizations, would not the United States be better off to enter into a binding, verifiable agreement with Russia with a commitment that neither side would hold nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles in reserve?

### E. NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY

According to the NPR outline (p. 10) the current force projection will remain until 2020 or longer. In contrast under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty the United States has an obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament. This was reaffirmed in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review conference in which the United States and other nuclear-weapon states made "an unequivocal undertaking...to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals".

1. Does the Nuclear Posture Review signal that the United States is in effect withdrawing from its NPT commitment?

#### F. DE-ALERTING

1. During presidential campaign George W. Bush stated that keeping nuclear weapons on high-alert "may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch". He added that the U.S. "should work with other nuclear nations to remove as many weapons as possible from hair-trigger status." Is this still President Bush's position? There seems to be nothing in the Nuclear Posture Review about de-alerting.

2. Under the policies of the Nuclear Posture Review, how many warheads will be on high-alert, hair-trigger status in 2012?

3. If we have a new relationship with Russia, why can't the U.S. move quickly to remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert status and encourage the Russians to do the same?

#### G. TESTING

1. The NPR outline (p. 10) indicates that the United States will "accelerate DOE's test readiness.

What does this mean in practical terms?

2. Does this mean that the Bush Administration intends to resume testing?

#### H. TACTICAL NUCLEAR WEAPONS

1. The Nuclear Posture Review makes no mention of tactical nuclear weapons. What will be the status of tactical nuclear weapons in the next ten years?

2. Will such weapons now stored at air bases in Europe be returned to the United States?

3. Are there any plans to dismantle tactical nuclear weapons?

4. How will be United States deal with Russia's stockpile of tactical nuclear weapons?

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:  
[interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com)

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to the [Yahoo! Terms of Service](#).



To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:  
[interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com)

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to the [Yahoo! Terms of Service](#).

From: "ANTHONY VENTO" <tvpcusa1@prodigy.net>  
To: "Howard Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Fw: Nuclear Posture Review  
Date: Wed, 13 Feb 2002 16:54:41 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700  
X-Mimeole: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Hello Howard,

Hope this is the right address. If so, let me introduce myself. I'm the new Program Director at Pax Christi USA, working with Dave Robinson who is now the National Coordinator.

I'm not sure if you received the email below - I'm afraid I may have sent it to the wrong address. I hope it is not too late for me to join you on Friday, on behalf of Pax Christi USA. When I didn't hear from you, I called around and got this email, and a phone #: 301/620-0232. Is that correct? I've tried a few times this afternoon, and there is no answer. But once again, I hope this can work. If you can send me any material electronically, I'll review it tomorrow. I am not planning to fly to DC until before dawn on Friday AM, and will be into DC by about 9 or 9:30 am.

Peace to you,

Tony

+++++

Tony Vento, Program Director

Pax Christi USA [www.paxchristiusa.org](http://www.paxchristiusa.org)

[tony@paxchristiusa.org](mailto:tony@paxchristiusa.org) [tvpcusa1@prodigy.net](mailto:tvpcusa1@prodigy.net)

Erie: 814/453-4955, x225 Cleveland: 216/631-5632

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

**From:** [ANTHONY VENTO](#)

**To:** [Mmupj@igc.org](mailto:Mmupj@igc.org)

**Cc:** [Dave Robinson](#)

**Sent:** Monday, February 04, 2002 3:59 PM

**Subject:** Nuclear Posture Review

Dear Howard,

Dave Robinson asked me to join the meeting on Friday, 2-15 with Franklin Miller, to represent Pax Christi USA. We are very excited that you secured this meeting. You can forward background information to me.

I'm also looking forward to meeting you. In my previous work, I often collaborated with Rich Aronson, from the Peace with Justice Project/East Ohio Conference of the UMC. He and I had some great fun together in doing some very effective work.

Peace to you,

Tony

P.S. Here is a good mailing address for me, since I work primarily from Cleveland.  
4010 John Avenue  
Cleveland, OH 44113

Also, please use both my email addresses, if you can, since I travel a lot, and cannot easily access the paxchristiusa address when outside the office.

+++++

Tony Vento, Program Director

Pax Christi USA [www.paxchristiusa.org](http://www.paxchristiusa.org)

[tony@paxchristiusa.org](mailto:tony@paxchristiusa.org) [tvpcusa1@prodigy.net](mailto:tvpcusa1@prodigy.net)

Erie: 814/453-4955, x225 Cleveland: 216/631-5632

To: "ANTHONY VENTO" <tvpcusa1@prodigy.net>, tony@paxchristiusa.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Fw: Nuclear Posture Review  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments: A:\icnd.128.doc;  
In-Reply-To: <0c9a01c1b4d9\$2511a1e0\$1400a8c0@paxchristiusa.org>  
References:

Dear Tony,

I'm glad that you can come to the briefing on the Nuclear Posture Review on Friday. It will be held in Conference Room 3, Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE. That's across the street from the Supreme Court Building.

The presenter will be Frank Miller of the National Security Council staff. We will have an opportunity to ask questions. Our intent is to have a friendly dialogue and not a stringent confrontation. Some sample questions are sent below and also as a Word attachment. I'll have copies of the reference document on hand.

Correct contact for me is listed below.

Call me at 301 896-0013 if you have any questions.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

Questions to Ask about the Nuclear Posture Review  
(Page numbers refer to "Findings of the Nuclear Posture Review",  
issued by the Department of Defense on January 9, 2002)

#### A. Sizing the Nuclear Force

The goal of the Nuclear Posture Review (p.9) is 1,700 to 2,200 "operationally deployed force" by 2012 for "immediate and unexpected contingencies". "Force structure and downloaded warheads" will be preserved in a "responsive force" for potential contingencies. "Preplanning is essential for immediate and potential contingencies."

1. Why will it take until 2012 to reach the 1,700 to 2,200 goal? Why can't it be accomplished much sooner?
2. How many warheads and delivery vehicles will be preserved in the responsive force, that is, held in reserved rather than be dismantled?
3. What will be the status of warheads and delivery vehicles placed in the responsive force in terms of how fast they might be re-deployed? In what circumstances will this occur?
4. Is "preplanning" for immediate and potential contingencies in effect a new version of SIOP (single integrated operating plan)?

#### B. Targeting

The NPR outline speaks (p. 7) of a "capabilities-based approach" that will not be country-specific but as a priority will maintain capabilities for unexpected and potential threat contingencies. The NPR outline (p. 9) also indicates that force sizing is not driven by an immediate contingency involving Russia.

1. If Russia is not an immediate contingency, is it still considered a potential threat that requires preplanning and targeting by the deployed operational force? If so, how many warheads in the operationally deployed force will be assigned to Russia?
2. What about China? Is it considered a potential threat requiring the targeting of nuclear weapons in preplanning? If so, how many warheads will be assigned to China?
3. In his State of Union address President Bush mentioned an "axis of evil" consisting of Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. Are they considered a potential threat that requires targeting of nuclear weapons? If so, how many warheads will be assigned to these states?
4. What other potential threats will be taken into account in preplanning? For instance, will nuclear weapons be committed to response to biological and chemical weapons?
5. Whereas previous administrations had a policy of no-first-use against any non-nuclear-weapons state (unless allied with a nuclear-weapons state), the NPR and statements by President Bush and others in his administration seem to indicate a willingness to use nuclear weapons against such states. Is this so? If this is the case, does not this expand the use of nuclear weapons in the military strategy of the United States beyond the deterrence of nuclear attack, which is the current primary justification?
6. Civil-sector analysts indicate that if Iraq, Iran, and North Korea are considered potential threats, they likely would have targets in the 10 to 20 range each and that potential targets in China might number in the low hundreds. This would leave 1,200 to 1,600 warheads to be assigned in preplanning to deal with Russia. Is this a reasonable estimate?

#### C. MAD Doctrine

The NPR outline (p. 5) indicates that the Cold War approach to deterrence is no longer appropriate, and it calls for an end to the relationship with Russia based on MAD (mutually assured destruction). During the past year President Bush, Secretary Rumsfeld, and Secretary Powell have all called for the end of MAD. However, the "preplanning" targeting of the 1,700 to 2,200 warheads in the operationally deployed force seems most likely to be directed primarily toward Russia.

1. In practical terms, will not the MAD doctrine still be in effect in 2012?
2. Furthermore, the NPR outline (p. 10) indicates that the current force is projected to remain until 2020 or longer. Does not this mean that MAD will prevail during the first two decades of the 21st century?

#### D. Dealing with Terrorism

President Bush's State of the Union address focused primarily upon dealing with terrorism. He expressed a concern that terrorist organizations might acquire and use nuclear weapons. One place this might occur is Russia where nuclear warheads and fissile material seem to be less than totally secure. The Nunn-Lugar program and related elements of the Cooperative Nuclear Reduction Program are dealing with this. However, if the United States reserves a large number of warheads in its responsive force, Russia is more likely to do likewise.

1. Since this would make more warheads available at risk for acquisition by terrorist organizations, would not the United States be better off to enter into a binding, verifiable agreement with Russia with a commitment that neither side would hold nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles in reserve?

#### E. Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

According to the NPR outline (p. 10) the current force projection will remain until 2020 or longer. In contrast under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty the United States has an obligation for good faith negotiations on

nuclear disarmament. This was reaffirmed in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review conference in which the United States and other nuclear-weapon states made "an unequivocal undertaking...to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals".

1. Does the Nuclear Posture Review signal that the United States is in effect withdrawing from its NPT commitment?  
F. De-alerting

1. During presidential campaign George W. Bush stated that keeping nuclear weapons on high-alert "may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch". He added that the U.S. "should work with other nuclear nations to remove as many weapons as possible from hair-trigger status." Is this still President Bush's position? There seems to be nothing in the Nuclear Posture Review about de-alerting.

2. Under the policies of the Nuclear Posture Review, how many warheads will be on high-alert, hair-trigger status in 2012?

3. If we have a new relationship with Russia, why can't the U.S. move quickly to remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert status and encourage the Russians to do the same?

#### G. Testing

1. The NPR outline (p. 10) indicates that the United States will "accelerate DOE's test readiness. What does this mean in practical terms?

2. Does this mean that the Bush Administration intends to resume testing?

#### H. Tactical Nuclear Weapons

1. The Nuclear Posture Review makes no mention of tactical nuclear weapons. What will be the status of tactical nuclear weapons in the next ten years?

2. Will such weapons now stored at air bases in Europe be returned to the United States?

3. Are there any plans to dismantle tactical nuclear weapons?

4. How will be United States deal with Russia's stockpile of tactical nuclear weapons?

At 04:54 PM 2/13/02 -0500, you wrote:

> Hello Howard, fly to DC until before dawn on Friday AM,  
> and will be into DC by about 9 or 9:30 am. Peace to you, Tony  
>+++++  
>Tony Vento, Program Director  
> www.paxchristiusa.org  
>tony@paxchristiusa.org tvpcusa1@prodigy.net  
> Cleveland: 216/631-5632 ----- Original Message ----- From: ANTHONY  
>VENTO To: Mmupj@igc.org Cc: Dave Robinson Sent: Monday, February 04,  
>2002 3:59 PM Subject: Nuclear Posture Review  
> Dear Howard, You can forward background information to me. In my  
>previous work, I often collaborated with Rich Aronson, from the Peace with  
>Justice Project/East Ohio Conference of the UMC. He and I had some great

>fun together in doing some very effective work. Peace to you, Tony a  
>good mailing address for me, since I work primarily from Cleveland. 4010  
>John Avenue Cleveland, OH 44113 ++++++  
>Tony Vento, Program Director  
> www.paxchristiusa.org  
>tony@paxchristiusa.org tvpcusa1@prodigy.net  
> Cleveland: 216/631-5632

To: "ANTHONY VENTO" <tvpcusa1@prodigy.net>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Notification for "Fw: Nuclear Posture Review"  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments: c:\windows\TEMP\eud22E4.TMP;  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

From: "ANTHONY VENTO" <tvpcusa1@prodigy.net>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Fw: Nuclear Posture Review  
Date: Wed, 13 Feb 2002 18:14:17 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700  
X-Mimeole: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Thanks, Howard! Looking forward to it. Lenten Peace to you, Tony

+++++

Tony Vento, Program Director  
Pax Christi USA www.paxchristiusa.org  
tony@paxchristiusa.org tvpcusa1@prodigy.net  
Erie: 814/453-4955, x225 Cleveland: 216/631-5632

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

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "ANTHONY VENTO" <tvpcusa1@prodigy.net>; <tony@paxchristiusa.org>  
Sent: Wednesday, February 13, 2002 5:32 PM  
Subject: Re: Fw: Nuclear Posture Review

> Dear Tony,

>

> I'm glad that you can come to the briefing on the Nuclear Posture Review  
> on

> Friday. It will be held in Conference Room 3, Methodist Building, 100  
> Maryland Avenue, NE. That's across the street from the Supreme Court  
> Building.

>

> The presenter will be Frank Miller of the National Security Council staff.  
> We will have an opportunity to ask questions. Our intent is to have a  
> friendly dialogue and not a strigent confrontation. Some sample questions  
> are sent below and also as a Word attachment. I'll have copies of the  
> reference document on hand.

>

> Correct contact for me is listed below.

>

> Call me at 301 896-0013 if you have any questions.

>

> Shalom,  
> Howard

>

> ###

>

> Questions to Ask about the Nuclear Posture Review  
> (Page numbers refer to "Findings of the Nuclear Posture Review",  
> issued by the Department of Defense on January 9, 2002)

>

> A. Sizing the Nuclear Force

>

> The goal of the Nuclear Posture Review (p.9) is 1,700 to 2,200  
> "operationally deployed force" by 2012 for "immediate and unexpected  
> contingencies". "Force structure and downloaded warheads" will be

- > preserved in a "responsive force" for potential contingencies.
- > "Preplanning is essential for immediate and potential contingencies."
- >
- > 1. Why will it take until 2012 to reach the 1,700 to 2,200 goal? Why can't it be accomplished much sooner?
- >
- > 2. How many warheads and delivery vehicles will be preserved in the responsive force, that is, held in reserved rather than be dismantled?
- >
- > 3. What will be the status of warheads and delivery vehicles placed in the responsive force in terms of how fast they might be re-deployed? In what circumstances will this occur?
- >
- > 4. Is "preplanning" for immediate and potential contingencies in effect a new version of SIOP (single integrated operating plan)?
- >
- > B. Targeting
- >
- > The NPR outline speaks (p. 7) of a "capabilities-based approach" that will not be country-specific but as a priority will maintain capabilities for unexpected and potential threat contingencies. The NPR outline (p. 9) also indicates that force sizing is not driven by an immediate contingency involving Russia.
- >
- > 1. If Russia is not an immediate contingency, is it still considered a potential threat that requires preplanning and targeting by the deployed operational force? If so, how many warheads in the operationally deployed force will be assigned to Russia?
- >
- > 2. What about China? Is it considered a potential threat requiring the targeting of nuclear weapons in preplanning? If so, how many warheads will be assigned to China?
- >
- > 3. In his State of Union address President Bush mentioned an "axis of evil" consisting of Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. Are they considered a potential threat that requires targeting of nuclear weapons? If so, how many warheads will be assigned to these states?
- >
- > 4. What other potential threats will be taken into account in preplanning? For instance, will nuclear weapons be committed to response to biological and chemical weapons?
- >
- > 5. Whereas previous administrations had a policy of no-first-use against any non-nuclear-weapons state (unless allied with a nuclear-weapons state), the NPR and statements by President Bush and others in his administration seem to indicate a willingness to use nuclear weapons against such states. Is this so? If this is the case, does not this expand the use of nuclear weapons in the military strategy of the United States beyond the deterrence of nuclear attack, which is the current primary justification?

>  
> 6. Civil-sector analysts indicate that if Iraq, Iran, and North Korea are  
> considered potential threats, they likely would have targets in the 10 to  
> 20 range each and that potential targets in China might number in the low  
> hundreds. This would leave 1,200 to 1,600 warheads to be assigned in  
> preplanning to deal with Russia. Is this a reasonable estimate?

>  
> C. MAD Doctrine

>  
> The NPR outline (p. 5) indicates that the Cold War approach to deterrence  
> is no longer appropriate, and it calls for an end to the relationship with  
> Russia based on MAD (mutually assured destruction). During the past year  
> President Bush, Secretary Rumsfeld, and Secretary Powell have all called  
> for the end of MAD. However, the "preplanning" targeting of the 1,700 to  
> 2,200 warheads in the operationally deployed force seems most likely to  
> directed primarily toward Russia.

>  
> 1. In practical terms, will not the MAD doctrine still be in effect in  
> 2012?

>  
> 2. Furthermore, the NPR outline (p. 10) indicates that the current force  
is  
> projected to remain until 2020 or longer. Does not this mean that MAD  
will  
> prevail during the first two decades of the 21st century?

>  
> D. Dealing with Terrorism

>  
> President Bush's State of the Union address focused primarily upon dealing  
> with terrorism. He express a concern that terrorist organizations might  
> acquire and use nuclear weapons. One place this might occur is Russia  
> where nuclear warheads and fissile material seem to be less than totally  
> secure. The Nunn-Lugar program and related elements of the Cooperative  
> Nuclear Reduction Program are dealing with this. However, if the United  
> States reserves a large number of warheads in its responsive force, Russia  
> is more likely to do likewise.

>  
> 1. Since this would make more warheads available at risk for acquisition  
> by terrorist organizations, would not the United States be better off to  
> enter into a binding, verifiable agreement with Russia with a commitment  
> that neither side would hold nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles in  
> reserve?

>  
> E. Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

>  
> According to the NPR outline (p. 10) the current force projection will  
> remain until 2020 or longer. In contrast under Article VI of the Nuclear  
> Non-Proliferation Treaty the United States has an obligation for good  
faith  
> negotiations on nuclear disarmament. This was reaffirmed in the Final  
> Document of the 2000 NPT Review conference in which the United States and  
> other nuclear-weapon states made "an unequivocal undertaking...to  
> accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals".

>

> 1. Does the Nuclear Posture Review signal that the United States is in  
> effect withdrawing from its NPT commitment?  
> F. De-alerting  
>  
> 1. During presidential campaign George W. Bush stated that keeping nuclear  
> weapons on high-alert "may create unacceptable risks of accidental or  
> unauthorized launch". He added that the U.S. "should work with other  
> nuclear nations to remove as many weapons as possible from hair-trigger  
> status." Is this still President Bush's position? There seems to be  
> nothing in the Nuclear Posture Review about de-alerting.

> 2. Under the policies of the Nuclear Posture Review, how many warheads  
will  
> be on high-alert, hair-trigger status in 2012?

> 3. If we have a new relationship with Russia, why can't the U.S. move  
> quickly to remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert status and  
> encourage the Russians to do the same?

> G. Testing

> 1. The NPR outline (p. 10) indicates that the United States will  
"accelerate

> DOE's test readiness.

> What does this mean in practical terms?

> 2. Does this mean that the Bush Administration intends to resume testing?

> H. Tactical Nuclear Weapons

> 1. The Nuclear Posture Review makes no mention of tactical nuclear  
> weapons. What will be the status of tactical nuclear weapons in the next  
> ten years?

> 2. Will such weapons now stored at air bases in Europe be returned to the  
> United States?

> 3. Are there any plans to dismantle tactical nuclear weapons?

> 4. How will the United States deal with Russia's stockpile of tactical  
> nuclear weapons?

> At 04:54 PM 2/13/02 -0500, you wrote:

>> Hello Howard, fly to DC until before dawn on Friday AM,  
>> and will be into DC by about 9 or 9:30 am. Peace to you, Tony

>>+++++

>> Tony Vento, Program Director

>> www.paxchristiusa.org

>> tony@paxchristiusa.org tvpcusa1@prodigy.net

> > Cleveland: 216/631-5632 ----- Original Message ----- From: ANTHONY  
> >VENTO To: Mmupj@igc.org Cc: Dave Robinson Sent: Monday, February 04,  
> >2002 3:59 PM Subject: Nuclear Posture Review  
> > Dear Howard, You can forward background information to me. In  
my  
> >previous work, I often collaborated with Rich Aronson, from the Peace  
with  
> >Justice Project/East Ohio Conference of the UMC. He and I had some great  
> >fun together in doing some very effective work. Peace to you, Tony a  
> >good mailing address for me, since I work primarily from Cleveland. 4010  
> >John Avenue Cleveland, OH 44113 ++++++  
> >Tony Vento, Program Director  
> > www.paxchristiusa.org  
> >tony@paxchristiusa.org tvpcusa1@prodigy.net  
> > Cleveland: 216/631-5632

-----  
----

>  
> Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
> 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036  
> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org  
>  
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of  
> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-4736742-13-1013637843-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com  
X-Sender: wstarman@wesleysem.edu  
X-Apparently-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
To: "interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com" <interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com>  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
From: STARMAN WENDY <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>  
Mailing-List: list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com; contact interfaithnd-owner@yahoogroups.com  
Delivered-To: mailing list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com>  
Date: Wed, 13 Feb 2002 16:58:48 -0500  
Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] NPR briefing on Friday, February 15  
Reply-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

Dear Howard,

I apologize, but it turns out that I will not be able to attend the Nuclear Posture review meeting. I am so clobbered with work right now, I can't budge. We are conducting a big event this Monday, and then a huge event in Harlem on March 1. Please forgive this late notice.

Thanks,

Wendy Starman  
Manager, NR/DI

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
Sent: Tuesday, February 12, 2002 9:04 AM  
To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com; ograbc@aol.com; jmatlack@erols.com; thart@episcopalchurch.org; gthunt@mdo.net; WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com; dave@paxchristiusa.org  
Subject: [interfaithnd] NPR briefing on Friday, February 15

Dear Colleagues,

1. Reminder. There will a briefing on the Bush Nuclear Posture Review for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on Friday, February 15 from 11:00 a.m. to 12 noon in Conference Room 3, Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE. It will be led by Frank Miller from the National Security Council staff. Out of respect for his busy schedule, please arrive by 10: 55 so that the meeting can start on time.
2. If you have not RSVP'd, please let me know if you are coming.
3. As background, I have developed a set of questions on the Nuclear Posture Review. They are provide below and also sent as a Word attachment. You may want to draw on these to ask questions to Mr. Miller. This is not a script, so put the questions in your own words.

In the questions, page references are to the NPR outline presented at the Pentagon news conference on January 9. I will have copies available on Friday. If you have downloaded this outline, my numbering treats the

first sheet as a cover and starts on the second sheet. If you want to see this outline in advance, go to <http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jan2002/020109-D-6570C-001.pdf>. If you can't get direct access in this manner, you can go to [www.defenselink.mil/](http://www.defenselink.mil/), then to DOD News, then to Special Briefing -- Nuclear Posture Review -- Jan. 9, then click on slides shown. The briefing has an explanation of the slides.

I look forward to seeing you on Friday.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

## QUESTIONS TO ASK ABOUT THE NUCLEAR POSTURE REVIEW

(Page numbers refer to "Findings of the Nuclear Posture Review", issued by the Department of Defense on January 9, 2002)

### A. SIZING THE NUCLEAR FORCE

The goal of the Nuclear Posture Review (p.9) is 1,700 to 2,200 "operationally deployed force" by 2012 for "immediate and unexpected contingencies". "Force structure and downloaded warheads" will be preserved in a "responsive force" for potential contingencies. "Preplanning is essential for immediate and potential contingencies."

1. Why will it take until 2012 to reach the 1,700 to 2,200 goal? Why can't it be accomplished much sooner?
2. How many warheads and delivery vehicles will be preserved in the responsive force, that is, held in reserved rather than be dismantled?
3. What will be the status of warheads and delivery vehicles placed in the responsive force in terms of how fast they might be re-deployed? In what circumstances will this occur?
4. Is "preplanning" for immediate and potential contingencies in effect a new version of SIOP (single integrated operating plan)?

### B. TARGETING

The NPR outline speaks (p. 7) of a "capabilities-based approach" that will not be country-specific but as a priority will maintain capabilities for unexpected and potential threat contingencies. The NPR outline (p. 9) also indicates that force sizing is not driven by an immediate contingency involving Russia.

1. If Russia is not an immediate contingency, is it still considered a potential threat that requires preplanning and targeting by the deployed operational force? If so, how many warheads in the operationally deployed force will be assigned to Russia?
2. What about China? Is it considered a potential threat requiring the

targeting of nuclear weapons in preplanning? If so, how many warheads will be assigned to China?

3. In his State of Union address President Bush mentioned an "axis of evil" consisting of Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. Are they considered a potential threat that requires targeting of nuclear weapons? If so, how many warheads will be assigned to these states?

4. What other potential threats will be taken into account in preplanning? For instance, will nuclear weapons be committed to response to biological and chemical weapons?

5. Whereas previous administrations had a policy of no-first-use against any non-nuclear-weapons state (unless allied with a nuclear-weapons state), the NPR and statements by President Bush and others in his administration seem to indicate a willingness to use nuclear weapons against such states. Is this so? If this is the case, does not this expand the use of nuclear weapons in the military strategy of the United States beyond the deterrence of nuclear attack, which is the current primary justification?

6. Civil-sector analysts indicate that if Iraq, Iran, and North Korea are considered potential threats, they likely would have targets in the 10 to 20 range each and that potential targets in China might number in the low hundreds. This would leave 1,200 to 1,600 warheads to be assigned in preplanning to deal with Russia. Is this a reasonable estimate?

### C. MAD DOCTRINE

The NPR outline (p. 5) indicates that the Cold War approach to deterrence is no longer appropriate, and it calls for an end to the relationship with Russia based on MAD (mutually assured destruction). During the past year President Bush, Secretary Rumsfeld, and Secretary Powell have all called for the end of MAD. However, the "preplanning" targeting of the 1,700 to 2,200 warheads in the operationally deployed force seems most likely to be directed primarily toward Russia.

1. In practical terms, will not the MAD doctrine still be in effect in 2012?

2. Furthermore, the NPR outline (p. 10) indicates that the current force is projected to remain until 2020 or longer. Does not this mean that MAD will prevail during the first two decades of the 21st century?

### D. DEALING WITH TERRORISM

President Bush's State of the Union address focused primarily upon dealing with terrorism. He expressed a concern that terrorist organizations might acquire and use nuclear weapons. One place this might occur is Russia where nuclear warheads and fissile material seem to be less than totally secure. The Nunn-Lugar program and related elements of the Cooperative Nuclear Reduction Program are dealing with this. However, if the United States reserves a large number of warheads in its responsive force, Russia is more likely to do likewise.

1. Since this would make more warheads available at risk for acquisition by terrorist organizations, would not the United States be better off to enter into a binding, verifiable agreement with Russia with a commitment that neither side would hold nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles in reserve?

#### E. NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY

According to the NPR outline (p. 10) the current force projection will remain until 2020 or longer. In contrast under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty the United States has an obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament. This was reaffirmed in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review conference in which the United States and other nuclear-weapon states made "an unequivocal undertaking...to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals".

1. Does the Nuclear Posture Review signal that the United States is in effect withdrawing from its NPT commitment?

#### F. DE-ALERTING

1. During presidential campaign George W. Bush stated that keeping nuclear weapons on high-alert "may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch". He added that the U.S. "should work with other nuclear nations to remove as many weapons as possible from hair-trigger status." Is this still President Bush's position? There seems to be nothing in the Nuclear Posture Review about de-alerting.

2. Under the policies of the Nuclear Posture Review, how many warheads will be on high-alert, hair-trigger status in 2012?

3. If we have a new relationship with Russia, why can't the U.S. move quickly to remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert status and encourage the Russians to do the same?

#### G. TESTING

1. The NPR outline (p. 10) indicates that the United States will "accelerate DOE's test readiness.

What does this mean in practical terms?

2. Does this mean that the Bush Administration intends to resume testing?

#### H. TACTICAL NUCLEAR WEAPONS

1. The Nuclear Posture Review makes no mention of tactical nuclear weapons. What will be the status of tactical nuclear weapons in the next ten years?

2. Will such weapons now stored at air bases in Europe be returned to the United States?

3. Are there any plans to dismantle tactical nuclear weapons?

4. How will be United States deal with Russia's stockpile of tactical nuclear weapons?

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:  
interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

----- Yahoo! Groups Sponsor ----->  
Get your FREE credit report with a FREE CreditCheck  
Monitoring Service trial  
<http://us.click.yahoo.com/ACHqaB/bQ8CAA/ySSFAA/nJ9qlB/TM>  
----->

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:  
interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

X-Lotus-FromDomain: MCC  
From: J.\_Daryl\_Byler@mail.mcc.org  
To: mupj@igc.org  
Date: Fri, 15 Feb 2002 13:24:38 -0500  
Subject: NPR briefing on Friday, February 15

To: mupj @ igc.org  
From: J. Daryl Byler  
Date: 2/15/2002 1:23:36 PM  
Subj: NPR briefing on Friday, February 15

Howard:

My sincere apologies for missing this briefing today. I was planning to take the day off and came in specifically for this briefing, but -- in my stuck mind -- envisioned that this was at 1:30 p.m.

Hope it went well.

Warm regards,  
Daryl

From: "Andrews, Anthony P." <ANTHONY.P.ANDREWS@saic.com>

To: 'Kerri Wright Platais' <kiki@wizard.net>,  
Dwight Smith <dosmith6@juno.com>,  
Tony Andrews <andrewsa@saic.com>,  
Pat Beverly <beverly@erols.com>,  
Jerry Muys <jcm@duncanallen.com>,  
Jeanne North <jfnorth@aol.com>,  
Ron and Holly Foster <holronfost@aol.com>,  
Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>,  
Jo Allen <frankjoall@aol.com>,  
Gene Vincent <gene.vincent@starpower.net>

Subject: RE: Draft Minutes from the Meeting held 9 January, 2002

Date: Fri, 15 Feb 2002 18:15:16 -0500

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

All -

Here are the minutes from the last meeting. A word file is attached if you wish to add or correct. I thought I had written down Marianne's e-mail address, but I couldn't find it. Dwight, could you forward this to her?

Thanks,

Tony

<<Outreach Committee minutes for 9Jan02.doc>>

Minutes of the Meeting of the Outreach Committee, BUMC  
9 January, 2002

Members present: Dwight, Haven, Jeanne, Tony, Pat, and Marianne Cook. The meeting was chaired by Dwight Smith.

Minutes from Previous Meetings

The minutes from the meeting held 14 November 2001 were approved.

Advocacy Forum

Haven said that he had mailed the report from the Forum to the participants and provided 1000 copies of the report to CMMC. Discussion turned to "next steps" and was wide-ranging but inconclusive.

Haven had spoken with Becky Wagner, who had suggested that BUMC could host the CMMC - Montgomery County Council special session that is normally held in public facilities by the County Council. After some discussion, the advantage of this could not be seen, since the normal facilities are adequate and reasonably convenient. Haven is to contact Becky and tell her that we had declined that particular offer, but were interested in any other she might have.

An attempt was made (by Tony) to determine if the nature of what the Committee would like to do could be categorized into the rough bins "advocacy" or "direct action", the idea being that some narrowing of focus

would be required to make a next step go somewhere farther than the first. No clear consensus was reached. The group was reluctant to pick a specific cause or course for fear of offending the larger group that gathered for the forum.

This seemed to suggest another fairly large meeting (although with invitations going to past participants, as opposed to the wide distribution made the first time) where ideas for action would be solicited. May was the time frame discussed for this next meeting.

### Alternative Gift Report

Haven's efforts with the materials were duly recognized by the group, although the total take (\$1885) wasn't overwhelming. Several ideas for increasing participation were put forward, including mailing catalogs to people's homes, simplifying the explanation of the concept, changing how acknowledgements are handled, etc. In the end the action was simply to think through it again at the end of summer or thereabouts.

### Operating Budget

Dwight provided the 2002 budget, which had not changed appreciably from the last meeting, and so discussion was limited.

### Special Outreach Budget

Dwight noted that the remaining funds in this budget from 2001 totaled \$16,500, and that the account would be closed out shortly. A discussion ensued, where items were separated into those for which additional funding didn't make sense (e.g., Gibbons Resurrection Center) and those that did (Poverty Forum, which the Committee had earmarked \$5000 to get a promising seed started, if we can identify one). Since we were running short on time, Dwight volunteered that he "had the drift" and would put forward a proposal at the next meeting.

### Total Church Outreach Financial Report to Finance Committee and Church Council (FYI)

Dwight had prepared an analysis of the broader financial support BUMC provides, which totals roughly three-quarters of a million dollars for FY 2001. The report is summarized here.

Outreach Committee budget per se; \$30,800, of which \$15,000 is recurring (normal operating budget)  
BUMC apportionment to Conference; \$58,860  
Wesley Seminary (including a bequest); \$636,175  
Bethesda United Methodist Women; \$12,800

and other line items at less than \$10,000 each. It was noted that no attempt was made to add the value of non-cash contributions.

### Nov. 18 dinner for Calvary women's homeless shelter

This event, for which help was solicited at the last meeting, was

carried off successfully.

### Bethesda Cares replacements for Bruce Smith and Ordella Allman

It was noted that Bruce and Ordella are dropping their efforts at Bethesda Cares after long stints, and anyone who would consider one of these positions or knows of someone who might should talk to Dwight. Bruce is a board member, and Ordella serves once a month. Marianne said she would be interested (but I failed to note which slot).

### Other Business

The board of Global Ministry came up (but my notes are incomplete on any substantive discussion).

### Date of Next Meeting

The date for the next meeting was not discussed.

Prepared by: Tony Andrews

Note to Committee: I have tried to do a poor and tardy job to discourage any consideration of me as primary Outreach scribe, but I suspect the well-seasoned members of the committee will not fall for this tactic. Therefore, I will switch places with Kerri until someone else can be found.  
Tony

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Outreach Committee minutes for 9Jan02.doc"

Date: Fri, 15 Feb 2002 22:43:39 -0500  
From: Kerri Wright Platais <kiki@wizard.net>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en]C-CCK-MCD NSCPCD47 (Win95; I)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
To: "Andrews, Anthony P." <ANTHONY.P.ANDREWS@saic.com>  
CC: Dwight Smith <dosmith6@juno.com>,  
Tony Andrews <andrewsa@saic.com>, Pat Beverly <beverly@erols.com>,  
Jerry Muys <jcm@duncanallen.com>, Jeanne North <jfnorth@aol.com>,  
Ron and Holly Foster <holronfost@aol.com>,  
Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>, Jo Allen <frankjoall@aol.com>,  
Gene Vincent <gene.vincent@starpower.net>  
Subject: Re: Draft Minutes from the Meeting held 9 January, 2002

Oh Tony!!!!

You did a remarkable job and I want to nominate you! Do I hear a second?

Well done and thanks a million, consider us "switched".

Cheers,  
kerri

"Andrews, Anthony P." wrote:

> All -  
>  
> Here are the minutes from the last meeting. A word file is attached if you  
> wish to add or correct. I thought I had written down Marianne's e-mail  
> address, but I couldn't find it. Dwight, could you forward this to her?  
> Thanks,  
>  
> Tony  
>  
> <<Outreach Committee minutes for 9Jan02.doc>>  
>  
> Minutes of the Meeting of the Outreach Committee, BUMC  
> 9 January, 2002  
>  
> Members present: Dwight, Haven, Jeanne, Tony, Pat, and Marianne Cook. The  
> meeting was chaired by Dwight Smith.  
>  
> Minutes from Previous Meetings  
>  
> The minutes from the meeting held 14 November 2001 were approved.  
>  
> Advocacy Forum  
>  
> Haven said that he had mailed the report from the Forum to the  
> participants and provided 1000 copies of the report to CMMC. Discussion  
> turned to "next steps" and was wide-ranging but inconclusive.  
>  
> Haven had spoken with Becky Wagner, who had suggested that BUMC could host  
> the CMMC - Montgomery County Council special session that is normally held

> in public facilities by the County Council. After some discussion, the  
> advantage of this could not be seen, since the normal facilities are  
> adequate and reasonably convenient. Haven is to contact Becky and tell her  
> that we had declined that particular offer, but were interested in any other  
> she might have.

>  
> An attempt was made (by Tony) to determine if the nature of what the  
> Committee would like to do could be categorized into the rough bins  
> "advocacy" or "direct action", the idea being that some narrowing of focus  
> would be required to make a next step go somewhere farther than the first.  
> No clear consensus was reached. The group was reluctant to pick a specific  
> cause or course for fear of offending the larger group that gathered for the  
> forum.

>  
> This seemed to suggest another fairly large meeting (although with  
> invitations going to past participants, as opposed to the wide distribution  
> made the first time) where ideas for action would be solicited. May was the  
> time frame discussed for this next meeting.

>  
> Alternative Gift Report

>  
> Haven's efforts with the materials were duly recognized by the  
> group, although the total take (\$1885) wasn't overwhelming. Several ideas  
> for increasing participation were put forward, including mailing catalogs to  
> people's homes, simplifying the explanation of the concept, changing how  
> acknowledgements are handled, etc. In the end the action was simply to  
> think through it again at the end of summer or thereabouts.

>  
> Operating Budget

>  
> Dwight provided the 2002 budget, which had not changed appreciably  
> from the last meeting, and so discussion was limited.

>  
> Special Outreach Budget

>  
> Dwight noted that the remaining funds in this budget from 2001  
> totaled \$16,500, and that the account would be closed out shortly. A  
> discussion ensued, where items were separated into those for which  
> additional funding didn't make sense (e.g., Gibbons Resurrection Center) and  
> those that did (Poverty Forum, which the Committee had earmarked \$5000 to  
> get a promising seed started, if we can identify one). Since we were  
> running short on time, Dwight volunteered that he "had the drift" and would  
> put forward a proposal at the next meeting.

>  
> Total Church Outreach Financial Report to Finance Committee and Church  
> Council (FYI)

>  
> Dwight had prepared an analysis of the broader financial support  
> BUMC provides, which totals roughly three-quarters of a million dollars for  
> FY 2001. The report is summarized here.

>  
> Outreach Committee budget per se; \$30,800, of which \$15,000 is recurring  
> (normal operating budget)  
> BUMC apportionment to Conference; \$58,860

> Wesley Seminary (including a bequest); \$636,175  
> Bethesda United Methodist Women; \$12,800  
>  
> and other line items at less than \$10,000 each. It was noted that no  
> attempt was made to add the value of non-cash contributions.

> Nov. 18 dinner for Calvary women's homeless shelter

> This event, for which help was solicited at the last meeting, was  
> carried off successfully.

> Bethesda Cares replacements for Bruce Smith and Ordella Allman

> It was noted that Bruce and Ordella are dropping their efforts at  
> Bethesda Cares after long stints, and anyone who would consider one of these  
> positions or knows of someone who might should talk to Dwight. Bruce is a  
> board member, and Ordella serves once a month. Marianne said she would be  
> interested (but I failed to note which slot).

> Other Business

> The board of Global Ministry came up (but my notes are incomplete on  
> any substantive discussion).

> Date of Next Meeting

> The date for the next meeting was not discussed.

Prepared by: Tony Andrews

> Note to Committee: I have tried to do a poor and tardy job to discourage  
> any consideration of me as primary Outreach scribe, but I suspect the  
> well-seasoned members of the committee will not fall for this tactic.  
> Therefore, I will switch places with Kerri until someone else can be found.  
> Tony

> -----  
> Name: Outreach Committee minutes for 9Jan02.doc  
> Outreach Committee minutes for 9Jan02.doc Type: Winword File (application/msword)  
> Encoding: base64

To: rsider@speakeasy.net  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Joining list serve  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Ron,

I notice that you have never joined the list serve of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. If you are interested, please reply to this communication, and I'll add your name.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: ograbc@aol.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Joining list serve  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Curtis,

I notice that you have never joined the list serve of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. If you are interested, please reply to this communication, and I'll add your name.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: thart@episcopalchurch.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Joining list serve  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Tom,

I notice that you have never joined the list serve of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. If you are interested, please reply to this communication, and I'll add your name.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: tlheath@churchwomen.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Joining list serve  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Tiffany,

I notice that you have never joined the list serve of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. If you are interested, please reply to this communication, and I'll add your name.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: interfaithnd, ograbc@aol.com, tlheath@churchwomen.org, thart@episcopalchurch.org, rsider@speakeasy.net  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Analysis of Nuclear Posture Review  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Colleagues:

As many of you know, Frank Miller was unable to make the briefing on the Nuclear Posture Review that we had scheduled for February 15. However, those of us who were there had an opportunity to share our views on the NPR.

Since then I have read and thought more about the NPR. This has led me to write an analysis that is appended below and also sent as a Word attachment.

As this analysis indicates, I am greatly concerned about the continued commitment to mutual assured destruction (MAD), not in word but in reality of the pattern of deployment of nuclear weapons, and about the opportunity missed to move toward much deeper reductions, leading to eventual elimination.

In response I suggest that we might work at two levels. First, as David Culp has suggested, there will be specific legislative issues, particularly in defense authorization and appropriations, such as funding of studies of new kinds of nuclear weapons and funds for preparing for quicker reduction of nuclear testing. Second, we should step up our efforts to make the case for the global elimination of nuclear weapons, both as a moral necessity and as a matter of self-interest for the United States, Russia, and the other possessors. We should be part of the public debate on the conclusions of the Nuclear Posture Review.

Please use our list serve to respond to my ideas and to offer your own.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

Nuclear Posture Review:  
A Missed Opportunity

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

On January 9, 2002 the U.S. Department of Defense released the results of its comprehensive Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). Mandated by Congress, the NPR lays out the direction for American nuclear forces for the next ten years and beyond.

On the positive side the Nuclear Posture Review sets forth the desirable objective of reducing the number of deployed strategic warheads. This is counterbalanced, however, by some highly undesirable features, including continuation of the Cold War doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD), an expansion of the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. military and foreign policy, and a commitment to retain nuclear weapons forever.

Accordingly, the Nuclear Posture Review represents a missed opportunity to make substantial progress toward the global elimination of nuclear weapons. This is the goal advocated by numerous religious bodies, retired military officers, and civilian national security experts. Moreover, in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) the United

States and other nuclear weapon states have a commitment to achieve this goal.

## Moral Perspective

At a time when the United States is re-examining its core values, it is important to consider nuclear weapons from a moral perspective. From this viewpoint religious leaders and religious bodies of many faiths have long questioned the moral legitimacy of nuclear weapons. In recent years they have been joined by retired military leaders with command experience, who are concerned about the morality of nuclear weapons and have also express grave doubts about their military utility.

The concern of these two sectors came together in a Joint Nuclear Reduction/ Disarmament Statement signed by 21 religious leaders and 18 admirals and generals and released at the Washington National Cathedral on June 21, 2000. Among other things the religious leaders and military professionals stated:

"We deeply believe that the long-term reliance on nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family.

"National security imperatives and ethical demands have converged to bring us to the necessity of outlawing and prohibiting nuclear weapons worldwide."

The religious and military leaders offered two truths:

"first, that the most commonly postulated threats to our national security are not susceptible to nuclear deterrence; second, that our nation's effort to provide effective leadership in opposing the growing threat of nuclear proliferation will be credible only if our policies and those of the other nuclear powers demonstrate a commitment to the universal outlawing of these weapons.

"We also believe that reliance on a nuclear deterrent in the long run calls into question our stewardship of God's creation."

These powerful words from denominational leaders, generals, and admirals provide a basic for evaluating the conclusions of the Nuclear Posture Review.

## Nuclear Weapons Reduction

The Nuclear Posture Review offers the goal of 1,700 to 2,200 operationally deployed strategic warheads for the United States by 2012. This is a reduction from the approximately 6,500 warheads now deployed and the goal of 3,500 by 2007 under the second Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START II), which has never gone into effect. This is a positive step in the right redirection. If achieved, it will be a worthy improvement over the lack of reductions during the Clinton Administration, deadlocked as it was with the Republican-controlled Congress.

As desirable as this reduction is, we should ask two questions. First, why wait until 2012 to reach 1,700-2,200 level? The NPR speaks of a new relationship with Russia. President Bush and President Putin have stated that the two nations are now friends rather than adversaries. President Putin has expressed a desire to have a 1,500 level for Russian strategic warheads. Why drag out the process when it is quite feasible to achieve the U.S. goal of 1,700 to 2,200 by 2004?

The NPR indicates that by 2004 the 50 multi-warhead MX missiles will be eliminated and four Trident submarines will be converted to carry cruise missiles not nuclear weapons. The other missiles in the reduction plan will not be eliminated but rather downloaded and shifted to a reserve known as the "responsive force". This could be easily accomplished in two years.

Second, why stop at 1,700 warheads? Why not set forth a plan for their total elimination, as religious and

military leaders have recommended? Instead the Nuclear Posture Review indicates that the current force is projected to remain until 2020 or longer. In effect this is saying that we will have nuclear weapons forever. This walks away from commitment made by the United States and other nuclear weapon states at the 2000 NPT Review Conference to "an unequivocal undertaking to eliminate their nuclear arsenals".

## MAD Continues

The Nuclear Posture Review speaks of an intention to encourage and facilitate a new framework for cooperation with Russia. It indicates that the Cold War approach to deterrence is no longer appropriate. It declares a desire to end the relationship with Russia based on mutual assured destruction (MAD). In speeches and news conferences President Bush has repeatedly stated an intent to move away from MAD. So have Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Secretary of State Colin Powell. Rumsfeld has acknowledged that the "deterrent of massive retaliation, or MAD -- mutual assured destruction -- did not do anything to deter the Korean War or the Vietnam War or Desert Storm or dozens of other events."

However, their words about moving away from MAD are contradicted by the level of the operationally deployed nuclear force and the warheads and delivery vehicles held in reserve under the plans of the Nuclear Posture Review.

The NPR proposes a change from a "traditional threat-based approach" to a "capabilities-based approach" which is not country specific. But it also specifies that "preplanning is essential for immediate and potential contingencies." National security experts who understand the targeting pattern of nuclear weapons indicate that the only possible contingency that can justify 1,700 to 2,200 operationally deployed nuclear warheads is the desire to maintain an active deterrent to a Russian arsenal of similar size. Furthermore, the estimated 1,500 warheads held in reserve for uploading to their delivery systems would also be available for a massive attack on Russia. The practical result is retention of the Cold War doctrine of mutual assured destruction.

Contrast this situation to the views that the religious leaders and military professionals expressed in the Cathedral Statement.

"We say that a peace based on terror, a peace based upon threats of inflicting annihilation and genocide upon whole populations is a peace that is corrupting, a peace that is unworthy of civilization.

"We say that it defies all logical to believe that nuclear weapons can exist forever and never be used.

"The opportunity is at hand to do away with this danger, to do away with our capacity for self-destruction."

It is in the self-interest of the United States and Russia to cease threatening one another with total destruction. For this to happen the level of operationally deployed warheads on each side should be lowered until it approaches or reaches zero. As indicated above, the 1,700 level is readily achievable by 2004. The next stage to 100 or fewer could be achieved in another four years. By not providing for reductions of this magnitude the Nuclear Posture Review is missing a significant opportunity.

## De-alerting

During the presidential campaign George W. Bush stated that keeping nuclear weapons on high-alert "may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch". He added that the U.S. "should work with other nuclear nations to remove as many weapons as possible from hair-trigger status." Nevertheless, the Nuclear Posture Review has nothing to say about de-alerting.

Though not called de-alerting the placement of 1,500 now-deployed warheads and their delivery vehicles into the "responsive force", as the reserve is called, is a form of de-alerting. But 1,700 to 2,200 nuclear warheads will still be deployed in 2012 according to the NPR. The majority of them are likely to be on hair-trigger alert as an application of the MAD doctrine. This retreat from President Bush's campaign advocacy of de-alerting is a serious flaw in the Nuclear Posture Review.

## Dealing with Terrorism

As noted, the religious and military leaders in their June 2000 statement indicated that "the most commonly postulated threats to our national security are not susceptible to nuclear deterrence." Clearly a threat they didn't postulate -- the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon -- was not deterred.

Since that tragic event occurred, President Bush has made the campaign against terrorism the primary focus of U.S. military and foreign policy. Nonetheless, the Nuclear Posture Review doesn't deal with the dangers of terrorism and indeed specifies a policy that could substantially increase the risk of terrorists acquiring nuclear weapons.

This occurs in the intention to have "force structure and downloaded warheads preserved for the responsive force." That may amount to 1,500 warheads with their delivery vehicles available for re-deployment. This is in contrast to previous nuclear arms reduction agreements, such as the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed by President Ronald Reagan, and START I, signed by President George H.W. Bush, which provided for destruction of delivery vehicles.

If the United States retains such a high number of warheads, Russia is likely to do the same. Yet, nuclear warheads and fissile material in Russia seem to be less than totally secure and could possibly be obtained by terrorist organizations. The United States is helping to reduce this risk through the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program. The fewer warheads Russia has deployed and in reserve the lower the risk. Therefore, the United States would be better off to forgo a large warhead reserve and instead enter into a binding, verifiable agreement with Russia that requires elimination of both delivery vehicles and nuclear warheads taken out of service.

## Testing and New Weapon Development

The Nuclear Posture Review affirms President Bush's commitment to a moratorium on nuclear weapons testing and also its opposition to ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). However, the NPR calls for the Department of Energy to reduce the time it would take to resume testing from the current two to three years to one year or so. Comments by the Pentagon spokesperson at a press briefing on the NPR and statements by other officials suggest that the Administration is looking toward the end of the test moratorium within a few years.

The NPR indicates that the current nuclear force is projected to remain until 2020 or longer. Meanwhile the Department of Defense will study alternatives for follow-ons. According to the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Department will begin studies for a new intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) to be operational in 2020, a new SLBM (submarine-launched ballistic missile) and a new SSBN (ballistic missile submarine) in 2030, and a new heavy bomber in 2040 as well as new warheads for all of them.

Thus, the Bush Administration assumes that nuclear weapons will be part of U.S. military forces for at least the next 50 years. This is clearly in conflict with the goal of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. It is contrary to the recommendation of numerous religious bodies to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons.

## Expansion of the Role of Nuclear Weapons

The Nuclear Posture Review indicates that nuclear planning will be capabilities-based to provide greater flexibility for a range of contingencies. Although these contingencies aren't spelled out, the NPR expresses a concern for the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and ballistic missile delivery systems. In his State of the Union address President Bush spoke of an "axis of evil" consisting of Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. Top officials within the Administration are on record as favoring the use of nuclear weapons to deal with such contingencies.

In previous administrations nuclear weapons were seen primarily as a deterrent to prevent (a) a nuclear attack on the United States by Soviet Union (now Russia) and (b) until 1989 the possibility of Soviet invasion of Western Europe. There was a policy of no-first-use against any non-nuclear-weapons state unless it was allied with a nuclear-weapons state. Now the Bush Administration seems willing to initiate first use in a broad range of events.

This expansion of the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. military and foreign policy is a matter of great concern. It goes in the opposite direction of limiting the role of nuclear weapons in world affairs and moving toward their elimination. As the religious leaders, generals, and admirals indicated in the Cathedral Statement in speaking of the nuclear predicament, it "is untenable in the face of a faith in the divine and unacceptable in terms of sound military doctrine."

They further stated:

"We know that the responsibility for banning nuclear weapons does not lie solely with the government of the United States and its citizens. It is a responsibility shared by all sovereign states and sovereign individuals everywhere.

"But as the creator of these weapons and the preeminent military power in the world, the United States and its people bear a obligation and have a unique opportunity to lead way."

This is an opportunity badly missed in the Nuclear Posture Review. People of faith should speak out in opposition to the continuation of the Cold War doctrine of mutual assured destruction, the expansion of the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. military and foreign policy, and the commitment to nuclear weapons forever. We as a nation can and should do better than that.

February 19, 2002

Methodists United for Peace with Justice 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036  
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013 E-mail: [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)

To: interfaithnd, ograbc@aol.com, tlheath@churchwomen.org, thart@episcopalchurch.org, rsider@speakeasy.net  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Addendum  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\icnd.129.doc;  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

I forgot to send the Word attachment. Here it is.

Howard

To: J.\_Daryl\_Byler@mail.mcc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: NPR briefing on Friday, February 15  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <85256B61.0066030C.00@mail.mcc.org>  
References:

At 01:24 PM 2/15/02 -0500, you wrote:

>To: mupj @ igc.org  
>From: J. Daryl Byler  
>Date: 2/15/2002 1:23:36 PM  
>Subj: NPR briefing on Friday, February 15  
>  
>Howard:  
>  
>My sincere apologies for missing this briefing today. I was planning to take  
>the day off and came in specifically for this briefing, but -- in my stuck mind  
>-- envisioned that this was at 1:30 p.m.  
>  
>Hope it went well.

Daryl,

As it turned out, Frank Miller cancelled at the last minute. So it's just as well that you didn't lose your day off.

Howard

To: 75254.2405@compuserve.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: List serve  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Alan,

The following message from Wendy Starman evoked my call about the list-serve of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. The purposes are to announce meetings, send out analyses, and provide opportunity for exchange on nuclear disarmament issues. Wendy and Barbara are on the list. Let me know if you would like to be added.

Howard

###

From Wendy STarman to Howard Hallman:

I was speaking with my colleague the Reverend Canon Alan Geyer and  
>learned that he was not a regular on your mailing list and is not on the new  
>list serve. He expressed an interest in being informed about the ongoing  
>activities and would like to be on the list. Could you please contact him at  
>301-652-7024 (home) or by e-mail at 75254.2405@compuserve.com. I'm not a  
>hundred percent sure that this e-mail address is up-to-date, so you should  
>probably give him a ring to double check.  
>  
>Given Alan's depth of knowledge and experience with the moral dimensions of  
>nuclear weapons issues, he would truly be a valuable addition to your list.  
>>  
>Best,  
>  
>Wendy  
>

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0  
Date: Wed, 20 Feb 2002 13:18:24 -0500  
To: jdi@clw.org  
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>  
Subject: Proposed March 1 meeting to discuss post-Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

Proposed meeting to discuss post-Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers:

Friday, March 1, 2002  
10:00 AM  
Union of Concerned Scientists  
1707 H Street, NW - Suite 600

Please RSVP to srobinson@clw.org (Stacie Robinson)

TO: Members and friends of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers  
FROM: Tom Collina, Kathy Crandall, David Culp, John Isaacs, Daryl Kimball, Chris Madison, Carleen Ponder

As you know, earlier this year the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers closed its doors. Nevertheless, our common nuclear risk reduction agenda is far from complete and 2002 is shaping up to be a very challenging and busy year. We along with a number of others believe it would be useful to continue to work together and propose that representatives from the former member groups and friends of the Coalition meet on March 1 at 10 AM at the UCS to discuss whether we should and how we might convene to facilitate communication and coordination on issues of common concern in the weeks and months ahead.

In addition, we would like to use the opportunity to discuss how we move ahead on the key issues and questions of common interest to us all -- from nuclear reductions, missile defense, new types of nuclear weapons, to the nuclear test moratorium.

We hope you can join us. Attached below is a proposed agenda. Please bring your ideas and suggestions. If you are not able to attend in person, please send your suggestions in writing to one of us, which we can share with others in attendance.

#### PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Demise of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers?
  - What happened?
  - What are the implications for the community?
2. Future meetings
  - Should the organizations involved continue meeting to exchange information and plan strategy?

What topics should be covered? How should this group relate to other meetings (i.e. Monday Lobby, Nuclear Weapons Working Group) ?  
If so, how often should the meetings be held? Monthly?  
Who should convene the meetings?  
Who should chair the meetings? Rotating chairs?  
Who should be invited? The original 17 organizational members of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers? A broader range of organizations?  
How to involve people who don't generally attend meetings:

### 3. 2002 strategy on national missile defense

Common strategy:

Primary goal: Prevent deployment of a missile defense system before it has been proven effective through realistic tests and has been shown to be a net benefit to global security

Seek legislation to:

- ==Reduce the funding for National Missile Defense and transfer funds to non-proliferation programs or to homeland defense
- ==Require that National Missile Defense works before deployment.
- ==Require rigorous testing and evaluation step by step: by Congress; by a Team B; by Pentagon testing, budget and program review offices; require operational tests before deployment decision.
- ==Bar testing or deployment of space weapons (i.e., anti-satellite weapons, space-based lasers).

Activities planned by organizations:

### 4. 2002 strategy on nuclear reductions/Bush-Putin summit

Common strategy: Build support and expectations for Bush and Putin to sign a legally-binding agreement on irreversible reductions of deployed arsenals to 2,200 or below at their May summit.

Should message also include de-alerting, defenses, non-proliferation issues?

Activities planned by organizations:

### 5. 2002 strategy on nuclear weapons testing

Common strategy:

- ==Prevent repeal of US legislation preventing research and development of a mini-nuke, and delete funding from DOE budget for a cost and feasibility study on such a weapon.
- ==Prevent heightened test site readiness and consequent erosion of the testing moratorium, stop repudiation of U.S. signature of the CTBT and demonstrate the need for the Treaty.
- ==Support full funding for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO).

Activities planned by organizations:

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

To: "ANTHONY VENTO" <tvpcusa1@prodigy.net>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Contact information  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <0d2d01c1b4e4\$7ec70580\$1400a8c0@paxchristiusa.org>  
References: <3.0.3.32.20020213173206.00691edc@pop2.igc.org>

Tony,

I am glad that you were able to join us last Friday. It's a start of what should prove to be a fruitful relationship.

I would like to add your name to our list serve. Is the above e-address the one to use? Also, could you provide me contact information on Frank Dvorak. As I recall, you indicated that he should be on the list as well.

Shalom,  
Howard

Date: Thu, 21 Feb 2002 19:51:53 -0500  
From: Ron Sider <rsider@speakeasy.net>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Joining list serve

Dear Howard,

I do not want to get regular material, but I am interested and would on occasion be glad to receive especially important things. I would also be open to signing on to letters.

Ron

"Howard W. Hallman" wrote:

> Dear Ron,

>

> I notice that you have never joined the list serve of the Interfaith  
> Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. If you are interested, please reply to  
> this communication, and I'll add your name.

>

> Shalom,

> Howard

>

> Howard W. Hallman, Chair

> Methodists United for Peace with Justice

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

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

>

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

To: conoverp@ucc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Web site proposal  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Pat,

Now that you are active again on nuclear disarmament issues, I would like to share with you a proposal for creation of an interfaith web site to promote discussion of ways to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons. It has a broader purpose of providing the basis for developing coalitions between religious organizations, retired military leaders, and others from the civil sector who are committed to nuclear disarmament.

My proposal is presented below. I have shared earlier versions with Ron Stief but have never been able to reach him to discuss the idea.

I invite your office to join with other denominational offices to be a sponsor of the site and to be represented on the steering committee. I will serve as moderator/administrator. So far I have commitments from Brethren, Cooperative Baptist Fellowship, Mennonite, Presbyterian, United Methodist, and Unitarian offices with decisions pending with Episcopalians, Friends, Lutherans, and Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism. The U.S. Catholic Conference doesn't join such ventures but is willing to have its policy statements posted.

It will take about \$2,000 to get a web site started: \$1,500 for a consultant and \$500 for domain licensing and web space. Thereafter, it will take some one to handle input. This could be a person on the staff of a sponsoring organization or some one paid part time. I might try to do this, if the consultant would show me how, but I would prefer to concentrate on moderator responsibilities and let some one else handle input.

A couple of offices have offered small amounts of funds. Requests for larger amounts are pending with two others. I am going to try a foundation source for \$2,000 in start-up money. I invite your office to make a contribution if possible.

When we have funds in sight, the first task of the steering committee will be to agree upon the domain name. I have suggested [www.zeronukes.org](http://www.zeronukes.org) as the name. I have picked up "zero" from statements by General Powell and General Horner (see below). It is more succinct and attention-grabbing than "nuclear disarmament" and probably better than "abolition", which puts off some persons. But I am open to other ideas. One suggestion is to incorporate "interfaith" into the title, but I would rather have a name that seems broader in scope in order to attract greater participation of military officers and civil-sector experts.

To repeat: would your office be willing to be a sponsor of the site, be represented on the steering committee, and perhaps contribute some funds?

Please call me at 301 896-0013 if you would like to discuss it.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

A Proposal for an Interfaith Web Site on Nuclear Disarmament

Proposed name: [www.zeronukes.org](http://www.zeronukes.org)

**Purposes.** Provide a forum for presentation and discussion of practical steps for the global elimination of nuclear weapons. Specifically: (a) Serve as a repository for statements and proposals by religious organizations and religious leaders on nuclear disarmament. (b) Provide linkages with civil-sector organizations working for nuclear disarmament. (c) Serve as a means for reaching out to military leaders, scientists, physicians, lawyers, national security experts, and others for their ideas on how to reach zero nuclear weapons. (d) Through a bulletin board provide for open discussion of nuclear disarmament proposals. The site will feature education and discussion and will not be used for legislative alerts or other advocacy of direct action.

**Sponsors.** Denominational offices. Representatives from these offices will serve as a steering committee for the web site.

**Moderator/Administrator.** Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

## Site Map

### A. Home page

Statement of purpose

Introduction (see Attachment 1)

Sponsors (underscored for web linkage)

Moderator with e-mail address

Menu

### B. Sections

1. Basic data on the global nuclear arsenal (primarily through linkages)

2. Statements of religious bodies and religious leaders on nuclear disarmament; linkages.

3. Civil-sector reports on nuclear disarmament: abstracts and linkages.

4. Proposals for how to get to zero nuclear weapon, to offered by military leaders, scientists, physicians, lawyers, national security experts, and other professionals. Open for proposals from members of Congress and interested citizens. Start with U.S. experts and extend globally, including proposals from Russia, NATO countries, and elsewhere.

5. Proposals for achieving zero alert (as a major step toward total elimination).

6. Proposals for approaching zero nuclear weapons from those who do not advocate going all the way to zero.

7. Nuclear Posture Review: summary (with linkage to government site) and comments.

### C. Bulletin Board

An opportunity for anyone to comment on the proposals and respond to other persons' comments. To be organized by major topics, such as steps toward zero nuclear weapons, de-alerting, dismantlement, transparency and verification, security of fissile material, Nuclear Posture Review, philosophy of nuclear deterrence and its application.

Attachment 1. Introduction (for home page).

"The nuclear weapon is obsolete. I want to get rid of them all....I want to go to zero." General Charles Horner, July 15, 1994, at the time Commander of the U.S. Space Command.

"I declare my hope and declare it from the bottom of my heart that we will eventually see the time when the number of nuclear weapons is down to zero and the world is a much better place." General Colin Powell, June 10, 1993, at the time Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Other military leaders have reached similar conclusions. For instance, Admiral Noel Gayler, while serving as commander-in-chief of all U.S. forces in the Pacific from 1972 to 1976, became convinced that "there is no sensible military use for nuclear weapons." During the period from 1991 to 1994 when General Lee Butler was commander-

in-chief of the U.S. Strategic Command, he began what he later described as "the long and arduous intellectual journey from staunch advocate of nuclear deterrence to public proponent of nuclear abolition."

Numerous religious organizations and religious leaders are on record as favoring the total elimination of nuclear weapons. They include Pope John Paul II, National Conference of Catholic Bishops (United States), World Council of Churches, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., many Protestant denominations, Jewish organizations, Muslim organizations, the Dalai Lama, and others. (For specifics, go to religious statements.)

The crucial question: How do we achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons from Earth -- the zero option?

We in the faith community strongly oppose nuclear weapons on moral grounds, but we lack technical expertise on the detailed steps for reaching zero. In this web site we turn to those who do. Therefore, we invite military leaders, scientists, civilian national security experts, and others to offer their proposals for practical steps and sequence of events that can lead to zero nuclear weapons. We also ask for ideas on how to bring about verification of the results and how to assure the secure storage of fissile material remaining after nuclear warheads are dismantled.

Some may want to address some aspects, such as achieving zero alert for nuclear weapons without necessarily dismantling all of them at this time; or going almost to zero but leaving a residual on each side; or special issues, such as verification. Such ideas will be welcomed.

[To be written: how to submit ideas.]

To: jmatlack@erols.com, bpinguel@afsc.org, joe@fcnl.org, david@fcnl.com, kathy@fcnl.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Proposal for a web site  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Friends,

I would like to share with you a proposal for creation of an interfaith web site to promote discussion of ways to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons. It has a broader purpose of providing the basis for developing coalitions between religious organizations, retired military leaders, and others from the civil sector who are committed to nuclear disarmament. The proposal is presented below.

I am proposing that the web site be co-sponsored by denominational offices, which will be represented on a steering committee. I will serve as moderator/administrator. I would like to invite either or both the American Friends Service Committee and the Friends Committee on National Legislation to join as co-sponsors.

So far I have commitments from Brethren, Cooperative Baptist Fellowship, Mennonite, Presbyterian, United Methodist, and Unitarian offices with decisions pending with Episcopalians, Lutherans, and Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism. The U.S. Catholic Conference doesn't join such ventures but is willing to have its policy statements posted.

It will take about \$2,000 to get a web site started: \$1,500 for a consultant and \$500 for domain licensing and web space. Thereafter, it will take some one to handle input. This could be a person on the staff of a sponsoring organization or some one paid part time. I might try to do this, if the consultant would show me how, but I would prefer to concentrate on moderator responsibilities and let some one else handle input.

A couple of offices have offered small amounts of funds. Requests for larger amounts are pending with two others. I am going to try a foundation source for \$2,000 in start-up money. I invite your office to make a contribution if possible.

When we have funds in sight, the first task of the steering committee will be to agree upon the domain name. I have suggested [www.zeronukes.org](http://www.zeronukes.org) as the name. I have picked up "zero" from statements by General Powell and General Horner (see below). It is more succinct and attention-grabbing than "nuclear disarmament" and probably better than "abolition", which puts off some persons. But I am open to other ideas. One suggestion is to incorporate "interfaith" into the title, but I would rather have a name that seems broader in scope in order to attract greater participation of military officers and civil-sector experts.

To repeat: would your office be willing to be a sponsor of the site, be represented on the steering committee, and perhaps contribute some funds?

Please call me at 301 896-0013 if you would like to discuss this proposal in greater depth.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

A Proposal for an Interfaith Web Site on Nuclear Disarmament

Proposed name: [www.zeronukes.org](http://www.zeronukes.org)

**Purposes.** Provide a forum for presentation and discussion of practical steps for the global elimination of nuclear weapons. Specifically: (a) Serve as a repository for statements and proposals by religious organizations and religious leaders on nuclear disarmament. (b) Provide linkages with civil-sector organizations working for nuclear disarmament. (c) Serve as a means for reaching out to military leaders, scientists, physicians, lawyers, national security experts, and others for their ideas on how to reach zero nuclear weapons. (d) Through a bulletin board provide for open discussion of nuclear disarmament proposals. The site will feature education and discussion and will not be used for legislative alerts or other advocacy of direct action.

**Sponsors.** Denominational offices. Representatives from these offices will serve as a steering committee for the web site.

**Moderator/Administrator.** Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

## Site Map

### A. Home page

Statement of purpose

Introduction (see Attachment 1)

Sponsors (underscored for web linkage)

Moderator with e-mail address

Menu

### B. Sections

1. Basic data on the global nuclear arsenal (primarily through linkages)

2. Statements of religious bodies and religious leaders on nuclear disarmament; linkages.

3. Civil-sector reports on nuclear disarmament: abstracts and linkages.

4. Proposals for how to get to zero nuclear weapon, to offered by military leaders, scientists, physicians, lawyers, national security experts, and other professionals. Open for proposals from members of Congress and interested citizens. Start with U.S. experts and extend globally, including proposals from Russia, NATO countries, and elsewhere.

5. Proposals for achieving zero alert (as a major step toward total elimination).

6. Proposals for approaching zero nuclear weapons from those who do not advocate going all the way to zero.

7. Nuclear Posture Review: summary (with linkage to government site) and comments.

### C. Bulletin Board

An opportunity for anyone to comment on the proposals and respond to other persons' comments. To be organized by major topics, such as steps toward zero nuclear weapons, de-alerting, dismantlement, transparency and verification, security of fissile material, Nuclear Posture Review, philosophy of nuclear deterrence and its application.

Attachment 1. Introduction (for home page).

"The nuclear weapon is obsolete. I want to get rid of them all....I want to go to zero." General Charles Horner, July 15, 1994, at the time Commander of the U.S. Space Command.

"I declare my hope and declare it from the bottom of my heart that we will eventually see the time when the number of nuclear weapons is down to zero and the world is a much better place." General Colin Powell, June 10, 1993, at the time Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Other military leaders have reached similar conclusions. For instance, Admiral Noel Gayler, while serving as commander-in-chief of all U.S. forces in the Pacific from 1972 to 1976, became convinced that "there is no sensible military use for nuclear weapons." During the period from 1991 to 1994 when General Lee Butler was commander-

in-chief of the U.S. Strategic Command, he began what he later described as "the long and arduous intellectual journey from staunch advocate of nuclear deterrence to public proponent of nuclear abolition."

Numerous religious organizations and religious leaders are on record as favoring the total elimination of nuclear weapons. They include Pope John Paul II, National Conference of Catholic Bishops (United States), World Council of Churches, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., many Protestant denominations, Jewish organizations, Muslim organizations, the Dalai Lama, and others. (For specifics, go to religious statements.)

The crucial question: How do we achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons from Earth -- the zero option?

We in the faith community strongly oppose nuclear weapons on moral grounds, but we lack technical expertise on the detailed steps for reaching zero. In this web site we turn to those who do. Therefore, we invite military leaders, scientists, civilian national security experts, and others to offer their proposals for practical steps and sequence of events that can lead to zero nuclear weapons. We also ask for ideas on how to bring about verification of the results and how to assure the secure storage of fissile material remaining after nuclear warheads are dismantled.

Some may want to address some aspects, such as achieving zero alert for nuclear weapons without necessarily dismantling all of them at this time; or going almost to zero but leaving a residual on each side; or special issues, such as verification. Such ideas will be welcomed.

[To be written: how to submit ideas.]

To: mweiner@rac.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Web site proposal  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Mike,

Here is my most recent formulation of the proposal for an interfaith web site on nuclear disarmament issues. I would like to invite the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism to be a co-sponsor along with other denominational offices and to be represented on the steering committee. Some offices are willing to make a financial contribution in the \$300 range, but this is not mandatory.

Please call me if you and others at RAC have questions about the proposal.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

## A Proposal for an Interfaith Web Site on Nuclear Disarmament

Proposed name: [www.zeronukes.org](http://www.zeronukes.org)

**Purposes.** Provide a forum for presentation and discussion of practical steps for the global elimination of nuclear weapons. Specifically: (a) Serve as a repository for statements and proposals by religious organizations and religious leaders on nuclear disarmament. (b) Provide linkages with civil-sector organizations working for nuclear disarmament. (c) Serve as a means for reaching out to military leaders, scientists, physicians, lawyers, national security experts, and others for their ideas on how to reach zero nuclear weapons. (d) Through a bulletin board provide for open discussion of nuclear disarmament proposals. The site will feature education and discussion and will not be used for legislative alerts or other advocacy of direct action.

**Sponsors.** Denominational offices. Representatives from these offices will serve as a steering committee for the web site.

**Moderator/Administrator.** Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

### Site Map

#### A. Home page

Statement of purpose

Introduction (see Attachment 1)

Sponsors (underscored for web linkage)

Moderator with e-mail address

Menu

#### B. Sections

1. Basic data on the global nuclear arsenal (primarily through linkages)

2. Statements of religious bodies and religious leaders on nuclear disarmament; linkages.

3. Civil-sector reports on nuclear disarmament: abstracts and linkages.

4. Proposals for how to get to zero nuclear weapon, to offered by military leaders, scientists, physicians, lawyers, national security experts, and other professionals. Open for proposals from members of Congress and interested citizens. Start with U.S. experts and extend globally, including proposals from Russia, NATO countries, and elsewhere.
5. Proposals for achieving zero alert (as a major step toward total elimination).
6. Proposals for approaching zero nuclear weapons from those who do not advocate going all the way to zero.
7. Nuclear Posture Review: summary (with linkage to government site) and comments.

### C. Bulletin Board

An opportunity for anyone to comment on the proposals and respond to other persons' comments. To be organized by major topics, such as steps toward zero nuclear weapons, de-alerting, dismantlement, transparency and verification, security of fissile material, Nuclear Posture Review, philosophy of nuclear deterrence and its application.

Attachment 1. Introduction (for home page).

"The nuclear weapon is obsolete. I want to get rid of them all....I want to go to zero." General Charles Horner, July 15, 1994, at the time Commander of the U.S. Space Command.

"I declare my hope and declare it from the bottom of my heart that we will eventually see the time when the number of nuclear weapons is down to zero and the world is a much better place." General Colin Powell, June 10, 1993, at the time Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Other military leaders have reached similar conclusions. For instance, Admiral Noel Gayler, while serving as commander-in-chief of all U.S. forces in the Pacific from 1972 to 1976, became convinced that "there is no sensible military use for nuclear weapons." During the period from 1991 to 1994 when General Lee Butler was commander-in-chief of the U.S. Strategic Command, he began what he later described as "the long and arduous intellectual journey from staunch advocate of nuclear deterrence to public proponent of nuclear abolition."

Numerous religious organizations and religious leaders are on record as favoring the total elimination of nuclear weapons. They include Pope John Paul II, National Conference of Catholic Bishops (United States), World Council of Churches, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., many Protestant denominations, Jewish organizations, Muslim organizations, the Dalai Lama, and others. (For specifics, go to religious statements.)

The crucial question: How do we achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons from Earth -- the zero option?

We in the faith community strongly oppose nuclear weapons on moral grounds, but we lack technical expertise on the detailed steps for reaching zero. In this web site we turn to those who do. Therefore, we invite military leaders, scientists, civilian national security experts, and others to offer their proposals for practical steps and sequence of events that can lead to zero nuclear weapons. We also ask for ideas on how to bring about verification of the results and how to assure the secure storage of fissile material remaining after nuclear warheads are dismantled.

Some may want to address some aspects, such as achieving zero alert for nuclear weapons without necessarily dismantling all of them at this time; or going almost to zero but leaving a residual on each side; or special issues, such as verification. Such ideas will be welcomed.

[To be written: how to submit ideas.]

From: "ANTHONY VENTO" <tvpcusa1@prodigy.net>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Cc: "Lori Swanson Nemenz" <lori@paxchristiusa.org>  
Subject: Re: Contact information  
Date: Thu, 21 Feb 2002 12:07:23 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700  
X-Mimeole: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Hello Howard,  
Yes, I too really enjoyed meeting you Friday and beginning to work together.

For contact information on Frank Dvorak, I've asked my co-worker in Erie to forward that to you.

As for my contact information, please use both of the email addresses and phone #s given below, if that is not a burden to put both on your list. My mailing address is 4010 John Avenue, Cleveland OH 44113. That is my (home) office, where I usually work, instead of in Erie, so the Cleveland # would be good to use except late at night.

Looking forward to more collaboration,

Thanks, Tony

+++++  
Tony Vento, Program Director  
Pax Christi USA www.paxchristiusa.org  
tony@paxchristiusa.org tvpcusa1@prodigy.net  
Erie: 814/453-4955, x225 Cleveland: 216/631-5632

----- Original Message -----  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "ANTHONY VENTO" <tvpcusa1@prodigy.net>  
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2002 11:48 AM  
Subject: Contact information

> Tony,  
>  
> I am glad that you were able to join us last Friday. It's a start of  
what  
> should prove to be a fruitful relationship.  
>  
> I would like to add your name to our list serve. Is the above e-address  
> the one to use? Also, could you provide me contact information on Frank  
> Dvorak. As I recall, you indicated that he should be on the list as well.  
>  
> Shalom,  
> Howard  
>  
>  
> Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
> 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036

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

>

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

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0  
Date: Fri, 22 Feb 2002 09:50:15 -0500  
To: jdi@clw.org (John Isaacs)  
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>  
Subject: "U.S. Drops Pledge On Nukes"

"U.S. Drops Pledge On Nukes"  
Washington Times - February 22, 2002 - By Nicholas Kralev

The Bush administration is no longer standing by a 24-year-old U.S. pledge not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states, a senior administration official said yesterday.

Washington is "not looking for occasions to use" its nuclear arsenal, John Bolton, undersecretary of state for arms control and international security, said in an interview. But "we would do whatever is necessary to defend America's innocent civilian population," he said.

In case of an attack on the United States, "we would have to do what is appropriate under the circumstances, and the classic formulation of that is, we are not ruling anything in and we are not ruling anything out," Mr. Bolton said.

"We are just not into theoretical assertions that other administrations have made," he said in reference to a 1978 commitment by the Carter administration not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states unless they attack the United States in alliance with nuclear-armed countries.

On June 12 that year, Secretary of State Cyrus Vance made the following statement on behalf of President Carter, which became known as "negative security assurances":

"The United States will not use nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapon state party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or any comparable internationally binding commitment not to acquire nuclear explosive devices, except in the case of an attack on the United States, its territories or armed forces, or its allies, by such a state allied to a nuclear-weapon state, or associated with a nuclear-weapon state in carrying out or sustaining the attack."

In 1995, Warren Christopher, the first secretary of state in the Clinton administration, reaffirmed Washington's commitment. Along with the pledges of the other four permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, who are all nuclear powers, it became part of a resolution, which the council adopted April 11, 1995.

But Mr. Bolton said such promises reflect "an unrealistic view of the international situation."

"The idea that fine theories of deterrence work against everybody, which is implicit in the negative security assurances, has just been disproven by September 11," he said. "What we are attempting to do is create a situation

where nobody uses weapons of mass destruction of any kind."

Mr. Bolton spoke a day after returning from Moscow, where he led the second round of arms control negotiations that are expected to produce an agreement on nuclear cuts in time for President Bush's visit to Russia in May.

The undersecretary said the "negative security assurances" never "came up" in the discussions with the Russians. Washington has never had a no-first-use nuclear policy but Moscow did until the mid-1990s.

Mr. Bolton's remarks displeased some arms control analysts yesterday, who said that such significant U.S. government statements as the "negative security assurances" should not be repudiated.

"These assurances are important in order to maintain the integrity and credibility of the nonproliferation regime. Repudiation can have a negative effect on international security," said Daryl Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control Association.

The nonprofit organization's publication, Arms Control Today, discussed the issue in an interview with Mr. Bolton earlier this month.

Although Washington's official position on using nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states has remained unchanged until now, "both Democratic and Republican administrations have maintained ambiguity to maximize the credibility of the U.S. nuclear force," Mr. Kimball said.

Only a year after the Clinton administration reaffirmed Mr. Carter's pledge, Defense Secretary William Perry said on April 26, 1996:

"If some nation were to attack the United States with chemical weapons, they have to fear the consequences of a response from any weapon in our inventory. ... We could have a devastating response without use of nuclear weapons, but we would not forswear that possibility."

John Holum, Mr. Bolton's predecessor at the State Department under Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright, said yesterday that the Bush administration's position to ignore the 1978 commitment would not affect the strategic balance of power but might send a wrong message overseas.

"It doesn't make the use of weapons of mass destruction more or less likely, but it's reflective of the administration's negative view of international treaties," Mr. Holum said.

He noted that there was an "extensive debate" in the Clinton administration on whether it's "responsible" to rely on nuclear weapons to combat potential biological and chemical attacks, but a decision was made to maintain "ambiguity."

Mr. Bolton said there has been "no formal review" of Mr. Vance's statement by the Bush administration, "nor are we going to undertake a review of every official statement made by secretaries of states in the past five administrations."

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

To: interfaithnd  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: "U.S. Drops Pledge On Nukes"  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

>X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]  
>X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0  
>Date: Fri, 22 Feb 2002 09:50:15 -0500  
>To: jdi@clw.org (John Isaacs)  
>From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>  
>Subject: "U.S. Drops Pledge On Nukes"  
>  
>"U.S. Drops Pledge On Nukes"  
>Washington Times - February 22, 2002 - By Nicholas Kralev  
>  
>The Bush administration is no longer standing by a 24-year-old U.S. pledge  
>not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states, a senior  
>administration official said yesterday.  
>  
>Washington is "not looking for occasions to use" its nuclear arsenal, John  
>Bolton, undersecretary of state for arms control and international  
>security, said in an interview. But "we would do whatever is necessary to  
>defend America's innocent civilian population," he said.  
>  
>In case of an attack on the United States, "we would have to do what is  
>appropriate under the circumstances, and the classic formulation of that  
>is, we are not ruling anything in and we are not ruling anything out," Mr.  
>Bolton said.  
>  
>"We are just not into theoretical assertions that other administrations  
>have made," he said in reference to a 1978 commitment by the Carter  
>administration not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states unless  
>they attack the United States in alliance with nuclear-armed countries.  
>  
>On June 12 that year, Secretary of State Cyrus Vance made the following  
>statement on behalf of President Carter, which became known as "negative  
>security assurances":  
>  
>"The United States will not use nuclear weapons against any  
>non-nuclear-weapon state party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or any  
>comparable internationally binding commitment not to acquire nuclear  
>explosive devices, except in the case of an attack on the United States,  
>its territories or armed forces, or its allies, by such a state allied to a  
>nuclear-weapon state, or associated with a nuclear-weapon state in carrying  
>out or sustaining the attack."  
>  
>In 1995, Warren Christopher, the first secretary of state in the Clinton  
>administration, reaffirmed Washington's commitment. Along with the pledges  
>of the other four permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, who are

>all nuclear powers, it became part of a resolution, which the council  
>adopted April 11, 1995.

>

>But Mr. Bolton said such promises reflect "an unrealistic view of the  
>international situation."

>

>"The idea that fine theories of deterrence work against everybody, which is  
>implicit in the negative security assurances, has just been disproven by  
>September 11," he said. "What we are attempting to do is create a situation  
>where nobody uses weapons of mass destruction of any kind."

>

>Mr. Bolton spoke a day after returning from Moscow, where he led the second  
>round of arms control negotiations that are expected to produce an  
>agreement on nuclear cuts in time for President Bush's visit to Russia in May.

>

>The undersecretary said the "negative security assurances" never "came up"  
>in the discussions with the Russians. Washington has never had a  
>no-first-use nuclear policy but Moscow did until the mid1990s.

>

>Mr. Bolton's remarks displeased some arms control analysts yesterday, who  
>said that such significant U.S. government statements as the "negative  
>security assurances" should not be repudiated.

>

>"These assurances are important in order to maintain the integrity and  
>credibility of the nonproliferation regime. Repudiation can have a negative  
>effect on international security," said Daryl Kimball, executive director  
>of the Arms Control Association.

>

>The nonprofit organization's publication, Arms Control Today, discussed the  
>issue in an interview with Mr. Bolton earlier this month.

>

>Although Washington's official position on using nuclear weapons against  
>non-nuclear states has remained unchanged until now, "both Democratic and  
>Republican administrations have maintained ambiguity to maximize the  
>credibility of the U.S. nuclear force," Mr. Kimball said.

>

>Only a year after the Clinton administration reaffirmed Mr. Carter's  
>pledge, Defense Secretary William Perry said on April 26, 1996:

>

>"If some nation were to attack the United States with chemical weapons,  
>they have to fear the consequences of a response from any weapon in our  
>inventory. ... We could have a devastating response without use of nuclear  
>weapons, but we would not forswear that possibility."

>

>John Holum, Mr. Bolton's predecessor at the State Department under  
>Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright, said yesterday that the Bush  
>administration's position to ignore the 1978 commitment would not affect  
>the strategic balance of power but might send a wrong message overseas.

>

>"It doesn't make the use of weapons of mass destruction more or less  
>likely, but it's reflective of the administration's negative view of  
>international treaties," Mr. Holum said.

>

>He noted that there was an "extensive debate" in the Clinton administration

>on whether it's "responsible" to rely on nuclear weapons to combat  
>potential biological and chemical attacks, but a decision was made to  
>maintain "ambiguity."  
>  
>Mr. Bolton said there has been "no formal review" of Mr. Vance's statement  
>by the Bush administration, "nor are we going to undertake a review of  
>every official statement made by secretaries of states in the past five  
>administrations."

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

>  
>

To: interfaithnd  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Nuclear Posture Review briefing on March 22  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Colleagues:

We have rescheduled the meeting with Frank Miller of the National Security Council staff to provide a briefing for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on the Nuclear Posture Review. It will take place from 1:25 to 2:30 p.m., Friday, March 22 in Conference Room 2, Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.

Because we had a discussion of the Nuclear Posture Review on February 15 when Mr. Miller didn't show up, we have started to develop our position on the NPR. Therefore, we might want to work out our views in advance and be prepared to present them to Mr. Miller at the briefing. More on this later.

Shalom,  
Howard

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-4736742-18-1014396314-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com  
X-Sender: conoverp@ucc.org  
X-Apparently-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
X-Lotus-FromDomain: UCC  
To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
From: conoverp@ucc.org  
Mailing-List: list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com; contact interfaithnd-owner@yahoogroups.com  
Delivered-To: mailing list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com>  
Date: Fri, 22 Feb 2002 11:23:41 -0500  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Nuclear Posture Review briefing on March 22  
Reply-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

Thanks Howard.

I will probably not be able to attend since the meeting is at the same time as the Domestic Human Needs Working Group meeting.

I do not suggest changing the meeting time.

Shalom, Pat

----- Yahoo! Groups Sponsor ----->  
FREE COLLEGE MONEY  
CLICK HERE to search  
600,000 scholarships!  
<http://us.click.yahoo.com/iZp8OC/4m7CAA/ySSFAA/nJ9qlB/TM>  
----->

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:  
[interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com)

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

To: mcropsey@umpublishing.org  
From: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Thirteen columns  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\#1-102.28.doc; C:\My Documents\#2-102.28G.doc; C:\My Documents\#3-102.28B.doc; C:\My Documents\#4-102.31D.doc; C:\My Documents\#5-202.01D.doc; C:\My Documents\#6-202.02D.doc; C:\My Documents\#7-202.04D.doc; C:\My Documents\#8-202.05D.doc; C:\My Documents\#9-102.21B.doc; C:\My Documents\#10-202.06C.doc; C:\My Documents\#11-202.07C.doc; C:\My Documents\#12-202.08D.doc; C:\My Documents\#13-202.08D.doc;  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Marvin,

Attached are the 13 devotions for Sept. 1-Nov. 24, 2002. This time my goal was 350-355 words, since you had said that you prefer having something to cut. In the Spring issue which just came out, my goal was 330-335 words. My mistake the last time was setting my goal at 230-235 words. Would you prefer a few less words?

You may want to check lesson # 9, since I used some phrases from hymns; lesson # 11, where I mention our church's "Stephen Ministry," and lesson # 13, where I paraphrase a description in a book by Jan Karon (The reference is listed at the end of the lesson). I will send a brochure on "Stephen Ministry" by snail mail.

I sent quite a list of friends and relatives that I hoped would receive complementary copies of the Spring 2002 issue. Some were received two weeks ago. Others have not arrived. I would like to request a copy to be sent to: Mr. & Mrs. Chas. Goodrum, 2808 Pierpont, Alexandria, VA 22302. If I have requested too many copies, please do send me four more copies and bill me.

Hope to hear from you soon. If you are in Washington again, we do hope to hear from you.

Peace,

Carlee Hallman

To: conoverp@ucc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Web site proposal  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <85256B68.0072EDCD.00@UCCLN2.ucc.org>  
References:

Dear Pat,

I appreciate your questions to clarify the purpose of the proposed web site on nuclear disarmament. It has multiple purposes.

First of all, web site would represent specialization within the faith community for a common source of information on nuclear disarmament issues: denominational statements, civil-sector statements and reports with linkages. Individually some (but not all) of the denominational statements are on individual denomination web sites but mixed in with information on a wide range of issues. This would bring them all together.

Last fall when I was feeling down in the dumps over the war spirit raging through America, I offered to resign as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. I was talked out of it by those who feel that this is the only common voice in the faith community on this issue and that I was rendering a valuable service in keeping the issue to the forefront and maintaining linkages with civil-sector organizations. So in a personal sense the web site is intended to help me fulfill this task more effectively.

Second, it is a means of outreach to other sectors. When I see eight years of poor performance by Clinton and the retrograde nuclear posture of the Bush Administration, I realize that on our own we haven't made much headway. The same holds for retired generals and admirals, scientists and other experts who have spoken out in favor of nuclear disarmament. We need to combine our strength. I doubt that a proposal out of the blue to form a multi-sector coalition would get very far. However, I am hopeful that some of these experts would respond to a request from the faith community to offer their proposals on practical steps for eliminating nuclear weapons. Once we establish contact in this manner we can then explore whether some kind of working coalition is possible.

Third, a message board can provide opportunities for internet discussion of various proposals and emerging issues. I would hope that persons from the faith community and the civil sector could interact in this manner. We could draw in congressional staff and maybe even some persons from within the government.

This would start in the United States but then extend beyond. There are advocates of nuclear disarmament in Russia with whom some of our civil-sector friends have contact. On the faith side the World Council of Churches, Pax Christi International, the Conference of European Churches, and the Canadian Council of Churches all have a strong interest in this issue.

Apart from wanting a distinctive web site for these purposes, I doubt that a multi-issue site, such as those run by denominations, would have the space. I know that is the case with the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society.

As to funding, I think we can raise enough money for out-of-pocket costs of a web site design consultant, domain licensing, and a host server. That is like to run to \$2,000 or so. It would be useful to have a part-time person to take care of technical aspects of input; that would cost more. As a beginning, two or three denominational offices have offered to contribute \$200 to \$300 each. I have a proposal pending for a \$5,000 grant from the United Methodist Peace with Justice Program with a decision to be made by mid-March. I know one small foundation source where I might get some seed money. A modest UCC contribution would be welcome but not required to obtain your participation.

I hope this answers your questions. Call me at 301 896-0013 if you want to discuss it further.

Shalom,  
Howard

**From:** David Culp <david@fcnl.org>  
**To:** Joe Volk <joe@fcnl.org>, Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fcnl.org>, Ned Stowe <ned@fcnl.org>, Sam Garman <sam@fcnl.org>, "Howard W. Hallman " <mupj@igc.org>  
**Subject:** Nuclear Weapons Briefing for National Religious Offices  
**Date:** Mon, 25 Feb 2002 15:54:18 -0500  
**X-Mailer:** Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

**To: Joe Volk, Kathy Guthrie, Ned Stowe, Sam Garman, and Howard Hallman**

I have talked to each of you about the proposed briefing. Here is the suggested plan. All the details are tentative. Comments are welcome. I plan to start making calls tomorrow (Tuesday) afternoon.

**David**

**What:** Briefing on nuclear weapons issues and missile defense  
**When:** Light breakfast: 9-9:30 am and program: 9:30-11:30 am, Tuesday, March 12  
**Where:** Methodist Building  
**Program:** Religious Imperative for Nuclear Disarmament - Rev. Alan Geyer, Washington National Cathedral  
Legislative Outlook for 2002 - Madelyn Creedon, Senate Armed Services Committee, and John Isaacs, Council for a Livable World  
U.S.-Russian Security Assistance Programs - Laura Holgate, Nuclear Threat Initiative  
A View from the Pew: How National Offices Can Help Local Activists - Ed Snyder, Bar Harbor, Maine, retired FCNL executive secretary  
**Audience:** Invite about 100 persons from offices of national religious offices. Hope to get 20 to 25 to attend  
**Sponsors:** Friends Committee on National Legislation  
National Council of Churches  
In association with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament  
**Publicity:** Send HTML e-mails with meeting details to 100 persons in the WISC directory and Howard Hallman's list  
**RSVPs:** Sam Garman

To: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>, Joe Volk <joe@fcnl.org>, Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fcnl.org>, Ned Stowe <ned@fcnl.org>, Sam Garman <sam@fcnl.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Nuclear Weapons Briefing for National Religious Offices  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF6A8542C@local.fcnl.org>  
References:

David,

A briefing for the faith community on the legislative outlook for 2002 would be useful. Knowing you, it is likely to be focused upon issues that will come to a vote within the next six months, not on a longer range agenda. That's okay.

In that context I have doubts about inviting Alan Geyer, for whom I have great respect. Everyone you invite already knows the religious imperative for nuclear disarmament. It would be like preaching to the choir, actually to other preachers. As knowledgeable as he is on the general subject, he isn't in touch with the current legislative situation. The same would apply to Barbara Green.

I think the time would be better spent on discussing what we in the faith community can do after hearing the outlook from experts. Ed Snyder can provide the grassroots perspective. Maybe Joe Volk could provide a Washington perspective.

Thanks for arranging this. I hope you can get people out on fairly short notice.

Howard

X-Originating-IP: [66.44.45.128]

From: "Dean Jones" <peacejones@hotmail.com>

To: mupj@igc.org

Subject: Howard Hallman: Info on nuclear disarmament?

Date: Tue, 26 Feb 2002 00:06:10 +0000

X-OriginalArrivalTime: 26 Feb 2002 00:06:10.0984 (UTC) FILETIME=[65A62A80:01C1BE59]

Hello Howard,

My name is Dean Jones and I work for World Peacemakers. We recently met at a meeting concerning the President's plans with regard to nuclear weapons. However, his staff person did not show up. While there I ask you if you would be willing to provide some up-to-date information about the United States' nuclear weapons and their plans for the future, so that I could present this information at the Every Church A Peace Church Conference on March 1 and 2. Is this still possible and how would I get the information from you?

Thanks,  
Dean Jones

---

Join the world's largest e-mail service with MSN Hotmail.  
<http://www.hotmail.com>

To: "Dean Jones" <peacejones@hotmail.com>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Howard Hallman: Info on nuclear disarmament?  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\icnd.129.doc;  
In-Reply-To: <F246qsoWGaaDi3dQT9d00007d57@hotmail.com>  
References:

At 12:06 AM 2/26/02 +0000, you wrote:

....While there I ask you if you  
>would be willing to provide some up-to-date information about the United  
>States' nuclear weapons and their plans for the future, so that I could  
>present this information at the Every Church A Peace Church Conference on  
>March 1 and 2. Is this still possible and how would I get the information  
>from you?

Dean,

I'm not sure what you have in mind. The one item I have is a piece I wrote on the Nuclear Posture Review following the meeting. It is attached as a Word document. If you want to reproduce it for use at the conference, it is okay with me.

Are you assigned by World Peacemakers to work with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament? If so, you may want to subscribe to our list serve. You can do so by contacting [interfaithnd-subscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:interfaithnd-subscribe@yahoogroups.com).

Shalom,  
Howard

X-Sender: cpd@his.com  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (32)  
Date: Tue, 26 Feb 2002 15:28:40 -0500  
To: mupj@igc.org  
From: Colin Delany <cpd@edesigns-graphics.com>  
Subject: url is available

Howard--

We're in luck! zeronukes.org and .com are both available.

Thanks for taking the time to meet today. I'll work on that proposal over the next couple of days and send it your way. I look forward to working with you.

Colin Delany  
e.designs -- making web design work  
<http://www.edesigns-graphics.com>  
cpd@edesigns-graphics.com  
202-483-6675

To: glaszakovits\_gb@brethren.org, turner@onebox.com, J.\_Daryl\_Byler@mcc.org, cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org, egbertl4pj@yahoo.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Naming the web site  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments: A:\icnd.130.doc;  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Colleagues,

I want to move ahead with the proposed web site, first, by settling on the name and second, by obtaining funds to retain a consultant to design the site.

I propose that the decision on the name be made by an initial steering committee of representatives of offices which have expressed willingness to be a sponsor. So far they include the Washington offices of Church of the Brethren, Cooperative Baptist Fellowship, Mennonite Central Committee, Presbyterian Church, and Unitarian Universalist Association. I am satisfied that the five of you are enough to provide legitimacy at this early phase.

Pending are decisions by the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society (likely favorable), Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, United Church of Christ, and one or more Quaker entities (Friends Committee on National Legislation, American Friends Service Committee). The U.S. Catholic Conference has declined but will make copyrighted material available. I've been unable to reach the offices of the American Baptist Churches and the Episcopal Church.

#### Naming the Web Site

I ask you five as the initial steering committee, will you approve my proposal to name the web site [www.zeronukes.org](http://www.zeronukes.org)? That address is available from Network Solutions. I propose this name because it sets a dramatic and prophetic tone. In a succinct phrase it indicates the goal we are seeking. Moreover, it is a term used by military leaders, such as General Colin Powell and General Charles Horner. It is distinctive from "abolition", which is already in use by the Abolition 2000 movement. To me "nuclear disarmament" is too weak because it can mean partial reduction without going all the way.

Larry Egbert has asked whether "interfaith" should be in the name. That is an appropriate question. Because I want to draw in proposals from military leaders and others in the civil sector, I would prefer not to emphasize interfaith in the web address but have the home page show that the web site is sponsored by religious organizations. Also, down the road we may want to create a separate web page called [www.interfaithnd.org](http://www.interfaithnd.org) (the name of our list serve) for action alerts and other kinds of common advocacy.

Please offer your views. Is [www.zeronukes.org](http://www.zeronukes.org) acceptable? Or what would you propose as an alternative? If you have another proposal, please reply to all. As soon as we have a consensus, I will seek a license for the domain.

#### Web Site Design Consultant

I have had a discussion with Colin Delany who designed the [www.fieldofdreams.org](http://www.fieldofdreams.org) web site for the Council for a Livable World to deal with national missile defense. He was recommended by CLW staff. I am favorably impressed by him. He says that his fee would be \$3,000.

Somebody told me that the job could be done by a free lancer for \$1,500. But never having done this before, I don't know what the best price would be. Do any of you have an idea of what a fair price is? Do you have anybody else to suggest? I want to get at least one more bid.

As to funding, I want to try Wade Greene in New York, an advisory to Rockefellers who sometimes can quickly come up with a small grant. Also, I have a request for a \$5,000 peace with justice grant from the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society. A decision is expected by mid-March. Otherwise we can try to piece together enough funds from several sources for the design consultant. I won't go ahead until the money is available.

I am willing to learn the input process and handle it initially as a volunteer. If we can find more money, I may ask for compensation or higher some one else to do it.

Attached is a revision of the web site proposal to help refresh your memory. Call me at 301 896-0013 if you want to discuss this further. Otherwise please respond by e-mail on the name.

Shalom,  
Howard

Date: Wed, 27 Feb 2002 09:13:35 -0800 (PST)  
From: Egbert Lawrence <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Re: zeronukes is good web site name  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Thanks, Howard,

I follow your logic about the interfaith language.

Let us go for it. PEACE! Larry

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

> Dear Colleagues,

>

> I want to move ahead with the proposed web site,

> first, by settling on the

> name and second, by obtaining funds to retain a

> consultant to design the site.

>

> I propose that the decision on the name be made by

> an initial steering

> committee of representatives of offices which have

> expressed willingness to

> be a sponsor. So far they include the Washington

> offices of Church of the

> Brethren, Cooperative Baptist Fellowship, Mennonite

> Central Committee,

> Presbyterian Church, and Unitarian Universalist

> Association. I am

> satisfied that the five of you are enough to provide

> legitimacy at this

> early phase.

>

> Pending are decisions by the United Methodist

> General Board of Church and

> Society (likely favorable), Lutheran Office for

> Governmental Affairs,

> Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, United

> Church of Christ, and one

> or more Quaker entities (Friends Committee on

> National Legislation,

> American Friends Service Committee). The U.S.

> Catholic Conference has

> declined but will make copyrighted material

> available. I've been unable to

> reach the offices of the American Baptist Churches

> and the Episcopal Church.

>

> Naming the Web Site

>

> I ask you five as the initial steering committee,

> will you approve my

> proposal to name the web site [www.zeronukes.org](http://www.zeronukes.org)?

> That address is available

> from Network Solutions. I propose this name

> because it sets a dramatic

> and prophetic tone. In a succinct phrase it  
> indicates the goal we are  
> seeking. Moreover, it is a term used by military  
> leaders, such as General  
> Colin Powell and General Charles Horner. It is  
> distinctive from  
> "abolition", which is already in use by the  
> Abolition 2000 movement. To  
> me "nuclear disarmament" is too weak because it can  
> mean partial reduction  
> without going all the way.  
>  
> Larry Egbert has asked whether "interfaith" should  
> be in the name. That  
> is an appropriate question. Because I want to draw  
> in proposals from  
> military leaders and others in the civil sector, I  
> would prefer not to  
> emphasize interfaith in the web address but have the  
> home page show that  
> the web site is sponsored by religious  
> organizations. Also, down the  
> road we may want to create a separate web page  
> called [www.interfaithnd.org](http://www.interfaithnd.org)  
> (the name of our list serve) for action alerts and  
> other kinds of common  
> advocacy.  
>  
> Please offer your views. Is [www.zeronukes.org](http://www.zeronukes.org)  
> acceptable? Or what would  
> you propose as an alternative? If you have another  
> proposal, please reply  
> to all. As soon as we have a consensus, I will seek  
> a license for the domain.  
>  
> Web Site Design Consultant  
>  
> I have had a discussion with Colin Delany who  
> designed the  
> [www.fieldofdreams.org](http://www.fieldofdreams.org) web site for the Council for a  
> Livable World to deal  
> with national missile defense. He was recommended  
> by CLW staff. I am  
> favorably impressed by him. He says that his fee  
> would be \$3,000.  
>  
> Somebody told me that the job could be done by a  
> free lancer for \$1,500.  
> But never having done this before, I don't know what  
> the best price would  
> be. Do any of you have an idea of what a fair price  
> is? Do you have  
> anybody else to suggest? I want to get at least  
> one more bid.

>  
> As to funding, I want to try Wade Greene in New  
> York, an advisory to  
> Rockefellers who sometimes can quickly come up with  
> a small grant. Also, I  
> have a request for a \$5,000 peace with justice grant  
> from the United  
> Methodist General Board of Church and Society. A  
> decision is expected by  
> mid-March. Otherwise we can try to piece together  
> enough funds from  
> several sources for the design consultant. I won't  
> go ahead until the  
> money is available.

>  
> I am willing to learn the input process and handle  
> it initially as a  
> volunteer. If we can find more money, I may ask  
> for compensation or  
> higher some one else to do it.

>  
> Attached is a revision of the web site proposal to  
> help refresh your  
> memory. Call me at 301 896-0013 if you want to  
> discuss this further.  
> Otherwise please respond by e-mail on the name.

>  
> Shalom,  
> Howard

>  
>

> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword  
name=icnd.130.doc; x-mac-type=42494E41;  
x-mac-creator=4D535744

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

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

---

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Greetings - Send FREE e-cards for every occasion!

<http://greetings.yahoo.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 5.5.6.1  
Date: Wed, 27 Feb 2002 11:44:05 -0500  
From: "Catherine Gordon" <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>  
To: <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Naming the web site

Howard,

I would recommend that the name of the website be identifiable as the website of the Interfaith Committee on Nuclear Disarmament. If it is not, I will need to go through the process of approval from our national ministries division which could take up to 6 months.

Maybe something like [www.ICND-Zeronukes.org](http://www.ICND-Zeronukes.org)

Will this be possible?

Catherine Gordon  
Associate for International Issues  
Washington Office  
Presbyterian Church (USA)  
[www.pcusa.org/washington](http://www.pcusa.org/washington)  
p(202)543-1126; f(202)543-7755

>>> "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> 02/27/02 11:25AM >>>  
Dear Colleagues,

I want to move ahead with the proposed web site, first, by settling on the name and second, by obtaining funds to retain a consultant to design the site.

I propose that the decision on the name be made by an initial steering committee of representatives of offices which have expressed willingness to be a sponsor. So far they include the Washington offices of Church of the Brethren, Cooperative Baptist Fellowship, Mennonite Central Committee, Presbyterian Church, and Unitarian Universalist Association. I am satisfied that the five of you are enough to provide legitimacy at this early phase.

Pending are decisions by the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society (likely favorable), Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, United Church of Christ, and one or more Quaker entities (Friends Committee on National Legislation, American Friends Service Committee). The U.S. Catholic Conference has declined but will make copyrighted material available. I've been

unable to reach the offices of the American Baptist Churches and the Episcopal Church.

### Naming the Web Site

I ask you five as the initial steering committee, will you approve my proposal to name the web site [www.zeronukes.org](http://www.zeronukes.org)? That address is available from Network Solutions. I propose this name because it sets a dramatic and prophetic tone. In a succinct phrase it indicates the goal we are seeking. Moreover, it is a term used by military leaders, such as General Colin Powell and General Charles Horner. It is distinctive from "abolition", which is already in use by the Abolition 2000 movement. To me "nuclear disarmament" is too weak because it can mean partial reduction without going all the way.

Larry Egbert has asked whether "interfaith" should be in the name. That is an appropriate question. Because I want to draw in proposals from military leaders and others in the civil sector, I would prefer not to emphasize interfaith in the web address but have the home page show that the web site is sponsored by religious organizations. Also, down the road we may want to create a separate web page called [www.interfaithnd.org](http://www.interfaithnd.org) (the name of our list serve) for action alerts and other kinds of common advocacy.

Please offer your views. Is [www.zeronukes.org](http://www.zeronukes.org) acceptable? Or what would you propose as an alternative? If you have another proposal, please reply to all. As soon as we have a consensus, I will seek a license for the domain.

### Web Site Design Consultant

I have had a discussion with Colin Delany who designed the [www.fieldofdreams.org](http://www.fieldofdreams.org) web site for the Council for a Livable World to deal with national missile defense. He was recommended by CLW staff. I am favorably impressed by him. He says that his fee would be \$3,000.

Somebody told me that the job could be done by a free lancer for \$1,500. But never having done this before, I don't know what the best price would

be. Do any of you have an idea of what a fair price is? Do you have anybody else to suggest? I want to get at least one more bid.

As to funding, I want to try Wade Greene in New York, an advisory to Rockefellers who sometimes can quickly come up with a small grant.

Also, I have a request for a \$5,000 peace with justice grant from the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society. A decision is expected by mid-March. Otherwise we can try to piece together enough funds from several sources for the design consultant. I won't go ahead until the money is available.

I am willing to learn the input process and handle it initially as a volunteer. If we can find more money, I may ask for compensation or higher some one else to do it.

Attached is a revision of the web site proposal to help refresh your memory. Call me at 301 896-0013 if you want to discuss this further. Otherwise please respond by e-mail on the name.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: glaszakovits\_gb@brethren.org, turner@onebox.com, J.\_Daryl\_Byler@mcc.org, cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org, egbertl4pj@yahoo.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Further on naming the web site  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Colleagues,

I want to share with you the response of Catherine Gordon on naming the web site.

>From: "Catherine Gordon" <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>  
>To: <mupj@igc.org>  
>Subject: Re: Naming the web site  
>  
>Howard,  
>  
>I would recommend that the name of the website be identifiable as the  
>website of the Interfaith Committee on Nuclear Disarmament. If it is  
>not, I will need to go through the process of approval from our national  
>ministries division which could take up to 6 months.  
>  
>Maybe something like [www.ICND-Zeronukes.org](http://www.ICND-Zeronukes.org)  
>  
>Will this be possible?  
>  
>Catherine Gordon  
>Associate for International Issues  
>Washington Office  
>Presbyterian Church (USA)  
>[www.pcusa.org/washington](http://www.pcusa.org/washington)  
>p(202)543-1126; f(202)543-7755

From: Howard, continued

I am open to this suggestion. The one concern I have is that the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is an informal coalition that doesn't speak in its own name. It doesn't even have a letterhead listing names of participants. Rather it is a convening and exchange vehicle. Sign-on letters, for instance, go in the name of the signers rather than the committee as a whole. Many participants are comfortable with that arrangement.

Let me ask you as participants, would it be acceptable to identify the web site on its home page as "A Project of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, Co-sponsored by [names of sponsoring organizations]"? Do you think other participants in ICND would object?

I haven't asked all the peace fellowships and other unofficial associations (including my own) to be sponsors because I wanted to emphasize the denominations in our outreach to military leaders and others. Also I think a list of 20 to 30 names as sponsors would be somewhat confusing. I still have that inclination.

Catherine, if we identified it as a project of ICND on the home page, would you also want to have ICND on the web address?

It's a mild dilemma to balance these various needs, including our desire to have the Presbyterians on board. So I'll appreciate our counsel.

Shalom,  
Howard

From: "Lori Swanson Nemenz" <lori@paxchristiusa.org>  
To: <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Attn: Howard Hallman  
Date: Wed, 27 Feb 2002 14:14:01 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)  
X-Mimeole: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300  
Importance: Normal

Dear Howard,

You requested contact information for Frank Dworak. This is Frank's email address, I hope this will be helpful. I have contacted Frank to ask his permission to share this contact information so he will be expecting your email.

fdpeace@earthlink.net

Lori E. Swanson Nemenz  
Program & Operations Assoc.  
Fostering a reverence for all creation.

To: bumc  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: An interesting insight  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Friends,

Here's an interesting insight I saw on the Internet. Although written in relation to 9-11, it applies to many other situations we find ourselves in.

Howard Hallman

###

A Native American grandfather was talking to his grandson about the tragedy on September 11th.

He said, "I feel as if I have two wolves fighting in my heart. One wolf is vengeful, angry, and violent. The other one is loving and compassionate."

The grandson asked, "Which wolf will win the fight in your heart?"

The grandfather answered, "The one I feed."

To: interfaithnd  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Proposed letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\iclt.184.doc;  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Colleagues,

I have drafted a letter to President Bush in response to the Nuclear Posture Review, proposed to be signed by representatives of religious organizations. It is pasted in below and also sent as a Word attachment if you prefer to study it in that format.

In this letter I have picked up a suggestion from David Culp that the Bush Administration is not of one mind about nuclear weapons policy. Therefore, the letter contrasts Bush's visionary statements about ending cold war confrontation and moving away from mutual assured destruction (MAD) with what Pentagon planners have produced in the Nuclear Posture Review.

The letter is longer than I usually draft, but there are several important issues to raise. It concludes with a request that the Nuclear Posture Review be sent back to the drawing boards with instructions to incorporate a nuclear disarmament component.

I would greatly appreciate your suggestions for changes: additions, deletions, modifications. If enough organizations believe such a letter is useful, I would like to complete all revisions, get signatures, and send it to President Bush and some top officials by no later than March 15. This is a week before our scheduled meeting with Frank Miller of the National Security Council staff, which will give us an opportunity to discuss our views with him.

I welcome your response.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

First Draft

The Honorable George W. Bush  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

As you prepare for your next meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin, we would like to offer our observations on the place of nuclear weapons in the relationship between the United States and Russia. We were encouraged when the two of you met in Texas and told the world that the two nations are now friends rather than military rivals. You each promised to make substantial reductions in strategic nuclear weapons. This follows through on your desire to move beyond the Cold War and its doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD).

This gives us hope that substantial progress can be made toward the global elimination of nuclear weapons. For decades religious leaders and religious organizations have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons. Increasingly retired military leaders have told us that nuclear weapons have no utility. In June 2000 these two strands were woven

together in the attached statement by 18 military professionals and 21 religious leaders, who indicated, "We deeply believe that the long-term reliance on nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable....National security imperatives and ethical demands have converged to bring us to the necessity of outlawing and prohibiting nuclear weapons worldwide."

With our hopes raised by your meeting with President Putin, we are, however, discouraged by what Pentagon planners have produced in the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). To be sure, the commitment to reduce strategic nuclear weapons to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads along with the Russia commitment to reduce theirs to 1,500 is a step in the right direction. Yet, we wonder why it should take ten years to accomplish. Surely this step could be completed by 2004. Furthermore, the reduction is mitigated by the NPR plan to keep an estimated 1,500 warheads in an active reserve with their delivery systems intact for uploading. In contrast previous arms reduction agreements, such as Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty signed by President Ronald Reagan and START I signed by your father, President George H.W. Bush, provided for the destruction of the delivery vehicles.

If the United States keeps so many warheads, Russia is likely to do the same. The more warheads that Russia has in reserve the greater the risk of some of them falling into the hands of terrorist organizations. The United States would be better off to forgo a large warhead reserve and instead enter into a binding, verifiable agreement with Russia that requires elimination of both delivery vehicles and nuclear warheads taken out of service.

We are especially disappointed that the doctrine of mutual assured destruction remains intact in the Pentagon's Nuclear Posture Review. In spite of talk of a change from a "traditional threat-based approach" to a "capabilities-based approach" which is not country specific, the NPR specifies that "preplanning is essential for immediate and potential contingencies". If you ask the Pentagon planners what these contingencies are, they are most likely to respond that Russian sites now targeted by the single integrated operating plan (SIOP) will remain the top contingency. Thus, in practice the MAD doctrine prevails.

Not only is MAD continuing but also the practice of keeping large numbers of missiles on hair-trigger alert. During the presidential campaign you rightly told the American people that "for two nations at peace, keeping so many weapons on high alert may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch." You stated, "the United States should remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert, hair-trigger status -- another unnecessary vestige of Cold War confrontation." Yet, the Pentagon planners have made no provision for de-alerting in the Nuclear Posture Review. True friends do not keep nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert targeted at each other.

Indeed, the Pentagon plan seems to expand the role of nuclear weapons beyond the primary role of deterring nuclear-weapon states from attacking the United States and its allies. The Nuclear Posture Review speaks of flexibility for a range of contingencies. Although these contingencies are not spelled out, the PNR expresses a concern for the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and ballistic missile delivery systems. In your State of the Union Address you spoke of an "axis of evil" consisting of Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. Some of your top appointees are previously on record as favoring use of nuclear weapons to deal with such contingencies. Since the NPR was released, John Bolton, undersecretary of state for arms control and international security, has revealed that your administration no longer stands behind previous U.S. policy of no first use of nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapon state not allied with a nuclear-weapon state. We are greatly disturbed that your administration wants to expand rather than contract the role of nuclear weapons in the 21st century.

Our concern is reinforced by the approach to nuclear testing revealed in the Nuclear Posture Review. While we welcome reaffirmation of your commitment to a moratorium on nuclear weapons testing, we are bothered by the NPR's call for the Department of Energy to reduce the time it would take to resume testing. This seems to go with your opposition to ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), a treaty we support. This is compounded by the NPR's indication that the current nuclear force is projected to remain until 2020 and that in the meantime the Department will "study alternatives for follow-ons" for nuclear delivery systems and warheads. Preparation to resume testing seems part of this scheme. This sounds like a commitment to nuclear weapons forever. We find this objectionable.

Therefore, Mr. President, we ask you to send the Nuclear Posture Review back to the drawing boards and have the Pentagon planners come up with a plan that will truly end the MAD doctrine and will steadily reduce the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. military and foreign policy. We propose that nuclear disarmament objectives be incorporated into the Nuclear Posture Review in accordance to the U.S. obligation under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), signed originally by President Richard Nixon. As a point of departure, we call to your attention the practical steps contained in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference (see attachment). Among other things these practical steps set forth the principle of irreversibility and call for "an unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals".

A revised Nuclear Posture Review along these lines would more nearly fulfill your goal of ending Cold War confrontation and achieving true friendship between the United States and Russia. We urge you to exercise your presidential leadership in the direction of diminishing the role of nuclear weapons and eventually eliminating them from Earth. As you do, we will do what we can to help build support with the American people.

With best regards,

Signed by representatives of religious organizations

From: "oneilsp" <oneilsp@netzero.net>  
To: "Howard Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] Proposed letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review  
Date: Thu, 28 Feb 2002 12:07:46 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)  
Importance: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700.

Hello Howard,

I like the letter. I have noted a couple of typo's. The Marianists are are ready to sign.

Bro. Steve

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

**From:** Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]

**Sent:** Wednesday, February 27, 2002 5:16 PM

**To:** interfaithnd@yahogroups.com

**Subject:** [interfaithnd] Proposed letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review

Dear Colleagues,

I have drafted a letter to President Bush in response to the Nuclear Posture Review, proposed to be signed by representatives of religious organizations. It is pasted in below and also sent as a Word attachment if you prefer to study it in that format.

In this letter I have picked up a suggestion from David Culp that the Bush Administration is not of one mind about nuclear weapons policy. Therefore, the letter contrasts Bush's visionary statements about ending cold war confrontation and moving away from mutual assured destruction (MAD) with what Pentagon planners have produced in the Nuclear Posture Review.

The letter is longer than I usually draft, but there are several important issues to raise. It concludes with a request that the Nuclear Posture Review be sent back to the drawing boards with instructions to incorporate a nuclear disarmament component.

I would greatly appreciate your suggestions for changes: additions, deletions, modifications.

If enough organizations believe such a letter is useful, I would like to complete all revisions, get signatures, and send it to President Bush and some top officials by no later than March 15. This is a week before our scheduled meeting with Frank Miller of the National Security Council staff, which will give us an opportunity to discuss our views with him.

I welcome your response.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
Subject: Message Campaign For U.S./Russian Summit: " Friends Don't Threaten Friends"  
Date: Thu, 28 Feb 2002 15:55:49 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600  
Importance: Normal

## BRINK CAMPAIGN LAUNCHES "FRIENDS DON'T THREATEN FRIENDS" MESSAGE CAMPAIGN

The U.S. and Russia are now strategic partners, yet they are still poised to destroy each other with thousands of nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. Back From the Brink plans to bring this point home with a major message campaign culminating with the U.S./Russian Summit in May. The campaign will feature images of new found friends President Bush and President Putin, with the message: "Friends Don't Threaten Friends with Nuclear Weapons on Hair-Trigger Alert."

**BUSH PLANS TO KEEP NUKES ON HIGH-ALERT.** It's good news that the Bush Administration wants to remove some 3800 warheads from missiles -- including 1500 to 1700 that are currently on hair-trigger alert. But they want to take ten years to de-alert these weapons -- a task that can be accomplished in under three. And even after ten years, the Bush plan calls for keeping 680 to 800 weapons on hair-trigger alert.

### SUBSTITUTING A FORM OF DE-ALERTING FOR DISARMAMENT DOES A DISSERVICE TO BOTH.

Instead of destroying the nuclear weapons slated for elimination, the Pentagon plans to put them in long-term storage. Leaving open the possibility of future deployment of these weapons makes the claim of "reductions" extremely dubious. By substituting a form of stretched out de-alerting for disarmament, the Bush plan does a disservice to both.

President Bush's new "partnership" with Russia is still based on the old Cold War relationship that kept both sides prepared for a quick launch of nuclear weapons against each other.

The events of September 11th have shown us that the unexpected can happen with dire consequences. If the unexpected happens with nuclear weapons, the results will be catastrophic for humanity and the planet. As the world's nuclear superpowers, the U.S. and Russia must set a standard: No nuclear weapons should be kept on high-alert status -- poised for immediate launch.

### "FRIENDS DON'T THREATEN FRIENDS"

Presidents Bush and Putin are meeting at a Moscow Summit in May. Leading up to that Summit, the Brink Campaign is launching a FAX/MESSAGE campaign using the theme "Friends Don't Threaten Friends."

We want to flood the White House and the Kremlin with faxes that call on both Presidents to: immediately remove all their nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert; rapidly remove warheads from missiles slated for

elimination, where they can be stored, secured and verified; and develop binding agreements on the irreversible elimination of nuclear weapons.

Fax/Flyers will be available soon and will also be available on our Web site. We'll send a printable copy by email next week along with other ordering information and news on how else we plan to get our message out (including the possibility of billboards in Moscow and Washington!)

Thanks,

Ira Shorr and Esther Pank

Back From the Brink Campaign  
6856 Eastern Avenue, NW  
#322  
Washington, DC 20012  
TEL: (202) 545-1001  
FAX: (202) 545-1004  
prgrm@backfromthebrink.net

GO TO [www.backfromthebrink.org](http://www.backfromthebrink.org) to check out the action!

To: bumc  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Sandwich Sunday and Communion Offering  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

## REMINDER

Sunday, March 3 is Sandwich Sunday. Bring your sandwiches to the kitchen before either service for McKenna's Wagon to distribute to the homeless.

Also contribute to the monthly Communion Offering to support BUMC's local outreach in the Bethesda Community.

To: mupj@igc.org  
Date: Fri, 1 Mar 2002 08:55:57 -0500  
Subject: Re: [bumc] Sandwich Sunday and Communion Offering  
X-Mailer: Juno 5.0.27  
From: Dwight O Smith <dosmith6@juno.com>

Howard,

Are these the same sandwiches that go to Martha's Table, 14th Street, between W and U? Bruce Smith asked me to deliver sandwiches to Martha's table on Sunday, March 3. Please reply.

Dwight

On Fri, 01 Mar 2002 08:45:38 -0500 "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> writes:

> REMINDER

>

> Sunday, March 3 is Sandwich Sunday. Bring your sandwiches to the

> kitchen

> before either service for McKenna's Wagon to distribute to the

> homeless.

>

> Also contribute to the monthly Communion Offering to support BUMC's

> local

> outreach in the Bethesda Community.

>

>

> ----- Yahoo! Groups Sponsor

> -----~-->

> Buy Stock for \$4.

> No Minimums.

> FREE Money 2002.

> <http://us.click.yahoo.com/BgmYkB/VovDAA/ySSFAA/X.ewlB/TM>

>

> -----~-->

>

> To unsubscribe from this list, send a message with "unsubscribe

> BUMC" in the message body to [mingomae@aol.com](mailto:mingomae@aol.com) For further

> information about BUMC, go to our website at

> <http://www.gbgm-umc.org/bumc-md>

>

> Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to

> <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

>

>

>

>

To: Dwight O Smith <dosmith6@juno.com>  
From: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: [bumc] Sandwich Sunday and Communion Offering  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <20020301.085557.-694179.0.dosmith6@juno.com>  
References:

At 08:55 AM 3/1/02 -0500, you wrote:

>Howard,

>

>Are these the same sandwiches that go to Martha's Table, 14th Street,  
>between W and U? Bruce Smith asked me to deliver sandwiches to Martha's  
>table on Sunday, March 3. Please reply.

>

Dwight,

Yes, they are. I copied McKenna's Wagon off the flyer we distributed for the outreach schedule. My impression is that Martha's Table receives them but that McKenna's Wagon distributes them. If that is wrong, let me know, and I'll change it the next time I do publicity.

Howard

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-4736742-20-1014997277-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com

X-Sender: conoverp@ucc.org

X-Apparently-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

X-Lotus-FromDomain: UCC

To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

From: conoverp@ucc.org

Mailing-List: list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com; contact interfaithnd-owner@yahoogroups.com

Delivered-To: mailing list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com>

Date: Fri, 1 Mar 2002 10:21:22 -0500

Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Proposed letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture  
Review

Reply-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

Dear Howard,

This looks like a very good letter to me. I support the substance and tone.

I suggest you get someone to copy edit the letter for language niceities, even though it is in pretty good shape.

Shalom, Pat Conover

----- Yahoo! Groups Sponsor ----->

Buy Stock for \$4.

No Minimums.

FREE Money 2002.

<http://us.click.yahoo.com/BgmYkB/VovDAA/ySSFAA/nJ9q1B/TM>

----->

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:  
[interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com)

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

From: "Cropsey, Marvin" <Mcropsey@umpublishing.org>  
To: "Carlee L. Hallman (E-mail)" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Winter Quarter "Maturing in Faith"  
Date: Fri, 1 Mar 2002 09:43:37 -0600  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Carlee. I have attached the lessons for the winter quarter. May I complete the contract for the "Maturing in Faith" to be delivered by May 25?

<<UMPH-MARV.doc>>

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\UMPH-MARV.doc"

To: "Cropsey, Marvin" <Mcropsey@umpublishing.org>

From: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Subject: Re: Winter Quarter "Maturing in Faith"

Cc:

Bcc:

X-Attachments:

In-Reply-To: <F304CCB28099FC4885E81A32064DB5A6372472@tweety.umpublishing.org>

References:

At 09:43 AM 3/1/02 -0600, you wrote:

>Carlee. I have attached the lessons for the winter quarter. May I complete

>the contract for the "Maturing in Faith" to be delivered by May 25?

Marvin,

Yes, go ahead with the contract. The May 25 deadline is acceptable.

Carlee

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 5.5.6.1  
Date: Fri, 01 Mar 2002 13:03:38 -0500  
From: "Catherine Gordon" <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>  
To: <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Gen Charles Horner

Howard,

I just read some of General Horner's comments on going to Zero. Maybe we could use some of his material on the website.

Catherine

Catherine Gordon  
Associate for International Issues  
Washington Office  
Presbyterian Church (USA)  
[www.pcusa.org/washington](http://www.pcusa.org/washington)  
p(202)543-1126; f(202)543-7755

Reply-To: "Stacie Robinson" <srobinson@clw.org>  
From: "Stacie Robinson" <srobinson@clw.org>  
To: "Stacie Robinson" <srobinson@clw.org>  
Subject: summary of today's meeting  
Date: Fri, 1 Mar 2002 16:41:06 -0500  
Organization: CRND  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2919.6600  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

The meeting to discuss the future arrangements in the post-Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers era agreed on March 1, 2002 on the following:

1. Demise of the Coalition: The combination of a budget deficit, the collapse of the W. Alton Jones Foundation, and the receipt of only a moderate replacement grant rendered the Coalition financially unviable. In January, the Council was no longer able to bear the financial burden of the Coalition and the Coalition was dissolved. The staff members were folded into the Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation.

2. Future Meetings: A consensus was reached on the following points -

==The groups that had previously met under the auspices of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers will to continue meeting once a month in a less formal arrangement with no formal mission statement.

==The Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation will take on the convening role of these meetings. (i.e., sending out e-mail invitations to the meetings, providing coffee and snacks, reserving a room, etc.).

==The chair will rotate every six months

==John Isaacs will be the first chair through July.

==The chair will develop an agenda of timely and relevant issues based on input from other groups.

==Different groups will lead the discussion on each of the major issues discussed at the meetings.

3. Function of the group

==The major function of the group is to bring together the organizations to exchange information on key arms control issues

==Attendance is open to all "like-minded" organizations. Those invited initially will be those invited to past Coalition meetings.

==The group will focus on major issues relevant to all groups, with a particularly focus on three issues: 1) missile defense, 2) nuclear reductions, 3) nuclear testing/strategic modernization-related issues. A second tier issue is Cooperative Threat Reduction-related issues. Other issues will be subsumed under the three major issues, such as space weapons, de-alerting and homeland defense.

==The focus will be on one monthly meeting at which all these issues will be discussed; smaller working groups, meetings of directors or other issue-related groups will be formed on an ad-hoc basis.

==The groups agreed that with limited available funds, there is no point at this time, or in the foreseeable future, to raise funds for any type of new Coalition.

#### 4. Upcoming summit: Groups detailed upcoming events related to the Bush-Putin Summit.

- =FCNL letters to the editor; will hire a media person to place in major regional newspapers - basic theme will be advocating Bush and Putin to get an agreement to slash nuclear arsenals
- =Brink Campaign - Fax message campaign to both Putin and Bush "Friends Don't Threaten Friends"; possible billboard in the Kremlin with same message
- =20/20 Vision - Postcards on cuts
- =WAND - Congressional briefing for women next month relating to the cuts and the summit
- =Disarmament Campaign - Congressional Briefing Days - facilitate meetings with members and their representatives
- =ACA- letter from past Secretaries as well as a letter from Senators (possibly Dem. leadership) on what the summit should produce; Press briefing in late April/May on strategic weapons
- =PSR - lobby days and possible press briefing before the summit
- =CDI - will be promoting transparency issues (with focus on Russian office); possible meetings with Russian officials explaining counter offers to any American proposals
- =Interfaith - March 22 meeting with NSC Frank Miller - will try to include summit issues
- =Nuclear Threat Reduction Initiative - possible legislation relating nuclear threat and terrorism in both Senate and House. Working with Smith (OR), Collins, Dorgan and Reed in Senate and Tauscher, Spratt and ??? in House.

#### 5. Missile Defense : Current Issue

- =CDI - possible report on MD budget based on CBO report. Will look into the ECAAR report (Economists Allied for Arms Reeducations)
- =Center congressional briefing with Phil Coyle Friday, March 8

Outlook in Congress - work on markups and amendments - efforts relating "cut and transfer" proposals

Missile Defense Agency - look in to oversight, or lack thereof. Theresa Hitchens will have something coming out in Defense News related to the subject.

MARCH 15 - next mid-course test with 3 balloon decoys

6. The next meeting of the post-Coalition will be held Thursday, March 21, 10:00 AM, Union of Concerned Scientists. Daryl Kimball will be responsible for coordinating the discussion on nuclear reductions; Tom Collina will be responsible for coordinating the discuss on missile defense; Bob Musil or Martin Butcher will be responsible for coordinating the discussion on nuclear testing-related issues.

+ + + + +

Stacie Robinson  
Center for Arms Control and Nonproliferation  
110 Maryland Ave., NE, Suite 201  
Washington, DC 20002

Phone: (202) 546-0795

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-4736742-25-1015082377-  
mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com  
X-Sender: Murraylou2@cs.com  
X-Apparently-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
X-Mailer: CompuServe 2000 6.0 for Windows US sub 10509  
From: Murraylou2@cs.com  
Mailing-List: list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com; contact interfaithnd-  
owner@yahoogroups.com  
Delivered-To: mailing list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com>  
Date: Sat, 2 Mar 2002 10:19:26 EST  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Proposed letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review  
Reply-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

Dear Friend Howard:

Just a clarification. Are you absolutely certain that the Bush Administration wants to expand the role of nukes or is it just more belligerent talk by elements in Washington's war party who are prepared to fight a lot of wars with their mouths so long as their own kids aren't involved.

Important to be exact, that is if you're trying to persuade and convince.

Best,

Murray Polner

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:  
interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to the [Yahoo! Terms of Service](#).

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-4736742-26-1015089608-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com  
X-Sender: egbertl4pj@yahoo.com  
X-Apparently-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
From: Egbert Lawrence <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>  
Mailing-List: list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com; contact interfaithnd-owner@yahoogroups.com  
Delivered-To: mailing list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com>  
Date: Sat, 2 Mar 2002 09:20:05 -0800 (PST)  
Subject: [interfaithnd] Reply from Larry: Proposed letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review  
Reply-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

Great letter, Howard,

My only question would be wondering if GWB can read a letter that long?

PEACE! Larry

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

> At 04:37 PM 3/1/02 EST, you wrote:

> > What letter? Where is it?

> >

> >Murray Polner

>

>

> I sent the letter as a Word attachment. In case you

> don't receive such

> items, the draft letter is pasted below.

>

> Howard

>

> ###

>

> First Draft

>

> The Honorable George W. Bush

> The White House

> Washington, DC 20500

>

> Dear Mr. President:

>

> As you prepare for your next meeting with Russian

> President Vladimir Putin,

> we would like to offer our observations on the place

> of nuclear weapons in

> the relationship between the United States and

> Russia. We were encouraged

> when the two of you met in Texas, you told the world

> that the two nations

> are now friends rather than military rivals. You

> each promised to make

> substantial reductions in strategic nuclear weapons.

> This follows through

> on your desire to move beyond the Cold War and its

> doctrine of mutual

> assured destruction (MAD).  
>  
> This gives us hope that substantial progress can be  
> made toward the global  
> elimination of nuclear weapons. For decades  
> religious leaders and  
> religious organizations have questioned the morality  
> of nuclear weapons.  
> Increasingly retired military leaders have told us  
> that nuclear weapons  
> have no utility. In June 2000 these two strands  
> were woven together in  
> the attached statement by 18 military professionals  
> and 21 religious  
> leaders, who indicated, "We deeply believe that the  
> long-term reliance on  
> nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear  
> powers, and the ever-present  
> danger of their acquisition by others, is morally  
> untenable and militarily  
> unjustifiable....National security imperatives and  
> ethical demands have  
> converged to bring us to the necessity of outlawing  
> and prohibiting nuclear  
> weapons worldwide."  
>  
> With our hopes raised by your meeting with President  
> Putin, we are,  
> however, discouraged by what Pentagon planners have  
> produced in the Nuclear  
> Posture Review (NPR). To be sure, the commitment to  
> reduce strategic  
> nuclear weapons to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads along  
> with the Russia commitment  
> to reduce theirs to 1,500 is a step in the right  
> direction. Yet, we wonder  
> why it should take ten years to accomplish. Surely  
> this step could be  
> completed by 2004. Furthermore, the reduction is  
> mitigated by the NPR plan  
> to keep an estimated 1,500 warheads in an active  
> reserve with their  
> delivery systems intact for uploading. In contrast  
> previous arms  
> reduction agreements, such as Intermediate-Range  
> Nuclear Forces (INF)  
> Treaty signed by President Ronald Reagan and START I  
> signed by your father,  
> President George H.W. Bush, provided for the  
> destruction of the delivery  
> vehicles.  
>  
> If the United States keeps so many warheads, Russia  
> is likely to do the

> same. The more warheads that Russia has in reserve  
> the greater the risk of  
> some of them falling into the hands of terrorist  
> organizations. The  
> United States would be better off to forgo a large  
> warhead reserve and  
> instead enter into a binding, verifiable agreement  
> with Russia that  
> requires elimination of both delivery vehicles and  
> nuclear warheads taken  
> out of service.  
>  
> We are especially disappointed that the doctrine of  
> mutual assured  
> destruction remains intact in the Pentagon's Nuclear  
> Posture Review. In  
> spite of talk of a change from a "traditional  
> threat-based approach" to a  
> "capabilities-based approach" which is not country  
> specific, the NPR  
> specifies that "preplanning is essential for  
> immediate and potential  
> contingencies". If you ask the Pentagon planners  
> what these contingencies  
> are, they are most likely to respond that Russian  
> sites now targeted by the  
> single integrated operating plan (SIOP) will remain  
> the top contingency.  
> Thus, in practice the MAD doctrine prevails.  
>  
> Not only is MAD continuing but also the practice of  
> keeping large numbers  
> of missiles on hair-trigger alert. During the  
> presidential campaign you  
> rightly told the American people that "for two  
> nations at peace, keeping so  
> many weapons on high alert may create unacceptable  
> risks of accidental or  
> unauthorized launch." You stated, "the United  
> States should remove as  
> many weapons as possible from high-alert,  
> hair-trigger status -- another  
> unnecessary vestige of Cold War confrontation."  
> Yet, the Pentagon planners  
> have made no provision for de-alerting in the  
> Nuclear Posture Review. True  
> friends do not keep nuclear weapons on hair-trigger  
> alert targeted at each  
> other.  
>  
> Indeed, the Pentagon plan seems to expand the role  
> of nuclear weapons  
> beyond the primary role of deterring nuclear-weapon  
> states from attacking

> the United States and its allies. The Nuclear  
> Posture Review speaks of  
> flexibility for a range of contingencies. Although  
> these contingencies are  
> not spelled out, the PNR expresses a concern for the  
> proliferation of  
> nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and  
> ballistic missile delivery  
> systems. In your State of the Union Address you  
> spoke of an "axis of evil"  
> consisting of Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. Some of  
> your top appointees  
> are previously on record as favoring use of nuclear  
> weapons to deal with  
> such contingencies. Since the NPR was released,  
> John Bolton,  
> undersecretary of state for arms control and  
> international security, has  
> revealed that your administration no longer stands  
> behind previous U.S.  
> policy of no first use of nuclear weapons against  
> any non-nuclear-weapons  
> state not allied with a nuclear-weapon state. We  
> are greatly disturbed  
> that your administration wants to expand rather than  
> contract the role of  
> nuclear weapons in the 21st century.  
>  
> Our concern is reinforced by the approach to nuclear  
> testing revealed in  
> the Nuclear Posture Review. While we welcome  
> reaffirmation of your  
> commitment to a moratorium on nuclear weapons  
> testing, we are bothered by  
> the NPR's call for the Department of Energy to  
> reduce the time it would  
> take to resume testing. This seems to go with your  
> opposition to  
> ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty  
> (CTBT), a treaty we  
> support. This is compounded by the NPR's indication  
> that the current  
> nuclear force is projected to remain until 2020 and  
> that in the meantime  
> the Department will "study alternatives for  
> follow-ons" for nuclear  
> delivery systems and warheads. Preparation to  
> resume testing seems part  
> of this scheme. This sounds like a commitment to  
> nuclear weapons forever.  
> We find this objectionable.  
>  
> Therefore, Mr. President, we ask you to send the  
> Nuclear Posture Review

> back to the drawing boards and have the Pentagon  
> planners come up with a  
> plan that will truly end the MAD doctrine and will  
> steadily  
==== message truncated ====

---

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Sports - sign up for Fantasy Baseball

<http://sports.yahoo.com>

----- Yahoo! Groups Sponsor ----->

FREE COLLEGE MONEY

CLICK HERE to search

600,000 scholarships!

<http://us.click.yahoo.com/iZp8OC/4m7CAA/ySSFAA/nJ9qlB/TM>

----->

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:

[interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com)

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Proposed letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <128.d53dcba.29b14ea9@cs.com>  
References:

At 04:37 PM 3/1/02 EST, you wrote:  
> What letter? Where is it?  
>  
>Murray Polner

I sent the letter as a Word attachment. In case you don't receive such items, the draft letter is pasted below.

Howard

###

First Draft

The Honorable George W. Bush  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

As you prepare for your next meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin, we would like to offer our observations on the place of nuclear weapons in the relationship between the United States and Russia. We were encouraged when the two of you met in Texas, you told the world that the two nations are now friends rather than military rivals. You each promised to make substantial reductions in strategic nuclear weapons. This follows through on your desire to move beyond the Cold War and its doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD).

This gives us hope that substantial progress can be made toward the global elimination of nuclear weapons. For decades religious leaders and religious organizations have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons. Increasingly retired military leaders have told us that nuclear weapons have no utility. In June 2000 these two strands were woven together in the attached statement by 18 military professionals and 21 religious leaders, who indicated, "We deeply believe that the long-term reliance on nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable....National security imperatives and ethical demands have converged to bring us to the necessity of outlawing and prohibiting nuclear weapons worldwide."

With our hopes raised by your meeting with President Putin, we are, however, discouraged by what Pentagon planners have produced in the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). To be sure, the commitment to reduce strategic nuclear weapons to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads along with the Russia commitment to reduce theirs to 1,500 is a step in the right direction. Yet, we wonder why it should take ten years to accomplish. Surely this step could be completed by 2004. Furthermore, the reduction is mitigated by the NPR plan to keep an estimated 1,500 warheads in an active reserve with their delivery systems intact for uploading. In contrast previous arms reduction agreements, such as Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty signed by President Ronald Reagan and START I signed by your father, President George H.W. Bush, provided for the destruction of the delivery vehicles.

If the United States keeps so many warheads, Russia is likely to do the same. The more warheads that Russia has in reserve the greater the risk of some of them falling into the hands of terrorist organizations. The United States would be better off to forgo a large warhead reserve and instead enter into a binding, verifiable agreement with Russia that requires elimination of both delivery vehicles and nuclear warheads taken out of service.

We are especially disappointed that the doctrine of mutual assured destruction remains intact in the Pentagon's Nuclear Posture Review. In spite of talk of a change from a "traditional threat-based approach" to a "capabilities-based approach" which is not country specific, the NPR specifies that "preplanning is essential for immediate and potential contingencies". If you ask the Pentagon planners what these contingencies are, they are most likely to respond that Russian sites now targeted by the single integrated operating plan (SIOP) will remain the top contingency. Thus, in practice the MAD doctrine prevails.

Not only is MAD continuing but also the practice of keeping large numbers of missiles on hair-trigger alert. During the presidential campaign you rightly told the American people that "for two nations at peace, keeping so many weapons on high alert may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch." You stated, "the United States should remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert, hair-trigger status -- another unnecessary vestige of Cold War confrontation." Yet, the Pentagon planners have made no provision for de-alerting in the Nuclear Posture Review. True friends do not keep nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert targeted at each other.

Indeed, the Pentagon plan seems to expand the role of nuclear weapons beyond the primary role of deterring nuclear-weapon states from attacking the United States and its allies. The Nuclear Posture Review speaks of flexibility for a range of contingencies. Although these contingencies are not spelled out, the PNR expresses a concern for the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and ballistic missile delivery systems. In your State of the Union Address you spoke of an "axis of evil" consisting of Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. Some of your top appointees are previously on record as favoring use of nuclear weapons to deal with such contingencies. Since the NPR was released, John Bolton, undersecretary of state for arms control and international security, has revealed that your administration no longer stands behind previous U.S. policy of no first use of nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapon state not allied with a nuclear-weapon state. We are greatly disturbed that your administration wants to expand rather than contract the role of nuclear weapons in the 21st century.

Our concern is reinforced by the approach to nuclear testing revealed in the Nuclear Posture Review. While we welcome reaffirmation of your commitment to a moratorium on nuclear weapons testing, we are bothered by the NPR's call for the Department of Energy to reduce the time it would take to resume testing. This seems to go with your opposition to ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), a treaty we support. This is compounded by the NPR's indication that the current nuclear force is projected to remain until 2020 and that in the meantime the Department will "study alternatives for follow-ons" for nuclear delivery systems and warheads. Preparation to resume testing seems part of this scheme. This sounds like a commitment to nuclear weapons forever. We find this objectionable.

Therefore, Mr. President, we ask you to send the Nuclear Posture Review back to the drawing boards and have the Pentagon planners come up with a plan that will truly end the MAD doctrine and will steadily reduce the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. military and foreign policy. We propose that nuclear disarmament objectives be incorporated into the Nuclear Posture Review in accordance to the U.S. obligation under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), signed originally by President Richard Nixon. As a point of departure, we call to your attention the practical steps contained in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference (see attachment). Among other things these practical steps set forth the principle of irreversibility and call for "an unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals".

A revised Nuclear Posture Review along these lines would more nearly fulfill your goal of ending Cold War confrontation and achieving true friendship between the United States and Russia. We urge you to exercise your presidential leadership in the direction of diminishing the role of nuclear weapons and eventually eliminating them from Earth. As you do, we will do what we can to help build support with the American people.

With best regards,

Signed by representatives of religious organizations

From: "Mladinov, Ann" <AMladinov@NAPAWASH.ORG>  
To: "Abramson, Mark" <mark.abramson@us.pwcglobal.com>,  
"Allen, Melissa"  
<melissa.allen@ost.dot.gov>,  
"Alloway, Robert" <dralloway@aol.com>, "BAN, CAROLYN" <cban+@pitt.edu>,  
"BANOVETZ, JAMES" <jbanovetz@niu.edu>,  
"Barnett, Camille" <camille@psgrp.com>,  
"Bawcum, Connie"  
<cbawcum@hotmail.com>,  
"BEALS, ALAN" <labeals@aol.com>, "Beaumont, Enid"  
<ebeaumo@aol.com>,  
"Beebe, Cora" <corabeebe@aol.com>,  
"BEHN, ROBERT"  
<redsox@ksg.harvard.edu>,  
"Bonser, Charles" <bonser@indiana.edu>,  
"Borut, Donald" <borut@nlc.org>, "Boster, Ron" <ronmjbooster@erols.com>,  
"Braithwaite Burke, Yvonne" <seconddistrict@bos.co.la.ca.us>,  
"Breul, Jonathan" <jbreul@NAPAWASH.ORG>,  
"Britnall, Mike"  
<britnall@naspaa.org>,  
"Britnall, Mike" <britnall@naspaa.org>,  
"Britnall, Mike" <britnall@naspaa.org>,  
"Broadnax, Walter"  
<wbroad@american.edu>,  
"BRODER, DAVID" <broderd@washpost.com>, "Clark, Tim" <tclark@njdc.com>,  
"Christopher, Gail"  
<gail\_christopher@harvard.edu>,  
"CALLAHAN, JOHN"  
<JJC\_ConsultingConcepts@msn.com>,  
"Burke, Yvonne"  
<yburke@bos.co.la.ca.us>,  
"Colvard, James" <jcolvard@crosslink.net>,  
"Comfort, Louis" <lkc@pitt.edu>,  
"Cooke, David"  
<bowersb@osd.pentagon.mil>,  
"Crone, Ruth" <silkking@erols.com>,  
"Davis, Bill" <davis@hqda.army.mil>,  
"Dean, Alan (unit# 2012)"  
<jeffarle@aol.com>,  
"DENHARDT, ROBERT" <rbd@asu.edu>,  
"DeSeve, Ed"  
<edeseve@bellatlantic.net>,  
"Dodge, William" <williamRDodge@aol.com>,  
"DORN, EDWIN" <eddorn@mail.utexas.edu>,  
"Dorn, Jennifer"  
<jdorn@nationalhealthmuseum.org>,  
"Downey, Mortimer"  
<downey@pbworld.com>,  
"DOWNS, ANTHONY" <adowns@brookings.edu>,  
"DOWNS, THOMAS" <tdowns@ursp.umd.edu>,  
"England, Mary Jane"  
<england@regiscollege.edu>,  
"FAIRBANKS, FRANK"

<frank.fairbanks@phoenix.gov>,  
"FARBER, STEPHEN" <sfarber@co.mo.md.us>,  
"FEARNSIDES, JOHN" <jfearnsides@mjfstrategies.com>,  
"Finger, Harold"  
<hbf24@aol.com>,  
"FISCHBACH, JOHN" <jfischbach@fcgov.com>,  
"FLEISHMAN, JOEL" <sdk@apscompany.com>,  
"Florestano,, Patricia"  
<pflorestano@aol.com>,  
"FOGARTY, ANDREW" <andrew\_fogarty@csx.com>,  
"Fogel, Richard" <dick.fogel@lmco.com>,  
"FORSYTHE, DALL"  
<dforsythe@dioceseny.org>,  
"Fosler, Scott" <scottfosler@aol.com>,  
"Frederickson, H.George" <gfred@falcon.cc.ukans.edu>,  
"Fritschler, A. Lee" <lfritschler@brookings.edu>,  
"FRYE, ALTON"  
<afrye@cfr.org>, "BEALS, ALAN" <labeals@aol.com>,  
"GAEBLER, TED"  
<cao@co.nevada.ca.us>,  
"Gambaccini, Louis" <lgambaccini@masternti.rutgers.edu>,  
"Gardner, Henry" <moniab@earthlink.net>,  
"Garrison, David F."  
<DGarrison@NAPAWASH.ORG>,  
"GARZA, JESUS" <jesus.garza@ci.austin.tx.us>,  
"GAWTHROP, LOUIS" <lgawthrop@ubmail.ubalt.edu>,  
"GLYNN, THOMAS"  
<tglynn@partner.org>,  
"GOLDENBERG, EDIE" <edieg@umich.edu>,  
"GOLEMBIEWSKI, ROBERT" <rtgolem@arches.uga.edu>,  
"Goode, Wilson"  
<wilson\_goode@ed.gov>,  
"GOODSELL, CHARLES" <goodsell@vt.edu>,  
"GORMLEY, WILLIAM" <gormleyw@gunet.georgetown.edu>,  
"GRASMICK, NANCY"  
<jbrown@msde.state.md.us>,  
"GUTTMAN, DANIEL" <djguttman@aol.com>,  
"GUY, MARY" <mguy@mailers.fsu.edu>,  
"Hale, Sandra"  
<sandrajh@maroon.tc.umn.edu>,  
"Hallman, Howard" <mupj@igc.apc.org>,  
"Hamilton, Mary" <mhamilton@aspanet.org>,  
"HAMM, WILLIAM"  
<bhamm@lecg.com>,  
"Hansell, Jr, William" <bhansell@icma.org>,  
"HANSON, ROYCE" <rhanson@umbc7.umbc.edu>,  
"HARKNESS, PETER"  
<pharkness@governing.com>,  
"Harper, Edwin" <ed.harper@us.fortis.com>,  
"Harper, Sallyanne" <harpers@gao.gov>,  
"Hatry, Harry"  
<hhatry@ui.urban.org>,  
"Heady, Ferrel" <fheady@unm.edu>,  
"Herbert, Jr., Adam" <aherbert@unf.edu>,

"Hillenbrand, Bernard"  
<bernardh@sso.org>,  
"HILLSMAN, SALLY" <hillsman@ojp.usdoj.gov>,  
"HINCHMAN, JAMES" <hinchman@nas.edu>, "Honey, Tim" <timhoney@aol.com>,  
"Horn, Stephen" <stephen.horn@mail.house.gov>,  
"HORNER, CONSTANCE"  
<chorner2@unidial.com>,  
"HOUSTOUN, FEATHER" <fhoustoun@state.pa.us>,  
"Howes, Jonathan" <Jonathan@athena.dev.unc.edu>,  
"Huther, Brad"  
<brad.huther@wipo.int>,  
"Ingraham, Patricia" <paingrah@maxwell.syr.edu>,  
"Ink, Dwight" <dwhightink@aol.com>, "IRVING, SUSAN" <irvings@gao.gov>,  
"Jasper, Herb" <herbjasper@hotmail.com>,  
"Jenkins, Harriet"  
<harriettgj@aol.com>,  
"John, DeWitt" <djohn@bowdoin.edu>,  
"JOHNSON, CURTIS" <cjohnson@citistates.com>,  
"JOHNSON, GENEVA"  
<genevabjohnson@aol.com>,  
"Johnson, Grantland"  
<gjohnson@chhs.cahwnet.gov>,  
"Johnson, Norman"  
<loretta.johnson@mail.famu.edu>,  
"JOHNSON, RANDALL"  
<Randy.Johnson@co.hennepin.mn.us>,  
"JUN, JONG" <jjun@csu Hayward.edu>,  
"KEENE, JAMES" <jkeen1@ci.tucson.as.us>,  
"Keiner, Suellen T"  
<SKeiner@NAPAWASH.ORG>,  
"Kellar, Elizabeth" <ekellar@icma.org>,  
"KELLEY, EDWARD" <ewkjrdc@worldnet.att.net>,  
"Kelman, Steven"  
<steve\_kelman@harvard.edu>,  
"Kettl, Donald" <kettl@lafollette.wisc.edu>,  
"Kiepper, Alan" <keipper@pbworld.com>,  
"KINCAID, JOHN"  
<meynerc@lafayette.edu>,  
"King, Norman" <king\_no@sanbag.ca.gov>,  
"Kinghorn, Morgan" <morgan.kinghorn@us.pwcglobal.com>,  
"KINGSBURY, NANCY"  
<kingsburyn@gao.gov>,  
"Kirlin, John" <jkirlin@iupui.edu>,  
"Kleeman, Roz"  
<rkleeman@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu>,  
"Kliman, Albert" <AKliman@NAPAWASH.ORG>,  
"KORB, LAWRENCE" <lkorb@cfr.org>, "KOSKINEN, JOHN" <jkoskinen@dc.gov>,  
"Krane, Dale" <dale\_krane@unomaha.edu>,  
"KUNDE, JAMES" <jekunde@aol.com>,  
"Lambert, Gilda" <gildalambert@aol.com>,  
"Larson, Thomas" <tdl1@psu.edu>,  
"LAURENT, ANNE" <Alaurent@govexec.com>,  
"Lemmie, Valerie"  
<citymgr@ci.dayton.oh.us>,

"Light, Paul" <pclight@brook.edu>,  
"LIPSKY, MICHAEL" <m.lipsky@fordfound.org>,  
"LOCKWOOD, CHRISTOPHER"  
<clockwood@memun.org>,  
"LUKENSMEYER, CAROLYN" <amerspeaks@aol.com>,  
"Lynn, Laurence" <llynn@midway.uchicago.edu>,  
"Lynn, Naomi"  
<lynn.naomi@uis.edu>,  
"MACCOBY, MICHAEL" <michael@maccoby.com>,  
Management Studies Group <ManagementStudies@NAPAWASH.ORG>,  
"MANN, THOMAS"  
<tmann@brookings.edu>,  
"Marcy, Kristine"  
<kristinemarcy@worldnet.att.net>,  
"MARSHALL, DALE"  
<dmarshal@wheatonma.edu>,  
"Marshallx, Byron"  
<marshallgroup@mindspring.com>,  
"MARTIN, BERNARD"  
<TABHMARTIN@starpower.net>,  
"Mathews, Audrey" <amathews@csusb.edu>,  
"Mathiasen, David" <dmathiasen@compuserve.com>,  
"MATSON, ROBERT"  
<rem7y@virginia.edu>,  
"Maynes, Charles" <bmaynes@eurasia.org>,  
"Mcfee, Thomas" <TomMcfee@aol.com>,  
"MCKENZIE, CHRISTOPHER"  
<mckenzie@cacities.org>,  
"Merget, Astrid" <merget@indiana.edu>,  
"Messner, Howard" <messnermeador@msn.com>,  
"Mihm, Christopher"  
<mihmj@gao.gov>,  
"MILLER, GERALD" <gerald.h.miller@lmco.com>,  
"MINTER, STEVEN" <sminter@clevelandn.org>,  
"MOE, RONALD" <rmoe@crs.loc.gov>,  
"Mladinov, Ann" <AMladinov@NAPAWASH.ORG>,  
"MORRILL, WILLIAM"  
<wmmorrill@aol.com>,  
"MOSKOW, MICHAEL" <michael.moskow@chi.frb.org>,  
"Mulrooney, Keith" <kmulrooney@tnc.org>,  
"Murley, James"  
<jmurley@fau.edu>,  
"Murray, Sylvester" <murray@wolf.urban.csuohio.edu>,  
"NAAKE, LARRY" <lnaake@naco.org>, "NALBANDIAN, JOHN" <nalband@ku.edu>,  
"NATHAN, RICHARD" <nathanr@rockinst.org>,  
"NEWCOMER, KATHRYN"  
<newcomer@gwu.edu>,  
"NEWELL, CHARLDEAN" <cnewell@scs.unt.edu>,  
"Newland, Chester" <newland@usc.edu>,  
"Norwood, Janet" <janetnor@aol.com>,  
"O'Connell, Brian" <boconnel@emerald.tufts.edu>,  
"Odeen, Phil"  
<phil.odeen@trw.com>,  
"OLEARY, HAZEL" <hrolea@blaylocklp.com>,

"O'Neill, Robert J." <roneill@NAPAWASH.ORG>,  
"OSBORNE, DAVID"  
<dosborne@aol.com>,  
"PACHECO, MANUEL" <austinb@ext.missouri.edu>,  
"PAGE, RICHARD" <page@pbworld.com>,  
"PALMER, JOHN"  
<jlpalmer@maxwell.syr.edu>,  
"PARR, JOHN" <jparr@usa.net>,  
"PASQUARELLA, ROBIN" <robin@alliance4ed.org>,  
"Patterson, Jr., Bradley"  
<bradshirl@aol.com>,  
"Payton, Sally" <spayton@umich.edu>,  
"Peirce, Neal"  
<npeirce@citistates.com>,  
"PFIFFNER, JAMES" <pfiffner@gmu.edu>, "Pisano, Jane" <jpisano@nhm.org>,  
"Pisano, Mark" <pisano@scag.ca.gov>,  
"POLSBY, NELSON" <nwpolsby@socrates.berkeley.edu>,  
"Posner, Paul"  
<posnerp@gao.gov>,  
"PUTNAM, ROBERT" <robert\_putnam@harvard.edu>,  
"Radin, Beryl" <Beryl.radin@albany.edu>,  
"REED, INGRID"  
<Ireed@rci.rutgers.edu>,  
"Reeder, Frank" <reeder@bellatlantic.net>,  
"Reischauer, Robert" <rreischa@ui.urban.org>,  
"RETSINAS, NICOLAS"  
<Nicolas\_Retsinas@harvard.edu>,  
"RICE, NORMAN" <nrice@fhlbsea.com>,  
"RIVLIN, ALICE" <arivlin@brook.edu>,  
"Roberts, Barbara"  
<roberts1@transport.com>,  
"Rogers, Jacqueline" <jr41@umail.umd.edu>,  
"ROMZEK, BARBARA" <b-romzek@ku.edu>,  
"ROSENBLOOM, DAVID"  
<rbloom@american.edu>,  
"ROSS, BERNARD" <bross@american.edu>,  
"Rusk, David" <drusk@patriot.net>,  
"Rutledge, Philip"  
<rutledge@indiana.edu>,  
"SAARIO, TERRY" <Tsaario@clynch.com>, "Sabol, Barbara" <bjs@wkkf.org>,  
"Sale, Chris" <chris.sale@sba.gov>,  
"Schall, Ellen" <Ellen.schall@wagner.nyu.edu>,  
"Schexnider, Alvin"  
<aschexni@wfubmc.edu>,  
"Shannon, John" <jayky@aol.com>,  
"SHERMAN, GORDON" <gordon.sherman@lamonsherman.com>,  
"SHERMAN, MAX"  
<max.sherman@mail.utexas.edu>,  
"Shields, Bill" <BShields@NAPAWASH.ORG>,  
"Skoler, Daniel" <dskoleraol.com>,  
"SPRINGER, CHRISTINE" <cgggs@aol.com>,  
"Stanton, Thomas" <TStan77346@aol.com>,  
"Stenberg, Carl"  
<cstenberg@ubmail.ubalt.edu>,

"STILLMAN, RICHARD"  
<rstillman@gspa.cudenver.edu>,  
"STEWART, DONALD" <marcia@cct.org>,  
"SUGARMAN, JULE" <sullisugar@chesapeake.net>,  
"Svara, James"  
<svara@ncsu.edu>,  
"SWEET, DAVID" <president.sweet@ysu.edu>,  
"Szanton, Peter" <plsz@aol.com>, "TERRELL, ROBERT" <terrellre@aol.com>,  
"Thomas, John" <jpt6n@virginia.edu>,  
"THOMAS, LEE" <LMthomas2@gapac.com>,  
"Thompson, Frank" <thompson@albany.edu>,  
"Thornburgh, Richard"  
<thornbrl@kl.com>,  
"Tolchin, Susan" <tolchin@gmu.edu>,  
"TOREGAS, COSTIS"  
<toregas@pti.org>,  
"TRACHTENBERG, ROBERT" <MARTICYP@msn.com>,  
"TRUMAN, EDWIN" <ttruman@ie.com>,  
"TSHINKEL, VICTORIA"  
<vtschinkel@landersandparsons.com>,  
"Valdez, Joel"  
<jdvaldez@u.arizona.edu>,  
"WALKER, DAVID" <dwalker@uconnvm.uconn.edu>,  
"Walsh, Annmarie" <annmarie.walsh@nyu.edu>,  
"Wamsley, Barbara"  
<bwamsley@prodigy.net>,  
"Wamsley, Gary" <wamsley@vt.edu>, "Ware, John"  
<jware@hmtf.com>,  
"Washington, Charles" <cwashing@fau.edu>,  
"Wegman, Richard" <dwegman@gsblaw.com>,  
"WEST, HARRY"  
<harry.west@parsons.com>,  
"Wholey, Joseph" <wholey@usc.edu>,  
"Widner, Ralph" <fxhouse@compuserve.com>,  
"Williams, Regina"  
<rvwilli@city.norfolk.va.us>,  
"Wise, Charles" <wise@indiana.edu>, "Wolf, Dona" <donawolf@aol.com>,  
"Wortman, Don" <diwort@worldnet.att.net>,  
"Wright, Deil" <dswright@mindspring.com>, "Zuck, Al" <alzuck@aol.com>

Subject: Opportunities from NAPA Federal System Panel

Date: Mon, 4 Mar 2002 12:33:56 -0500

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

The Academy's Standing Panel on the Federal System is pleased to let you know about several new opportunities:

1 - The Standing Panel on Social Equity in Governance is generously sharing its March 8 meeting (this Friday) with the Standing Panel on the Federal System, for a forum on the effects of welfare reform on target individuals and groups in society and on state and local governments, particularly the impending cut-off in federal welfare benefits, as the nation is also facing the economic downturn after September 11, a shift in national priorities, and budget deficits in federal, state, and local governments. The forum

will consider state and local responses and the administration's new welfare proposals as time permits.

Ups and Downs: Downturn, Deficits, Domestic Issues and the Effects of Welfare Reform since September 11

Speakers: Wendell Primus, Director of Income Security Issues,  
Center on Budget and Policy Priorities [www.cbpp.org](http://www.cbpp.org)

Elaine Ryan, Acting Director of Communications,  
American Public Human Services Association [www.aphsa.org](http://www.aphsa.org)

Discussant from Social Equity Panel: Charles Washington, Professor  
of Public Administration, Florida Atlantic University

Moderator: Elizabeth Kellar, chair of the Federal System Panel and  
Deputy Executive Director of the International City/County Management  
Association

Friday, March 8, 2002

1:00-3:00 forum (lunch buffet at noon)

Staats Conference Room

National Academy of Public Administration

1100 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1090 East Tower

Washington, DC 20005

RSVP to Ann Mladinov at 202-347-3190 X3109

Phone-in participation will be possible if you let us know  
by Wednesday, March 6.

2 - If you have not visited the Academy Web site recently, you should get on-line and see the new improved look . . . and at the same time, take advantage of the Federal System Panel's summary of the presentation by the federal Critical Infrastructure Assurance Office (CIAO) on homeland security and the challenges to intergovernmental relations and the federal system. The discussion was highly relevant to the discussions the Academy will be having at the 2002 Spring Meeting in Charlottesville, VA, from June 6-8, 2002.

You will find the material by going to the lefthand column on the Academy Home Page and looking for "Standing Panels." Then click on:

Federal System

Meetings

Previous Meetings

November 15, 2001

3 - You are also invited to participate in the next Federal System Panel meeting on April 18 at the Academy offices from noon to 2:00 pm. In preparation for the Spring Meeting, the discussion will focus on the issues for state and local governments and intergovernmental relations in planning for and dealing with national security challenges:

- communications in a crisis

- roles and responsibilities

e.g., who should handle which functions and funds and how funds can best flow to first responders; coordination; prioritizing resources to get the biggest bang for the buck

- transportation security

- critical infrastructure

e.g., government and business strategies and partnerships for

anticipating and managing risks in order to maintain vital services

CIAO poses a spectrum of approaches from restoration and recovery after the fact to crisis management and emergency response planning, mitigation, prevention, and deterrence.

Please feel free to join in. There will be opportunities to phone in and participate by telephone. RSVP to Ann Mladinov (202)347-3190 X3109

The regular June meeting of the Federal System Panel will be held on Thursday, June 6, 2002 from 3:00-5:00 at the Academy Spring Meeting in Charlottesville. Put it on your calendar!

Call if you have any questions or contact Beth Kellar <ekellar@icma.org>

SAP

From: "Orr, Elaine" <EOrr@NAPAWASH.ORG>  
To: Social Equity Panel <SocEqPanel@NAPAWASH.ORG>  
Cc: "Keiner, Suellen T" <SKeiner@NAPAWASH.ORG>,  
"Walsh, Charlene"  
<CWalsh@NAPAWASH.ORG>,  
"Mladinov, Ann" <AMladinov@NAPAWASH.ORG>,  
"Kellar, Elizabeth" <ekellar@icma.org>  
Subject: Iinfo on March 8 Social Equity Panel meeting, including call-in i  
nfo  
Date: Mon, 4 Mar 2002 14:07:39 -0500  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Dear Standing Panel memebers:

The Standing Panel on Social Equity in Governance will hold its March 8 meeting (this Friday) with the Standing Panel on the Federal System. The meeting will be a forum on the effects of welfare reform on target individuals and groups in society and on state and local governments. A particular focus will be the impending cut-off in federal welfare benefits, as the nation is also facing the economic downturn after September 11, a shift in national priorities, and budget deficits in federal, state, and local governments. The forum will consider state and local responses and the administration's new welfare proposals as time permits.

We thank Beth Kellar and Ann Mlandinov of the Standing Panel on the Federal System for arranging the program. The participants are:

Ups and Downs: Downturn, Deficits, Domestic Issues and the Effects of Welfare Reform since September 11

Speakers: Wendell Primus, Director of Income Security Issues,  
Center on Budget and Policy Priorities [www.cbpp.org](http://www.cbpp.org)

Elaine Ryan, Acting Director of Communications, American Public  
Human Services Association [www.aphsa.org](http://www.aphsa.org)

Discussant from Social Equity Panel: Charles Washington, Professor  
of Public Administration, Florida Atlantic University

Moderator: Elizabeth Kellar, chair of the Federal System Panel and  
Deputy Executive Director of the International City/County Management  
Association

Friday, March 8, 2002

Noon - lunch for those attending in person (no call-in for this)

1:00-3:00 forum (Call-in starts at 1 p.m.)

Staats Conference Room

National Academy of Public Administration

1100 New York Avenue, NW Suite 1090 East Tower

Washington, DC 20005

The Conference American call-in number is: 800-311-9408. Security code is:

Officers

Conference Leader is Phil Rutledge.

Our next regular meeting is April 12, with the usual schedule (lunch at noon  
for those physically present, call-in at 1 p.m.).

Please let me know if you will be at the March 8 meeting in person or on the phone.

The day of the meeting, I will be in sunny Florida on vacation; I'm not sure if I will be in a location where I can call in. Attending the meeting from Academy staff will be Suellen Keiner and Charlene Walsh.

Sincerely,  
Elaine Orr  
Associate Panel Member

Elaine L. Orr  
Coordinator  
National Public Service Awards  
Hm Office: 641-682-2674  
Toll-free: 877-628-9660  
NAPA: 202-347-3190  
Toll-free: 800-883-3190  
National Academy of Public Administration  
1100 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 10903  
Washington, DC 20005  
eorr@napawash.org

From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>  
To: 'Representatives of National Religious Organizations'  
<No\_One@fcnl.org>  
Subject: You're invited ...  
Date: Mon, 4 Mar 2002 15:17:59 -0500  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

**Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament**

**Invites You to**

**Nuclear Weapons and Missile Defense Issues in 2002**

- What:** Issue briefing for staff of national religious offices
- When:** Tuesday, March 12, 9:00-9:30 am, breakfast; 9:30-11:30 am, program
- Where:** United Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, N.E., Conference Room 3
- Program:** *Religious Imperative for Nuclear Disarmament*, Rev. Barbara Green, Executive Director, Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy; and Gerald Powers, Director, Office of International Justice and Peace, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops
- Legislative Outlook for 2002 and the Bush-Putin Summit*, Madelyn Creedon, Professional Staff Member, Senate Armed Services Committee; and John Isaacs, President, Council for a Livable World
- U.S.-Russian Threat Reduction Programs*, Laura Holgate, Vice President, Nuclear Threat Initiative
- A View from the Pew: How National Offices Can Help Local Activists*, Tom Ewell, Executive Director, Maine Council of Churches

**Please RSVP by noon, Monday, March 11 to:**

**Sam Garman, [sam@fcnl.org](mailto:sam@fcnl.org) or (202) 547-6000, ext. 120**

To: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: You're invited ...  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF6A85467@local.fcnl.org>  
References:

At 03:17 PM 3/4/02 -0500, you wrote:

> Friends Committee on National Legislation Interfaith Committee for  
> Nuclear Disarmament  
> Invites You to  
> Nuclear Weapons and Missile Defense Issues in 2002

I'll be there.

Howard Hallman

To: interfaithnd  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Sign-on letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Colleagues,

Here is the second draft of a letter to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review. I request sign-ons by heads of organizations (in the case of denominations, Washington offices) or whoever you think is appropriate. Reply to me at mupj@igc.org instead of the whole interfaithnd list.

I would like to hear from you by close of business, Wednesday, March 13. This will give me an opportunity to get the letter to the White House on March 15, a week before our March 22 meeting with Frank Miller of the National Security Council staff. I will also send a copy to Secretaries Rumsfeld and Powell.

This draft incorporates feedback I received on the first draft. I have added paragraph headings in bold so that the subjects covered can be seen at a glance, and I have emphasized several sentences by boldface. Attachments will include the June 2000 Cathedral statement and an excerpt from the Final Document of the NPT 2000 Review Conference. If you want to see either, let me know.

There will be no letterhead. Signers will be identified by name and organization. At the end it will note that a reply can be sent to my attention as chair, Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament at my mailing address.

I am sending the letter to you as a Word attachment. If you cannot receive it in this format, please let me know, and I'll send it as a paste-on to a regular e-message.

If you have any questions or comments, please reply to me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org (not to the whole interfaithnd list), or call me at 301 896-0013.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: interfaithnd  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Attachment of letter to President Bush  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\iclt.185.doc;  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

My previous message got out without the attachment. It is attached herewith.

Howard

To: ograbc@aol.com, tlheath@churchwomen.org, thart@episcopalchurch.org, rsider@speakeasy.net  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Sign-on Letter to President Bush on Nuclear Posture Review  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Colleagues,

I invite you to sign the attached letter to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review. I would like to hear from you by close of business, Wednesday, March 13. This will give me an opportunity to get the letter to the White House on March 15, a week before a meeting with Frank Miller of the National Security Council staff we have scheduled for March 22. I will also send a copy to Secretaries Rumsfeld and Powell.

There will be no letterhead. Signers will be identified by name and organization. At the end it will note that a reply can be sent to my attention as chair, Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament at my mailing address.

I am sending the letter to you as a Word attachment. If you cannot receive it in this format, please let me know, and I'll send it as a paste-on to a regular e-message.

Attachments to the letter going to President Bush will include the June 2000 Cathedral statement and an excerpt from the Final Document of the NPT 2000 Review Conference. If you want to see either, let me know.

If you have any questions or comments, please reply to me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org, or call me at 301 896-0013.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: ograbc@aol.com, ttheath@churchwomen.org, thart@episcopalchurch.org, rsider@speakeasy.net  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Attachment for letter to President Bush  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\iclt.185.doc;  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

I omitted the attachment of the letter to President Bush. It is attached here in World format.

Howard

To: acurtis@networklobby.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\iclt.185.doc;  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Anne,

I invite a representative of NETWORK to sign the attached letter to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review. I would like to hear from you by close of business, Wednesday, March 13. This will give me an opportunity to get the letter to the White House on March 15, a week before a meeting with Frank Miller of the National Security Council staff we have scheduled for March 22. I will also send a copy to Secretaries Rumsfeld and Powell.

There will be no letterhead. Signers will be identified by name and organization. At the end it will note that a reply can be sent to my attention as chair, Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament at my mailing address.

I am sending the letter to you as a Word attachment. If you cannot receive it in this format, please let me know, and I'll send it as a paste-on to a regular e-message.

Attachments to the letter going to President Bush will include the June 2000 Cathedral statement and an excerpt from the Final Document of the NPT 2000 Review Conference. If you want to see either, let me know.

If you have any questions or comments, please reply to me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org, or call me at 301 896-0013.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: interfaithnd  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Message Campaign For U.S./Russian Summit: " Friends Don't Threaten Friends"  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Colleagues,

I am forwarding you an announcement of a message campaign by Back from the Brink. They will soon have a more specific action alert, which I'll share with you. I hope that many of you will respond.

Shalom,  
Howard

>From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
>Subject: Message Campaign For U.S./Russian Summit: " Friends Don't Threaten Friends"  
>Date: Thu, 28 Feb 2002 15:55:49 -0500  
>  
>BRINK CAMPAIGN LAUNCHES "FRIENDS DON'T THREATEN FRIENDS" MESSAGE CAMPAIGN  
>  
>The U.S. and Russia are now strategic partners, yet they are still poised to  
>destroy each other with thousands of nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert.  
>Back From the Brink plans to bring this point home with a major message  
>campaign culminating with the U.S./Russian Summit in May. The campaign will  
>feature images of new found friends President Bush and President Putin, with  
>the message: "Friends Don't Threaten Friends with Nuclear Weapons on  
>Hair-Trigger Alert."  
>  
>BUSH PLANS TO KEEP NUKES ON HIGH-ALERT. It's good news that the Bush  
>Administration wants to remove some 3800 warheads from missiles -- including  
>1500 to 1700 that are currently on hair-trigger alert. But they want to take  
>ten years to de-alert these weapons -- a task that can be accomplished in  
>under three. And even after ten years, the Bush plan calls for keeping 680  
>to 800 weapons on hair-trigger alert.  
>  
>SUBSTITUTING A FORM OF DE-ALERTING FOR DISARMAMENT DOES A DISSERVICE TO  
>BOTH.  
>Instead of destroying the nuclear weapons slated for elimination, the  
>Pentagon plans to put them in long-term storage. Leaving open the  
>possibility of future deployment of these weapons makes the claim of  
>"reductions" extremely dubious. By substituting a form of stretched out  
>de-alerting for disarmament, the Bush plan does a disservice to both.  
>  
>President Bush's new "partnership" with Russia is still based on the old  
>Cold War relationship that kept both sides prepared for a quick launch of  
>nuclear weapons against each other.  
>  
>The events of September 11th have shown us that the unexpected can happen  
>with dire consequences. If the unexpected happens with nuclear weapons, the  
>results will be catastrophic for humanity and the planet. As the world's

>nuclear superpowers, the U.S. and Russia must set a standard: No nuclear  
>weapons should be kept on high-alert status -- poised for immediate launch.  
>  
>"FRIENDS DON'T THREATEN FRIENDS"  
>Presidents Bush and Putin are meeting at a Moscow Summit in May. Leading up  
>to that Summit, the Brink Campaign is launching a FAX/MESSAGE campaign using  
>the theme "Friends Don't Threaten Friends."  
>  
>We want to flood the White House and the Kremlin with faxes that call on  
>both Presidents to: immediately remove all their nuclear weapons on  
>hair-trigger alert; rapidly remove warheads from missiles slated for  
>elimination, where they can be stored, secured and verified; and develop  
>binding agreements on the irreversible elimination of nuclear weapons.  
>  
>Fax/Flyers will be available soon and will also be available on our Web  
>site. We'll send a printable copy by email next week along with other  
>ordering information and news on how else we plan to get our message out  
>(including the possibility of billboards in Moscow and Washington!)  
>  
>Thanks,  
>  
>Ira Shorr and Esther Pank  
>  
>  
>Back From the Brink Campaign  
>6856 Eastern Avenue, NW  
>#322  
>Washington, DC 20012  
>TEL: (202) 545-1001  
>FAX: (202) 545-1004  
>prgrm@backfromthebrink.net  
>  
>GO TO [www.backfromthebrink.org](http://www.backfromthebrink.org) to check out the action!  
>  
>  
>

To: blythe-goodman@erols.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Proposed letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <3C7FE765.785C@erols.com>  
References: <3.0.3.32.20020227171611.00693f48@pop2.igc.org>

At 03:41 PM 3/1/02 -0500, you wrote:

>Howard -- your letter looks good to my untrained eye. I will let other  
>smarter folks suggest revisions etc.

>

>I can forward to Alliance of Baptists, American Baptists, and Baptist  
>Peace Fellowship to see if those organizations will sign on. But I  
>thought I should check to see if you are contacting any of those on your  
>own?

>

>Shalom -- Carol Blythe

Carol,

American Baptists and Baptist Peace Fellowship are on my list, but your extra contact would be helpful.

Howard

To: Murraylou2@cs.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Proposed letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <97.23e5a146.29b2477e@cs.com>  
References:

At 10:19 AM 3/2/02 EST, you wrote:

> Dear Friend Howard:

>

>Just a clarification. Are you absolutely certain that the Bush  
>Administration wants to expand the role of nukes or is it just more  
>belligerent talk by elements in Washington's war party who are prepared to  
>fight a lot of wars with their mouths so long as their own kids aren't  
>involved.

>

>Important to be exact, that is if you're trying to persuade and convince.

>

>Best,

>

>Murray Polner

Murray,

I've been in on several discussions of the Nuclear Posture Review. The feeling is that in rhetoric at least the Bush Administration is willing to expand the use of nuclear weapons. The statement by Bolton that no-first-use is no longer U.S. policy. It may be deliberate ambiguity, but I believe that it is a dangerous trend.

Howard

From: Tom Hart <thart@episcopalchurch.org>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Cc: Jere Skipper <jskipper@episcopalchurch.org>  
Subject: RE: Attachment for letter to President Bush  
Date: Mon, 4 Mar 2002 17:05:59 -0500  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Howard, I'm going to have a hard time signing this for several reasons.

First paragraph - We have told Russia that we are friends for years. Bush is not the first.

Point (1) - I can't say whether this reduction should 1 year or 10 years. We are happy it's the new policy.

Point (3) - We can't make an argument on MAD based on what we think Pentagon planners would say ("they are most likely to respond . . "). This point would be interpreted as setting up a straw man to knock down.

Point (6) - It's so vague as to be indefensible. You say at least twice that "this seems" to be your position. We can't make an argument out of what we presume their position is.

I'd rather have a letter that is much shorter, with fewer points that we can defend.

Tom

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
Sent: Monday, March 04, 2002 4:24 PM  
To: ograbc@aol.com; tlheath@churchwomen.org;  
thart@episcopalchurch.org; rsider@speakeasy.net  
Subject: Attachment for letter to President Bush

<< File: ictl.185.doc >> << File: ATT13231.txt >> I omitted the attachment of the letter to President Bush. It is attached here in World format.

Howard

Date: Mon, 04 Mar 2002 18:46:45 -0500  
From: Ron Sider <rsider@speakeasy.net>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Attachment for letter to President Bush

I am glad to add my signature to this letter. Identify me as Ronald J. Sider,  
President, Evangelicals for Social Action.  
Ron

"Howard W. Hallman" wrote:

> I omitted the attachment of the letter to President Bush. It is attached  
> here in World format.

>  
> Howard

>  
> -----  
> Name: iclt.185.doc  
> iclt.185.doc Type: Winword File (application/msword)  
> Encoding: base64  
> Download Status: Not downloaded with message

>  
> -----

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

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

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-4736742-30-1015341390-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com  
X-Sender: david@fcl.org  
X-Apparently-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament  
<interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com>  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
From: David Culp <david@fcl.org>  
X-Yahoo-Profile: davidculp  
Mailing-List: list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com; contact interfaithnd-owner@yahoogroups.com  
Delivered-To: mailing list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com>  
Date: Mon, 4 Mar 2002 16:24:37 -0500  
Subject: [interfaithnd] You're invited ...  
Reply-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

**Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament**

**Invites You to**

**Nuclear Weapons and Missile Defense Issues in 2002**

- What:** Issue briefing for staff of national religious offices
- When:** Tuesday, March 12, 9:00-9:30 am, breakfast; 9:30-11:30 am, program
- Where:** United Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, N.E., Conference Room 3
- Program:** *Religious Imperative for Nuclear Disarmament*, Rev. Barbara Green, Executive Director, Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy; and Gerald Powers, Director, Office of International Justice and Peace, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops
- Legislative Outlook for 2002 and the Bush-Putin Summit*, Madelyn Creedon, Professional Staff Member, Senate Armed Services Committee; and John Isaacs, President, Council for a Livable World
- U.S.-Russian Threat Reduction Programs*, Laura Holgate, Vice President, Nuclear Threat Initiative
- A View from the Pew: How National Offices Can Help Local Activists*, Tom Ewell, Executive Director, Maine Council of Churches

**Please RSVP by noon, Monday, March 11 to:  
Sam Garman, [sam@fcl.org](mailto:sam@fcl.org) or (202) 547-6000, ext. 120**



To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:  
[interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com)

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to the [Yahoo! Terms of Service](#).

From: Murraylou2@cs.com  
Date: Tue, 5 Mar 2002 10:40:45 EST  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Proposed letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review  
To: mupj@igc.org  
X-Mailer: CompuServe 2000 6.0 for Windows US sub 10509

Howard: Thanks for the reply.

All Best!

Murray Polner  
Jewish Peace Fellowship Chair

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-4736742-34-1015376200-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com  
X-Sender: egbertl4pj@yahoo.com  
X-Apparently-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
From: Egbert Lawrence <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>  
Mailing-List: list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com; contact interfaithnd-owner@yahoogroups.com  
Delivered-To: mailing list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com>  
Date: Tue, 5 Mar 2002 11:07:38 -0800 (PST)  
Subject: [interfaithnd] Re: Attachment of letter to G.W. Bush

Hello, Howard,

I think that the letter in the attachment is the same as the one which came before only not as an attachment. My joke is the same: do you think GWB can read such a long letter?

Thanks. I will not hold my breath for your reply.

PEACE! Larry

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

> My previous message got out without the attachment.

> It is attached herewith.

>

> Howard

>

>

> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword  
name=iclt.185.doc; x-mac-type=42494E41;  
x-mac-creator=4D535744

>

> Howard W. Hallman, Chair

> Methodists United for Peace with Justice

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

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

>

> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a

> membership association of

> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any

> Methodist denomination.

---

Do You Yahoo!?

Try FREE Yahoo! Mail - the world's greatest free email!

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

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:  
[interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com)

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>



X-eGroups-Return: sentto-4736742-35-1015393348-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com  
X-Sender: egbertl4pj@yahoo.com  
X-Apparently-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
From: Egbert Lawrence <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>  
Mailing-List: list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com; contact interfaithnd-owner@yahoogroups.com  
Delivered-To: mailing list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com>  
Date: Tue, 5 Mar 2002 09:17:04 -0800 (PST)  
Subject: Response from Larry Egbert: [interfaithnd] You're invited ...

Thank you, David,

I would really like to attend but am stuck with previous commitments. Any records which are kept, I would try and read. Thanks again.

PEACE! Larry

--- David Culp <david@fcnl.org> wrote:

>  
> Friends Committee on National Legislation  
> Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament  
>  
> Invites You to  
>  
> Nuclear Weapons and Missile Defense Issues in 2002  
>  
>  
> What: Issue briefing for staff of  
> national religious offices  
>  
> When: Tuesday, March 12, 9:00-9:30 am,  
> breakfast; 9:30-11:30 am,  
> program  
>  
> Where: United Methodist Building, 100  
> Maryland Avenue, N.E.,  
> Conference Room 3  
>  
> Program: Religious Imperative for Nuclear  
> Disarmament, Rev. Barbara  
> Green, Executive Director, Churches' Center for  
> Theology and Public Policy;  
> and Gerald Powers, Director, Office of International  
> Justice and Peace, U.S.  
> Conference of Catholic Bishops  
>  
> Legislative Outlook for 2002 and the Bush-Putin  
> Summit, Madelyn Creedon,  
> Professional Staff Member, Senate Armed Services  
> Committee; and John Isaacs,  
> President, Council for a Livable World  
>  
> U.S.-Russian Threat Reduction Programs, Laura  
> Holgate, Vice President,

- > Nuclear Threat Initiative
- >
- > A View from the Pew: How National Offices Can Help
- > Local Activists, Tom
- > Ewell, Executive Director, Maine Council of Churches
- >
- >
- >
- > Please RSVP by noon, Monday, March 11 to:
- > Sam Garman, <mailto:sam@fcnl.org> sam@fcnl.org or
- > (202) 547-6000, ext. 120
- >

---

Do You Yahoo!?  
Try FREE Yahoo! Mail - the world's greatest free email!  
<http://mail.yahoo.com/>

----- Yahoo! Groups Sponsor ----->

Buy Stock for \$4.  
No Minimums.  
FREE Money 2002.  
<http://us.click.yahoo.com/BgmYkB/VovDAA/ySSFAA/nJ9qlB/TM>

----->

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:  
[interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com)

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

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

Yesterday I wrote you about a second draft of a sign-on letter to President Bush about the nuclear posture review. I pushed the wrong button before I added the attachment, and it went out without it. I sent the attachment separately but by then the yahoogroups server was down. So you didn't get the attachment until this afternoon (Tuesday, March 5).

To clarify any confusion the letter in the attachment is the one for which I am seeking signers. My deadline is close of business, Wednesday, March 13.

Sorry for the mix-up. I look forward to your reply.

Howard

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

I figured out how to change the reply setting for our list serve so that replies will go only to sender. I am testing it with this message.

Howard

From: STARMAN WENDY <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] Sign-on letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review  
ew  
Date: Wed, 6 Mar 2002 08:39:27 -0500  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Howard,

I still can't find the second draft. Please re-send.

Thanks,

Wendy

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
Sent: Monday, March 04, 2002 4:03 PM  
To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
Subject: [interfaithnd] Sign-on letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review

Dear Colleagues,

Here is the second draft of a letter to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review. I request sign-ons by heads of organizations (in the case of denominations, Washington offices) or whoever you think is appropriate. Reply to me at mupj@igc.org instead of the whole interfaithnd list.

I would like to hear from you by close of business, Wednesday, March 13. This will give me an opportunity to get the letter to the White House on March 15, a week before our March 22 meeting with Frank Miller of the National Security Council staff. I will also send a copy to Secretaries Rumsfeld and Powell.

This draft incorporates feedback I received on the first draft. I have added paragraph headings in bold so that the subjects covered can be seen at a glance, and I have emphasized several sentences by boldface. Attachments will include the June 2000 Cathedral statement and an excerpt from the Final Document of the NPT 2000 Review Conference. If you want to see either, let me know.

There will be no letterhead. Signers will be identified by name and organization. At the end it will note that a reply can be sent to my attention as chair, Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament at my mailing address.

I am sending the letter to you as a Word attachment. If you cannot receive it in this format, please let me know, and I'll send it as a paste-on to a regular e-message.

If you have any questions or comments, please reply to me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org (not to the whole interfaithnd list), or call me at 301

896-0013.

Shalom,  
Howard

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

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

----- Yahoo! Groups Sponsor ----->

Buy Stock for \$4.

No Minimums.

FREE Money 2002.

<http://us.click.yahoo.com/BgmYkB/VovDAA/ySSFAA/nJ9qlB/TM>

----->

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:  
[interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com)

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

To: STARMAN WENDY <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] Sign-on letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\iclt.185.doc;  
In-Reply-To: <DC1977460103D311B0DE0060943F439FADCFCC@wesley-exch1.wesleysem.edu>  
References:

At 08:39 AM 3/6/02 -0500, you wrote:

>Howard,  
>  
>I still can't find the second draft. Please re-send.  
>  
>Thanks,  
>  
>Wendy

Wendy,

It is attached.

Howard

Date: Wed, 06 Mar 2002 08:42:41 -0500  
From: Carol Blythe and Rick Goodman <blythe-goodman@erols.com>  
Reply-To: blythe-goodman@erols.com  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-DH397 (Win95; I)  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Sign-on letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review

Howard, can you send me the letter as a paste in? Thanks -- Carol  
Blythe

To: blythe-goodman@erols.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Sign-on letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <3C861CD1.2112@erols.com>  
References: <3.0.3.32.20020304160329.0069364c@pop2.igc.org>

At 08:42 AM 3/6/02 -0500, you wrote:  
>Howard, can you send me the letter as a paste in? Thanks -- Carol  
>Blythe

Carol,

Here it is.

Howard

###

Second Draft

The Honorable George W. Bush  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President: Re: Nuclear Posture Review

As you prepare for your next meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin, we the undersigned representatives of religious organizations would like to offer our observations on the place of nuclear weapons in the relationship between the United States and Russia. We were encouraged when the two of you met in Texas and told the world that the two nations are now friends rather than military rivals. You each promised to make substantial reductions in strategic nuclear weapons. This follows through on your desire to move beyond the Cold War and its doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD).

This gives us hope that substantial progress can be made toward the global elimination of nuclear weapons. This is the desire of numerous religious leaders and religious organizations in the United States and elsewhere. For example, 21 top religious leaders in the United States, joined by 18 military professionals, in June 2000 proclaimed, "We deeply believe that the long-term reliance on nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. ...National security imperatives and ethical demands have converged to bring us to the necessity of outlawing and prohibiting nuclear weapons worldwide." (Emphasis added; full statement attached.)

With our hopes raised by your meeting with President Putin, we are, however, discouraged by what Pentagon planners have produced in the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). We have several concerns to call to your attention.

(1) Reductions. We commend the NPR commitment to reduce strategic nuclear weapons to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads along with the Russia commitment to reduce theirs to 1,500. This is a positive step in the right direction. Yet, we wonder why it should take ten years to accomplish. We ask that standing down of these warheads and their delivery vehicles be completed by 2004.

(2) Warhead reserve and the terrorist threat. The reduction in strategic weapons is compromised by the NPR plan to keep an estimated 1,500 warheads in an active reserve with their delivery systems intact for uploading. If the United States keeps so many warheads in reserve, Russia is likely to do the same. The more warheads that Russia has in reserve the greater the risk of some of them falling into the hands of terrorist organizations. The United States would be much better off to forgo a large warhead reserve and instead enter into a binding, verifiable agreement with Russia that requires elimination of both delivery vehicles and nuclear warheads taken out of service. This would follow the example of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed by President Ronald Reagan, and START I, signed by your father, President George H.W. Bush, both of which provided for the destruction of the delivery vehicles taken out of service.

(3) Mutual assured destruction. We are especially disappointed that the doctrine of mutual assured destruction remains intact in the Pentagon's Nuclear Posture Review. In spite of talk of a change from a "traditional threat-based approach" to a "capabilities-based approach" which is not country specific, the NPR specifies that "preplanning is essential for immediate and potential contingencies". If you ask the Pentagon planners what these contingencies are, they are most likely to respond that Russian sites now targeted by the single integrated operating plan (SIOP) will remain the top contingency. Thus, in practice the MAD doctrine prevails.

(4) De-alerting. Not only is MAD continuing but also the practice of keeping large numbers of missiles on hair-trigger alert. During the presidential campaign you rightly told the American people that "for two nations at peace, keeping so many weapons on high alert may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch." You stated, "the United States should remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert, hair-trigger status -- another unnecessary vestige of Cold War confrontation." Yet, the Pentagon planners have made no provision for de-alerting in the Nuclear Posture Review. True friends do not keep nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert targeted at each other. Therefore, we call for zero alert.

(5) Expanded role. The Pentagon plan seems to expand the role of nuclear weapons beyond the primary role of deterring nuclear-weapon states from attacking the United States and its allies. The Nuclear Posture Review speaks of flexibility for a range of contingencies. Although these contingencies are not spelled out, the NPR expresses a concern for the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and ballistic missile delivery systems. In your State of the Union Address you spoke of an "axis of evil" consisting of Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. Some of your top appointees are previously on record as favoring use of nuclear weapons to deal with such contingencies. Since the NPR was released, John Bolton, undersecretary of state for arms control and international security, has revealed that your administration no longer stands behind previous U.S. policy of no first use of nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapon state not allied with a nuclear-weapon state. We are greatly disturbed that your administration wants to expand rather than contract the role of nuclear weapons in the 21st century.

(6) Testing. Our concern is reinforced by the approach to nuclear testing revealed in the Nuclear Posture Review. While we welcome reaffirmation of your commitment to a moratorium on nuclear weapons testing, we are bothered by the NPR's call for the Department of Energy to reduce the time it would take to resume testing. This seems to go with your opposition to ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), a treaty we support. This is compounded by the NPR's indication that the current nuclear force is projected to remain until 2020 and that in the meantime the Department of Defense will "study alternatives for follow-ons" for nuclear delivery systems. Preparation to resume testing seems part of this scheme. This sounds like a commitment to nuclear weapons forever. We find this objectionable.

Therefore, Mr. President, we ask you to send the Nuclear Posture Review back to the drawing boards and have the Pentagon planners come up with a plan that will truly end the MAD doctrine and will steadily reduce the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. military and foreign policy. We propose that nuclear disarmament objectives be incorporated into the Nuclear Posture Review in accordance to the U.S. obligation under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), signed originally by President Richard Nixon. As a point of departure, we call your attention to the practical steps contained in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference (see attachment). Among other things these practical steps set forth the principle of irreversibility and call for "an unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals".

A revised Nuclear Posture Review along these lines would more nearly fulfill your goal of ending Cold War confrontation and achieving true friendship between the United States and Russia. We urge you to exercise your presidential leadership in the direction of diminishing the role of nuclear weapons and eventually eliminating them from Earth. As you do, we will do what we can to help build support with the American people.

With best regards,

Signed by representatives of religious organizations

To: mingomae@aol.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: First Sunday notices  
Cc: ronfoster  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <69.23172a64.29b6392f@aol.com>  
References:

Sandy,

Last week I posted in the bumc list-serve a notice of Sandwich Sunday and the Communion Offering for the first Sunday in March. Would it be possible to automate such a notice to go out, say, the Friday before the first Sunday of each month?

The subject might be: "Sandwich Sunday, Communion Offering". The message might be: "The first Sunday in the month is coming. It will be Sandwich Sunday to provide food for the homeless and Communion Offering for special outreach needs in the Bethesda community." Or any other way you want to edit it. However, before the first Sunday in October a notice would need to indicate that the offering is for World Wide Communion.

Thanks in advance.

Howard

Date: Wed, 06 Mar 2002 15:31:08 EST  
From: MingoMae@aol.com  
Subject: Re: First Sunday notices  
To: <mupj@igc.org>  
X-Mailer: Unknown (No Version)

Howard,

Ron asked me to stop the reminders a few months ago because some folks were complaining about too much email coming out.....if you can get the ok from him, I'll put them back up.

Sandy

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

Ron,

Were you able to find out how much came for the communion offering in 2001? At the Outreach Committee this evening I want to talk about the promotion of First Sunday. This would be helpful information to have.

Shalom,  
Howard

X-Sender: cpd@his.com  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (32)  
Date: Wed, 06 Mar 2002 10:05:30 -0500  
To: mupj@igc.org  
From: Colin Delany <cpd@edesigns-graphics.com>  
Subject: proposal

Howard--

Attached please find a proposal for the MUPJ website. I'll be leaving town for a week this afternoon, but will be checking email periodically if you have any questions. Thanks for opportunity to talk with you about this project.

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

Colin Delany  
e.designs -- making web design work  
<http://www.edesigns-graphics.com>  
cpd@edesigns-graphics.com  
202-483-6675

From: Murraylou2@cs.com  
Date: Wed, 6 Mar 2002 11:37:24 EST  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Sign-on letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review  
To: mupj@igc.org  
X-Mailer: CompuServe 2000 6.0 for Windows US sub 10509

Your attachment never came through. Please try a standard Email message.

Murray Polner

To: Murraylou2@cs.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Sign-on letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <49.19882338.29b79fc4@cs.com>  
References:

At 11:37 AM 3/6/02 EST, you wrote:  
>Your attachment never came through. Please try a standard Email message.  
>  
>Murray Polner

Here it is. I hope that you will sign.

Howard

###

Second Draft

The Honorable George W. Bush  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President: Re: Nuclear Posture Review

As you prepare for your next meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin, we the undersigned representatives of religious organizations would like to offer our observations on the place of nuclear weapons in the relationship between the United States and Russia. We were encouraged when the two of you met in Texas and told the world that the two nations are now friends rather than military rivals. You each promised to make substantial reductions in strategic nuclear weapons. This follows through on your desire to move beyond the Cold War and its doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD).

This gives us hope that substantial progress can be made toward the global elimination of nuclear weapons. This is the desire of numerous religious leaders and religious organizations in the United States and elsewhere. For example, 21 top religious leaders in the United States, joined by 18 military professionals, in June 2000 proclaimed, "We deeply believe that the long-term reliance on nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. ...National security imperatives and ethical demands have converged to bring us to the necessity of outlawing and prohibiting nuclear weapons worldwide." (Emphasis added; full statement attached.)

With our hopes raised by your meeting with President Putin, we are, however, discouraged by what Pentagon planners have produced in the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). We have several concerns to call to your attention.

(1) Reductions. We commend the NPR commitment to reduce strategic nuclear weapons to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads along with the Russia commitment to reduce theirs to 1,500. This is a positive step in the right direction. Yet, we wonder why it should take ten years to accomplish. We ask that standing down of these warheads and their delivery vehicles be completed by 2004.

(2) Warhead reserve and the terrorist threat. The reduction in strategic weapons is compromised by the NPR plan to keep an estimated 1,500 warheads in an active reserve with their delivery systems intact for uploading. If the United

States keeps so many warheads in reserve, Russia is likely to do the same. The more warheads that Russia has in reserve the greater the risk of some of them falling into the hands of terrorist organizations. The United States would be much better off to forgo a large warhead reserve and instead enter into a binding, verifiable agreement with Russia that requires elimination of both delivery vehicles and nuclear warheads taken out of service. This would follow the example of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed by President Ronald Reagan, and START I, signed by your father, President George H.W. Bush, both of which provided for the destruction of the delivery vehicles taken out of service.

(3) Mutual assured destruction. We are especially disappointed that the doctrine of mutual assured destruction remains intact in the Pentagon's Nuclear Posture Review. In spite of talk of a change from a "traditional threat-based approach" to a "capabilities-based approach" which is not country specific, the NPR specifies that "preplanning is essential for immediate and potential contingencies". If you ask the Pentagon planners what these contingencies are, they are most likely to respond that Russian sites now targeted by the single integrated operating plan (SIOP) will remain the top contingency. Thus, in practice the MAD doctrine prevails.

(4) De-alerting. Not only is MAD continuing but also the practice of keeping large numbers of missiles on hair-trigger alert. During the presidential campaign you rightly told the American people that "for two nations at peace, keeping so many weapons on high alert may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch." You stated, "the United States should remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert, hair-trigger status -- another unnecessary vestige of Cold War confrontation." Yet, the Pentagon planners have made no provision for de-alerting in the Nuclear Posture Review. True friends do not keep nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert targeted at each other. Therefore, we call for zero alert.

(5) Expanded role. The Pentagon plan seems to expand the role of nuclear weapons beyond the primary role of deterring nuclear-weapon states from attacking the United States and its allies. The Nuclear Posture Review speaks of flexibility for a range of contingencies. Although these contingencies are not spelled out, the NPR expresses a concern for the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and ballistic missile delivery systems. In your State of the Union Address you spoke of an "axis of evil" consisting of Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. Some of your top appointees are previously on record as favoring use of nuclear weapons to deal with such contingencies. Since the NPR was released, John Bolton, undersecretary of state for arms control and international security, has revealed that your administration no longer stands behind previous U.S. policy of no first use of nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapon state not allied with a nuclear-weapon state. We are greatly disturbed that your administration wants to expand rather than contract the role of nuclear weapons in the 21st century.

(6) Testing. Our concern is reinforced by the approach to nuclear testing revealed in the Nuclear Posture Review. While we welcome reaffirmation of your commitment to a moratorium on nuclear weapons testing, we are bothered by the NPR's call for the Department of Energy to reduce the time it would take to resume testing. This seems to go with your opposition to ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), a treaty we support. This is compounded by the NPR's indication that the current nuclear force is projected to remain until 2020 and that in the meantime the Department of Defense will "study alternatives for follow-ons" for nuclear delivery systems. Preparation to resume testing seems part of this scheme. This sounds like a commitment to nuclear weapons forever. We find this objectionable.

Therefore, Mr. President, we ask you to send the Nuclear Posture Review back to the drawing boards and have the Pentagon planners come up with a plan that will truly end the MAD doctrine and will steadily reduce the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. military and foreign policy. We propose that nuclear disarmament objectives be incorporated into the Nuclear Posture Review in accordance to the U.S. obligation under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), signed originally by President Richard Nixon. As a point of departure, we call your attention to the practical steps contained in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference (see attachment). Among other things these practical steps set forth the principle of irreversibility and call for "an unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals".

A revised Nuclear Posture Review along these lines would more nearly fulfill your goal of ending Cold War

confrontation and achieving true friendship between the United States and Russia. We urge you to exercise your presidential leadership in the direction of diminishing the role of nuclear weapons and eventually eliminating them from Earth. As you do, we will do what we can to help build support with the American people.

With best regards,

Signed by representatives of religious organizations

To: "Larry Egbert" <uuawo@aol.com>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Letter to President Bush  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\iclt.185.doc;  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Larry,

I am sending as a Word attachment the letter to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review. I hope that Meg Riley will sign it.

If you need me to send the letter pasted in as text, please let me know. The attachment is preferable because it shows my use of boldface.

Thanks for your support,  
Howard

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 5.5.6.1  
Date: Wed, 06 Mar 2002 13:11:38 -0500  
From: "Catherine Gordon" <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>  
To: <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Attachment of letter to President Bush

Howard,

I think the letter is good but the introductory paragraphs could be more direct. I'm not sure I like the phrase "we would like to offer you our observations." It isn't strong enough. I would also cut our "with our hopes raised" and simply state that the meeting with Putin was seen to be a positive step forward.

Catherine

Catherine Gordon  
Associate for International Issues  
Washington Office  
Presbyterian Church (USA)  
www.pcusa.org/washington  
p(202)543-1126; f(202)543-7755

>>> mupj@igc.org 03/04/02 04:25PM >>>  
My previous message got out without the attachment. It is attached herewith.

Howard

----- Yahoo! Groups Sponsor ----->  
Buy Stock for \$4.  
No Minimums.  
FREE Money 2002.  
<http://us.click.yahoo.com/BgmYkB/VovDAA/ySSFAA/nJ9qlB/TM>  
----->

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:  
[interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com)

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

X-Lotus-FromDomain: UCC  
From: conoverp@ucc.org  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 6 Mar 2002 13:48:35 -0500  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Replying

Hi Howard,

You have our sign-on to the letter to President Bush concerning nuclear weapons.

We would prefer an institutional sign-on as: United Church of Christ Justice and Witness Ministries.

If you need an individual sign-on, please use the following:

Pat Conover, Legislative Director, United Church of Christ Justice and Witness Ministries.

With this tight time line there is no way I can get a more prestigious signature.

Shalom, Pat

THANKS FOR YOUR WORK.

To: conoverp@ucc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Letter to President Bush  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <85256B74.006D1CFD.00@UCCLN2.ucc.org>  
References:

Pat,

Your name is fine with me. Thanks for signing.

Howard

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-4736742-39-1015484105-  
mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com  
X-Sender: Murraylou2@cs.com  
X-Apparently-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
X-Mailer: CompuServe 2000 6.0 for Windows US sub 10509  
From: Murraylou2@cs.com  
Mailing-List: list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com; contact interfaithnd-  
owner@yahoogroups.com  
Delivered-To: mailing list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com>  
Date: Wed, 6 Mar 2002 11:51:20 EST  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Attachment of letter to President Bush

No need to resend the letter. I was able to pick up the attachment.

Murray Polner

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:  
interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to the [Yahoo! Terms of Service](#).

X-Sender: acurtis@networklobby.org@mail.networklobby.org  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0  
Date: Thu, 07 Mar 2002 12:10:16 -0500  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: Anne Curtis <acurtis@networklobby.org>  
Subject: Re: Letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review

Sign us on & Thanks

Kathy Thornton, RSM  
National Coordinator, NETWORKA National Catholic Social Justice Lobby

At 04:35 PM 3/4/02 -0500, you wrote:

>Dear Anne,

>  
>I invite a representative of NETWORK to sign the attached letter to  
>President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review. I would like to hear from  
>you by close of business, Wednesday, March 13. This will give me an  
>opportunity to get the letter to the White House on March 15, a week before  
>a meeting with Frank Miller of the National Security Council staff we have  
>scheduled for March 22. I will also send a copy to Secretaries Rumsfeld  
>and Powell.

>  
>There will be no letterhead. Signers will be identified by name and  
>organization. At the end it will note that a reply can be sent to my  
>attention as chair, Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament at my  
>mailing address.

>  
>I am sending the letter to you as a Word attachment. If you cannot  
>receive it in this format, please let me know, and I'll send it as a  
>paste-on to a regular e-message.

>  
>Attachments to the letter going to President Bush will include the June  
>2000 Cathedral statement and an excerpt from the Final Document of the NPT  
>2000 Review Conference. If you want to see either, let me know.

>  
>If you have any questions or comments, please reply to me by e-mail at  
>mupj@igc.org, or call me at 301 896-0013.

>  
>Shalom,  
>Howard

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

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

~~~~~  
Anne Curtis, RSM, NETWORK Lobbyist

NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby
801 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 460
Washington, DC 20003-2167
202-547-5556, Ext. 25 Phone
202-547-5510 FAX
acurtis@networklobby.org

<http://www.networklobby.org>

~~~~~

X-Lotus-FromDomain: UCC  
From: conoverp@ucc.org  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 7 Mar 2002 11:55:01 -0500  
Subject: Re: Web site proposal

Dear Howard,

Thanks for your reply.

Let me begin by seconding those who think that the work you have done to sustain the interfaith work on nuclear disarmament is valuable and I'm glad your choosing to continue this ministry.

Your reply gives me a better sense of the purposes of the website.

I pledge \$200 from my program budget to help the web site get up and running.

I'll try to get an appropriate UCC posting of our positions for that section of the web site.

I'll try to get the web site announced to the appropriate part of our peace and justice network.

I would like to suggest a terrific webmaster, web site creator person. His name is Kris Herbst and he works for the Ashoka Foundation. He runs a pair of terrific web sites. He's a dedicated Christian and might find this a tasty bit of work to do - might do it inexpensively. He would also be somebody who would be excellent to consult with as you move further into what you want to accomplish through the website and what it would take to make such dreams come true. If you contact Kris please tell him I suggested the contact. His email is [Kris@globalweb.org](mailto:Kris@globalweb.org) I recently hired him to set up the website for my new publishing company: New Wineskins Press.

Shalom, Pat

Date: Thu, 07 Mar 2002 16:24:12 -0500  
From: Christine Kucia <ckucia@basicint.org>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
To: Christine Kucia <ckucia@basicint.org>  
Subject: Nuclear Non-Proliferation: Issues and Opportunities

## **The 2002 NPT PrepCom: Issues and Opportunities**

The 2002 Preparatory Committee meeting for the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) will take place April 8-19, 2002 in New York. This month, BASIC is offering a few short briefings on challenges and concerns for nuclear arms control and non-proliferation.

\*\*\* BASIC will be attending the PrepCom and posting key documents and analysis on its Web site during the two week period. For the latest news and information, visit [BASIC's 2002 PrepCom Page](#) \*\*\*

For more information, please contact Christine Kucia in Washington: 1-202-347-8340, or Mark Bromley in London: 44-20-7407-2977

\*\*\*\*\*

## **PrepCom 2002: Avoiding More Missed Steps**

By Christine Kucia  
March 7, 2002

The upcoming meeting of States Parties to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) will be another opportunity for the world to focus on the strength of international security agreements in the wake of heightened concern over the availability of weapons of mass destruction.

### **Why Are We Having A PrepCom?**

The Preparatory Committee (PrepCom) meeting, which will begin paving the path toward the 2005 Review Conference (RevCon) of the NPT, will meet April 8-19, 2002 in New York. PrepCom meetings convene in the three years preceding the five-yearly NPT reviews to start procedural and substantive discussions. According to *Strengthening the Review Process for the Treaty* (Decision 1 of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference), "The purpose of the Preparatory Committee meetings would be to consider principles, objectives and ways in order to promote the full implementation of the Treaty, as well as its universality, and to make recommendations thereon to the Review Conference." Creating procedural recommendations are also a task for PrepComs.

During the 2002 PrepCom, the 189 NPT States Parties will discuss ways to move forward with the NPT's objectives, especially in light of the decisions made at the May

2000 RevCon.

### **What Are the Issues Being Carried Forward from the 2000 Review Conference?**

The May 2000 RevCon broke new ground for global non-proliferation efforts. In the final document, all states agreed to an historic “13 steps” toward the goal of accomplishing the elimination of the world’s nuclear arsenals. Steps agreed by both nuclear-weapon states and their non-nuclear allies and neighbors include:

- Achieve early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT).
- Continue the moratorium on nuclear-weapon-test explosions until CTBT enactment.
- Move forward on negotiations for a verifiable treaty banning fissile material production.
- Establish a body within the U.N. Conference on Disarmament to start discussions on nuclear disarmament.
- Apply the principle of irreversibility to arms control and disarmament negotiations.
- Develop verification capabilities that will be required to provide assurance of compliance with nuclear disarmament agreements.
- Implement START II and conclude START III negotiations as soon as possible, while preserving and strengthening the ABM Treaty as a cornerstone of strategic stability and as a basis for further reductions of strategic offensive weapons.
- Nuclear-weapon States will take the following steps leading to nuclear disarmament in a way that promotes international stability:
  - o Efforts to reduce their nuclear arsenals unilaterally;
  - o Increased transparency on nuclear weapons capabilities and implementing agreements;
  - o Further reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons, both unilaterally and as a part of the arms reduction and disarmament process;
  - o Concrete measures to further reduce the operational status of nuclear weapons;
  - o A diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies to minimize the risk that these weapons ever be used and to facilitate the process of their total elimination;
  - o Engagement of all the nuclear-weapon States in the process leading to the total elimination of their nuclear weapons.
- Reaffirm that the ultimate objective of the efforts of States in the disarmament process is general and complete disarmament under effective international control.
- An unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament.

### **What Are the Expected Outcomes or Anticipated Glitches?**

When the countries convene in New York next month, evaluating the level of progress on this list of commitments will be a critical component guiding the discussions.

However, several changes in the international security climate since May 2000 have resulted in significant setback in the implementation of these measures.

#### - U.S. Withdrawal From the ABM Treaty

Recent actions and statements by the Bush administration in the United States are likely to have the greatest impact on the steps listed above. The decision in December 2001 to withdraw from the ABM Treaty, cited in May 2000 as “a cornerstone of strategic stability and as a basis for further reductions of strategic offensive weapons” represents the most high profile action by Washington. With the cornerstone removed, and discussions on the START process stalled due to impasses between the legislatures in the United States and Russia, the stability of the non-proliferation regime has been significantly weakened. The example set by Washington in withdrawing from an international treaty also sets an unfortunate precedent that may be exploited by other countries in the future.

#### - Lack of Progress in Transparency, Irreversibility, and Verification

The issues of transparency, irreversibility, and verification have seen some setbacks since the May 2000 RevCon. The United States announced proposed reductions in its arsenal from 6,000 to 1,700-2,200 deployed strategic nuclear warheads over the next ten years. While those reductions are welcome, they were initially suggested by President Bush outside of a treaty framework, which would hinder international efforts to verify the reductions, and make sure that the warheads would be destroyed. Upon closer inspection, the “cuts” offered by Bush were redefined in his administration’s Nuclear Posture Review in January 2002. The warheads would instead be moved to active or inactive storage, and no announcements of warhead destruction have been made yet by the administration. Finally, transparency remains problematic among all of the nuclear weapon states. For example, China’s nuclear arsenal modernization and buildup remains a largely obscure process to other states and independent experts seeking a clearer idea of China’s holdings, development, and potential proliferation risk.

#### - Failure to Implement the CTBT

Another challenge confronting States Parties involves the not-yet-implemented CTBT. While all countries still abide by the voluntary moratorium pending the treaty’s entry into force, discussions on enacting the CTBT last November were not conclusive. The United States, a required ratifier to implement the CTBT, refused to attend the meeting; while India, Israel, and Pakistan, also required ratifiers, have yet to even sign the treaty. Progress has not been significant on banning nuclear testing, a key action for furthering global nuclear disarmament.

#### - Stalled Action on Fissban

Progress on banning fissile material production and establishing a nuclear disarmament sub-body in the U.N. Conference on Disarmament has been stalled as well. The consensus negotiating body has failed to establish a program for its work for six years, without which negotiations may not proceed.

#### - Non-Compliance, Universality, and Other Concerns

Other issues beyond the “13 steps” will also challenge countries at the upcoming PrepCom. The alleged nuclear activities of Iraq and North Korea, States Parties to the

NPT, bring up concerns about compliance with their international obligations to the nuclear non-proliferation regime. The heightened conflict in the Middle East will also drive a wedge between states during the discussions, as some countries aim to address Israel as a nuclear-weapon state, while Israel remains outside of the treaty. And increased tension between India and Pakistan, also outside of the NPT regime, will bring forth more deliberations about how to make the NPT a universal treaty.

### **Avoiding More Missed 'Steps'**

The forthcoming PrepCom in New York will be an opportunity for States Parties to begin discussing these concerns in the context of their commitment to and compliance with non-proliferation and disarmament measures outlined in the NPT process. While the PrepCom is tasked only to make recommendations for future negotiations, and will not produce a binding document out of its own discussions, countries should start toward the 2005 RevCon with measures to build upon the May 2000 steps. Changes in international priorities, and particularly in U.S. government policy, will force some of the commitments made in 2000 to be extensively reevaluated. The challenge will be to ensure that the remaining steps listed above stay intact and are strengthened and implemented as much as possible.

The current international climate, while still troubling and unsettled in the wake of the Sept. 11 attacks, increased tension in South Asia, and heightened violence in the Middle East, must not override States Parties' existing commitment to ensuring "nuclear disarmament in a way that promotes international stability, based on the principle of undiminished security for all."

For more information, please see:

Full text of the 13 steps, see the [Final Document of the Review Conference](#)  
[BASIC's NPT Web pages](#)  
[UN Dept. for Disarmament Affairs, NPT Web pages](#)

Upcoming briefings: British Nuclear Policy and the NPT; Is the United States Living Up to Its Disarmament Commitments?

To: Kris@globalweb.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Need for web site consultant  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Mr. Herbst:

I am writing to you at the suggestion of Pat Conover of the Washington Office, United Church of Christ. The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, is setting up a web site called [www.zeronukes.org](http://www.zeronukes.org) to (a) provide basic information about how the faith community stands on nuclear disarmament, (b) obtain from retired military officers and other excerpts concrete proposals on how to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons (the zero option), and (c) facilitate discussion of these ideas. A fuller description is attached below.

We need the assistance of an experienced consultant to help us design and operate the web site. Pat says that you have such skills. We have modest resources and are now trying to raise some money to get the web site underway. If you are interested and available, please get in touch with me. I am interested in what you think is required and what your fee would be to assist us. If you have any clarifying questions before offering a proposal, call me at 301 896-0013 or reply by e-mail to [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org).

Shalom,  
Howard Hallman

###

An Interfaith Web Site: [www.zeronukes.org](http://www.zeronukes.org)

A Project of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

**Purposes.** Provide a forum for presentation and discussion of practical steps for the global elimination of nuclear weapons. Specifically: (a) Serve as a repository for statements and proposals by religious organizations and religious leaders on nuclear disarmament. (b) Provide linkages with civil-sector organizations for their statements and proposals on nuclear disarmament. (c) Serve as a means for reaching out to military leaders, scientists, physicians, lawyers, national security experts, and others for their ideas on how to reach zero nuclear weapons. (d) Offer opportunity to post responses to various nuclear disarmament proposals. The site will feature education and discussion and will not be used for legislative alerts or advocacy of direct action.

**Sponsors.** Agreed to: Washington offices of Church of the Brethren, Cooperative Baptist Fellowship, Mennonite Central Committee, Presbyterian Church U.S.A., Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Unitarian Universalist Association, United Church of Christ. Pending: Washington offices of American Baptist Churches, Episcopal Church, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, United Methodist General Board of Church and Society; also, American Friends Service Committee, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Pax Christi USA. Representatives from these offices will serve as a steering committee for the web site.

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

Site Map

A. Home page  
Statement of purpose

Introduction

Sponsors (underscored for web linkage)

Moderator with e-mail address

Menu

## B. Sections

1. Basic data on the global nuclear arsenal (primarily through linkages)
2. Statements of religious bodies and religious leaders on nuclear disarmament; linkages.
3. Civil-sector reports on nuclear disarmament: abstracts and linkages.
4. Proposals for how to get to zero nuclear weapon, to offered by military leaders, scientists, physicians, lawyers, national security experts, and other professionals. Open for proposals from members of Congress and interested citizens. Start with U.S. experts and extend globally, including proposals from Russia, NATO countries, and elsewhere.
5. Proposals for achieving zero alert (as a major step toward total elimination).
6. Proposals for approaching zero nuclear weapons from those who do not advocate going all the way to zero.
7. Nuclear Posture Review: summary (with linkage to government site) and comments.
8. Comments: an opportunity for anyone to comment on the proposals and respond to other persons' comments. To be organized by major topics, such as steps toward zero nuclear weapons, de-alerting, dismantlement, transparency and verification, security of fissile material, Nuclear Posture Review, philosophy of nuclear deterrence and its application.

From: help@netsol.com  
Date: Wed, 6 Mar 2002 18:21:40 -0500 (EST)  
To: mupj@igc.org  
Subject: Confirmation of your VeriSign Order

---

Your VeriSign(r) Order is Confirmed

---

Dear Customer,

We are happy to confirm your order for the VeriSign(r) services listed below:

DOMAIN NAME : ZERO-NUKES.ORG

DOMAIN NAME : ZERONUKES.ORG

ACCOUNT NUMBER/LOGIN: 19365614  
PASSWORD: For security reasons, not included

**COMPLETE YOUR WEB SERVICES:**

Whatever your personal or business needs are on the Web, VeriSign has everything you want -- all in one place, including:

\* E-mail -- matches your Web address, and includes free e-mail forwarding and Spam blocking.

\* Web sites -- simple, all-in-one packages include a domain name, email address and hosting. Choose the size that's right for you -- a one-page or a multi-page site. In less than an hour you can set up your site with easy-to-follow instructions and a choice of over 100 design templates.

\* SureList -- have your Web site included in the major search engines, including AOL, MSN, HotBot and iWon.

Learn more now: <http://www.verisign-welcome.com>

**HOW TO MANAGE YOUR ACCOUNT(S):**

To update your account(s) or contact us, go to the Manage Your Account area on our Home Page -- or go directly there from this link: <http://goto.netsol.com/account>

Once again -- thank you for your order. At VeriSign, we

been building online identities since the Internet was introduced. We look forward to putting this experience and reliability to work for you.

Regards,

VeriSign, Inc.

---

**IMPORTANT:** Your VeriSign(r) services are subject to the terms and conditions set forth in our Service Agreement, which you accepted at the time of purchase. You can view the complete Agreement again at:  
<http://www.verisignagreement.info>  
(Please let us know if, for any reason, you have difficulty accessing the Agreement.)

Copyright (c) 2002 VeriSign, Inc. All rights reserved.

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-4736742-38-1015451075-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com  
X-Sender: ken@bpfna.org  
X-Apparently-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
Organization: Baptist Peace Fellowship  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 (Macintosh; I; PPC)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
From: Ken Sehested <ken@bpfna.org>  
Mailing-List: list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com; contact interfaithnd-owner@yahoogroups.com  
Delivered-To: mailing list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com>  
Date: Wed, 06 Mar 2002 16:43:24 -0500  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Attachment of letter to President Bush  
Reply-To: ken@bpfna.org

Howard,

Add my name: Rev. Ken Sehested, Executive Director, Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America.

Thanks.

Ken

"Howard W. Hallman" wrote:

> My previous message got out without the attachment. It is attached herewith.

>

> Howard

>

>

> To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:

> interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

>

>

>

> Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

>

> -----

> Name: iclt.185.doc

> iclt.185.doc Type: Microsoft Word Document (application/msword)

> Encoding: base64

>

> -----

>

> Howard W. Hallman, Chair

> Methodists United for Peace with Justice

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

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

>

> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of

> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

----- Yahoo! Groups Sponsor ----->

FREE COLLEGE MONEY

CLICK HERE to search

600,000 scholarships!

<http://us.click.yahoo.com/iZp8OC/4m7CAA/ySSFAA/nJ9qlB/TM>

----->

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:

[interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com)

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

From: J.\_Daryl\_Byler@mail.mcc.org  
X-Lotus-FromDomain: MCC  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Date: Thu, 7 Mar 2002 18:33:29 -0500  
Subject: sign on

To: Howard Hallman  
From: J. Daryl Byler  
Date: 3/7/2002 6:32:51 PM  
Subj: sign on

Hi Howard:

Please add our name to the Nuclear Posture Review letter, as follows:

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

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 5.5.6.1  
Date: Fri, 08 Mar 2002 11:34:28 -0500  
From: "Catherine Gordon" <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>  
To: <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Attachment of letter to President Bush

Yes, Thank You.

It will be

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

Catherine Gordon  
Associate for International Issues  
Washington Office  
Presbyterian Church (USA)  
[www.pcusa.org/washington](http://www.pcusa.org/washington)  
p(202)543-1126; f(202)543-7755

To: "Catherine Gordon" <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Attachment of letter to President Bush  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <sc8615a3.066@gerizim.ctr.lan>  
References:

At 01:11 PM 3/6/02 -0500, you wrote:

>Howard,

>

>I think the letter is good but the introductory paragraphs could be more  
>direct. I'm not sure I like the phrase "we would like to offer you our  
>observations." It isn't strong enough. I would also cut our "with our  
>hopes raised" and simply state that the meeting with Putin was seen to be a  
>positive step forward.

Dear Catherine,

Although the second draft of the letter to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review is out for signing, I would like to accommodate your concerns. What would you think of the following changes?

Proposed redraft of letter to President Bush on Nuclear Posture Review

First paragraph:

We the undersigned representatives of religious organizations were encouraged by the meetings you and Russian President Vladimir Putin held last November in Washington and Texas. Together you told the world that the United States and Russia are now friends rather than military rivals. You each promised to make substantial reductions in strategic nuclear weapons. This follows through on your desire to move beyond the Cold War and its doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD). We look forward to your signing a specific agreement on strategic arms reductions when you meet in Moscow in May.

Third paragraph:

From this perspective we are, however, discouraged by what Pentagon planners have produced in the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). We have several concerns we would like to share with you.

If these are made, will Elenora Giddings Ivory or someone else from your letter sign it?

Shalom,  
Howard

To: Tom Hart <thart@episcopalchurch.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: RE: Attachment for letter to President Bush  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <3CD7239EC58ED41196730008C756D7401868D5@MAILDFMS>  
References:

Dear Tom,

I'm sorry the letter to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review isn't to your liking. It is longer than usual. I tried to cut it substantially in the second draft, but there was a lot to cover.

The points come out the discussion we had on February 15 when Frank Miller of the National Security Council staff failed to appear for a briefing. I also drew upon information obtained at a forum sponsored by the Cato Institute and discussion with Monday Lobby groups.

I have redrafted the first and third paragraphs to incorporate a suggestion from Catherine Gordon of the Presbyterian office for sharpening the language, as follows:

First paragraph:

We the undersigned representatives of religious organizations were encouraged by the meetings you and Russian President Vladimir Putin held last November in Washington and Texas. Together you told the world that the United States and Russia are now friends rather than military rivals. You each promised to make substantial reductions in strategic nuclear weapons. This follows through on your desire to move beyond the Cold War and its doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD). We look forward to your signing a specific agreement on strategic arms reductions when you meet in Moscow in May.

Third paragraph:

From this perspective we are, however, discouraged by what Pentagon planners have produced in the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). We have several concerns we would like to share with you.

On the other points:

- (1) Several experts in the Monday Lobby have spoken in favor of speeding up the pace of reductions.
- (3) Among others Stan Norris of the Natural Resources Defense Council, who has intensely studied targeting, and Bruce Blair of the Center for Defense Information indicate that the only possible use of most of the 1,700 to 2,200 nuclear warheads is to target sites in Russia and that in effect MAD continues.
- (6) The language "this seems" is intent to soften rather than accuse. A number of civil-sector experts say directly that the Bush Administration is preparing for resumption of testing and warhead development.

I hope that you'll take a second look and sign the letter. So far we have the following ten signers: AFSC, Baptist Peace Fellowship, Evangelicals for Social Action, Jewish Peace Fellowship, Mennonite Central Committee, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, NETWORK, Presbyterian Church, United Church of Christ, and Unitarian Universalist Association. I expect to have 20 to 25 by Wednesday, March 13, my deadline.

Please call me at 301 896-0013 if you want to discuss this further.

Shalom,  
Howard



From: Murraylou2@cs.com  
Date: Fri, 8 Mar 2002 12:05:44 EST  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Sign-on letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review  
To: mupj@igc.org  
CC: kenanddavid@starpower.net  
X-Mailer: CompuServe 2000 6.0 for Windows US sub 10509

Dear Howard:

Your second draft is fine. I agree to sign. If, however, there are future changes, please let me know.

Murray Polner  
Chair, Jewish Peace Fellowship

1. EXPERT SERIES: Lying in the Land of Memoir: Straddling the Line Between Fact and Fiction by Gotham Writers Workshop Memoir Faculty and award winning writer Kathleen Finneran

I've never been good at telling the truth. From the time I first encountered stories as a child, I understood that they were meant to be manipulated, details added or deleted toward a desired result. I

suspect the situation is the same for most memoirists. I suspect we have trouble with the unalterable truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and that we turn to memoir because it provides us with a legitimate way of lying.

To supporters of memoir-writers and readers like myself-this may seem a shocking statement, a betrayal of sorts, ill-considered in its confession, arrogant in its speculation. But to others, to those who have rallied hard in recent years against the modern memoir, it may be a welcome admission, one that finally satisfies the skeptics, those eager to challenge how much we memoirists actually remember and how much we make up.

How much do I remember? How much do I make up? As a writer of memoir, as a teacher of memoir writing, these are the questions I am asked most often. Readers wonder how much liberty I've taken with my life; students want to know how free they can be with the facts. Long before I was being asked these questions directly, I was aware that they had become the central questions in any discussion-critical or casual-about memoir. During the question and answer session following memoirists' readings, audience members inevitably inquire about the depth of the writer's memory. And more often than not, these inquiries are coupled with inferred challenges in which the questioner stakes his or her claim as someone whose memory is renowned, extolled, laudable at the least. Questions the like of: 'Mr. McCourt, I pride myself on having a superb memory, friends and relatives verify that I do, but I must say my memory looks like a shallow pool next to yours. When you wrote *Angela's Ashes*, so many years after the events you describe, how could you possibly have remembered...?' Or 'Ms. Karr, given how much drug use you cop to in your second memoir *Cherry*, I wonder how you were able to remember the many vivid details of the younger years that you write about in that book and in *The Liar's Club*. I have a sterling memory and I've never experimented with drugs of any type, still I would be at a loss to recreate my childhood in such detail.' Not questions, so much as veiled accusations: I can't remember as much about my life, so how can you remember as much about yours?

Writing in *The New York Times Book Review* in May 1997-the late 1990s, if not the entire decade, marked the years when, as premier memoirist Patricia Hampl puts it, the

memoir 'emerged as the signature genre of the age'-Anna Quindlen took this same approach to memoir. In her article 'How Dark? How Stormy? I Can't Recall,' she writes:

'I can't remember the spread on my parent's bed. If it was quilted satin, I can't remember running my small hand over its smooth surface when I was 6 or 7 years old. If it was chenille, I can't recall feeling the bobbles beneath my palm as I sat and watched in the mirror as my mother braided my long hair.

If I were creating life in a novel, these are the sorts of details that would make the difference between a stick figure of a story and something that had the smell, the feel, the noisy allure of real life. And so I would invent them. They are the sorts of details, too, that make memoir feel as though we are living a life in tandem with the writer who lived it first. But I do not have them at my disposal, and so the arc of my work is forever circumscribed. I will never write a memoir, even though the form has become the *oeuvre du jour*. I've got a lousy memory.'

As it happens, I can remember the spread on my parents' bed when I was seven. The reason I remember it, as is the reason I remember most of the minute details that, as Quindlen expresses so well, elevate a story from 'stick figure' status, is because it is tied to a much larger memory, one I have of sitting on my parents' bed in the late afternoon with my father on the day after Martin Luther King, Jr., was shot. When his assassination was discussed at school, my second grade teacher, Sister Mary Marcus, told us that some grown-ups, maybe even our own parents, welcomed the news that Dr. King was dead.

So that is why I remember that the spread on my parents' bed when I was seven was powder blue. I remember the calm color of it between my father and me as I sat beside him while he removed his work shoes. I remember his hand covering mine to stop me from pulling on a loose thread. It was a hard, nylon thread that punched a pattern into the dull cotton, forming a design my mother called 'fleur de lis,' something that sounded much too fancy for the cheap feel of the fabric. My father's hand stopped mine from inflicting further damage to the spread. He had big, coarse, bricklayer hands and I liked the feel of them against my skin. I asked him if he welcomed Dr. King's death. What the hell kind of question is that, he wondered, and he removed his hand from mine.

I don't remember anything else about that afternoon. I don't remember my father's answer, if he answered. I don't think he did. I don't think he did because when I return to that moment, I have a memory that has no other words attached to it, a memory that contains only the feeling of my father moving away from me.

I have an exceptional memory. Most memoirists do. But I don't think it is the quality of our memories that draw us toward memoir. No, it is something much more than that, something that remains unrecognized by those readers, those audience members, who question the veracity of what we write, who seek to separate each detail of our story into piles marked 'true' and 'untrue.' What draws us, as writers; to memoir is the need-not just the desire, but the absolute necessity-to commemorate major and minor moments in our lives and the people and places in them. This can't be achieved through fiction, however autobiographical we make it.

But why we write memoir is another topic. Whether we manipulate the truth in memoir is the matter at hand. We do, but we don't usually do it in the details. In the interest of answering the contentions of skeptics, but more importantly, in the service of would-be memoirists who need to know how much they can play with their material, here are three ways that I, and other memoirists I know, test the line between fact and fiction.

1. We make up dialogue.

It's hard for me to believe that readers assume the dialogue in memoirs is written verbatim, but they do. I haven't yet met a memoirist who can remember crucial conversations-especially those dating back to childhood-word for word. Most memoirists admit, as I do, that they recall either a central line of the dialogue or some semblance of what was said, and construct the dialogue around those words. It's the intention, purpose, or message of the conversation that we aim to recreate and remain true to.

2. We conflate time and construe it to our advantage.

In the interests of creating a cohesive, non-sprawling story, we sometimes merge experiences or minimize the time between events. For example, one of the chapters of my memoir tells the story of viewing a video an uncle had made of home movies he had taken of my brothers, my sisters, and me when we were children. We had not anticipated seeing my younger brother Sean, who had killed himself a few years earlier, in the video as we thought our uncle had stopped making home movies long before Sean was born. To our surprise, and central to the chapter in my memoir, Sean appears in footage near the end.

I wrote the chapter as if my entire family were watching the video together on New Year's Day 1990. In fact, my older brother and his wife were not there. They watched the tape the night after, when my parents and I viewed it a second time. Why not write these experiences as the separate occasions that they were? Dealing with time in stories, juggling the ins and outs of it, can become a narrative nightmare; and staying true to time, because of the extra set-ups and explanations it can require, can often

detract from the point of the story. What was important to me were the reactions of my various family members as we watched our past on film, and more importantly, as we encountered Sean again, seeing him animated in a way that photographs-which were our only visual record of him prior to discovering him on the video-did not allow. Seeing someone walk again, laugh again, climb onto someone's lap again, someone whom you'd had no hope of seeing do those things again, carries with it quite an emotional impact. It was the emotional impact that was important to me, not that some of us felt the force of it one night, while others did not feel the force of it until the next.

### 3. We leave stuff out.

Some people think that to tell a true story, you have to tell the whole story. Most memoirists realize that you can tell a truer story by leaving some stuff out. I don't mean that we omit crucial elements. I mean that we don't include those elements that aren't crucial. In a scene in my memoir, for example, I write about the last night I saw my brother alive. We went to my older sister's house to play Uno, a card game that she and Sean were fond of. Along with Sean, my sister, and me, my brother-in-law and baby niece are present. They are crucial to the events of the evening. The way Sean interacted with my niece-feeding her, changing her diaper, playing with her, putting her to sleep-showed parts of his personality that I wanted readers to see. As did the verbal exchanges he had with my brother-in-law. Two friends of my sister were also there that evening. You will not know that from reading my book. Just as you will not know that Annie Dillard wasn't living alone at Tinker Creek during the year she recounts in her memoir 'Pilgrim at Tinker Creek.' Does it matter? To some, it might. But for me, the choice to include my sister's friends in my depiction of that night would have meant bringing in unnecessary characters, characters whose presence and participation did not make the story any more or less meaningful in its relation to my brother's life and death; just as the presence of anyone else at Tinker Creek did not change the story Annie Dillard was interested in telling. Certainly, the presence of those people changes the actual experience, but they do not change the story at the center of the experience, and it is the story at the center that is most important to the memoirist.

Those are just three examples of how we memoirists take liberties with the truth. But what's more important for readers and writers of memoir to understand is that memoirs are made of memories, and memories are mere impressions, remnants, imprints on our minds that, for some reason, withstand time. Why do we remember one moment of our lives and not another? A mystery. And why do those moments we remember reshape themselves sometimes, showing us that our memories are not static truths, but malleable entities that form and reform. Another mystery. In the introduction to his book 'Somehow Form

A Family: Stories That Are Mostly True,' Tony Earley writes:

'On the night of July 20, 1969, my little sister and I followed our father into the backyard, where we studied the moon through a surveyor's transit owned by a neighbor. Peering through the eyepiece, I felt as if I could almost see Neil Armstrong on the lunar surface, which made the universe seem very large and, simultaneously, very small. It's one of the most vivid memories of my childhood. When I wrote about that night almost thirty years later, I described the full moon in detail, how, once magnified, it had seemed almost too bright to look at. When a fact checker at Harper's magazine informed me that the moon on the night of July 20, 1969, had not been full, but had been a waxing crescent, I refused at first to believe her. When I looked it up myself and discovered that she was right, I was faced on one hand with a memory so strong I was sure it had to be true, and on the other hand with an objective truth significantly different than what I remembered. At that moment I came to understand, if not embrace, the true nature of the phrase creative nonfiction.'

Earlier in this article, I boldly claimed memory of my parents' bedspread when I was seven. When recalling that day, what I couldn't remember was what time of year it had been when Martin Luther King, Jr. was shot. Was it Fall? Spring? I looked it up and was gratified to learn that it was April when I sat beside my father and asked him if he welcomed Dr. King's death (I had had a faint sense that it was spring). What shocked me was to learn that Dr. King was killed in 1968. I was not seven, but nearly eleven. I could not have been in second grade, so it would not have been Sister Mary Marcus, but Sister Francis Ann, my fourth grade teacher, who made the statement that ultimately led my father to move his hand from mine.

In my mind, I have always associated Sister Mary Marcus with those words, with that day, with an opening in my soul that had to do with some new understanding about the world, something I would later learn the name for-racism. In my mind, I had always tied Sister Mary Marcus to that memory of my father's hand moving from mine. Was it because Sister Mary Marcus had dark skin, and Sister Francis Ann was frail? Was it because I confused the talk at school of Martin Luther King's assassination with that of President Kennedy's, for whose death I really was seven and, therefore, would have really been in Sister Mary Marcus's room. I don't know. I don't know the answers about memory-about what's true and what's not.

But the bedspread, I promise, was blue.

From: WILLNORTH@aol.com  
Date: Sat, 9 Mar 2002 08:57:29 EST  
Subject: Outreach Committee minutes (3/6/02)  
To: andrewsa@saic.com, beverly@erols.com, dosmith6@juno.com,  
gene.vincent@starpower.net, HolRonFost@aol.com, jcm@duncanallen.com,  
JFNORTH@aol.com, kiki@wizard.net, mupj@igc.org  
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Mac sub 39

Bethesda United Methodist Church  
Outreach Committee Meeting  
Minutes for March 6, 2002

Participants: Dwight Smith, Gene Vincent, Kerri Platais, Marianne Cook, Pat Beverly, Haven North, Jeanne North, Howard Hallman.

#### Advocacy Forum

Haven and Jeanne reported on a possible follow-up forum. Nothing decided and not clear on what would be desirable; CMMC has not proposed a topic. Discussion led to considering a series of Sunday morning classes plus an open multi-congregational forum on issues of mental health illnesses and homelessness, etc. in the county/state â€” possible title â€”Healing our Community.â€”Kerri to explore with the Education Committee and Ron; Jeanne to look into resources.

#### Building for the Future funds allocation

Dwight reported that there is \$16,500 remaining in the Building for the Future outreach account. Discussion on how best to use. \$1,000 allocated for the Fall forum on mental health.

#### Other ideas discussed:

â€” Opportunity International (need more information on what contribution would be for); Haven to find out from Gordon/Helen Smith;

â€” â€”Stop Hunger Now-Afghanistanâ€”(reservations about going with new program; why not work with UMCOR?)

â€” CMMCâ€™s new program for microcredits, possibly \$2500) Haven will provide details.

â€” Bethesda Cares (already in regular budget) consideration of another \$2500;

â€” Missionaries: Hoovers and Sue Porter (now back in Afghanistan); need up date on their situations; suggested \$4000 for special projects;

â€” Mark Stevens is going with government team to Zimbabwe in April to help with HIV/AIDS crisis and orphans; \$1,000 for special project.

â€” African University: continuing need for scholarship funds; suggested \$3000-4000.

Conclusion: Dwight will put together a suggested allocation program for members to look at and react to.

#### Communication Items:

Dwight said BUMC congregation needs more information on outreach activities such as Minute for Mission and items in the Messenger; Bulletin Board. No action decided on.

Replacements for BUMC Bethesda Cares Board member and for lunch volunteer coordinator.

Marianne Cook has agreed to be the Bethesda Cares board member from our church. Out thanks to Marianne. Still looking for a replacement for Ordella Allman.

Peace with Justice

Howard noted that "Peace with Justice Sunday" is coming. Group agreed to support his work. What action is needed?

To: kgdime@hotmail.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Sessions on the Social Principles  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Kelly,

Here is a proposed title and outline for the six sessions I will lead on the Social Principles of the United Methodist Church. Please suggest any changes you think are desirable.

I hope that we can get this in the next Messenger.

Howard

###

## CHRISTIANS GRAPPLE WITH SOCIAL ISSUES The Social Principles of the United Methodist Church

Six sessions to be lead by Howard Hallman

### I. Life and Death

When does human life begin? How should it end? Abortion and reproductive assistance, stem cell research and genetic technology, death with dignity, suicide.

### II. Human Nature and Nurture

Sexuality, marriage, family, divorce, personal morality, nurturing community

### III. Human Rights and Social Responsibility

Equal rights, freedom, political responsibility, criminal and restorative justice, death penalty

### IV. Poverty in Midst of Affluence

Acquisition and use of property, labor and management, economic justice

### V. God's Creation: Exploit or Conserve

Environmental issues, consumption and resource conservation, science and technology

### VI. War and Peace

National power versus "one world" perspective, war and weapons of mass destruction, military service and pacifism, peacemaking alternatives

To: interfaithnd, ograbc@aol.com, tlheath@churchwomen.org, thart@episcopalchurch.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Nuclear Posture Review: 7 items  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Colleagues,

I want to share these items with you even though in total they are long. I may want to adjust some of the language in our letter to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review to take into account these disclosures. I'll send you any suggested changes.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

>X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]  
>X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0  
>Date: Mon, 11 Mar 2002 09:22:28 -0500  
>To: jdi@clw.org  
>From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>  
>Subject: Nuclear Posture Review: 7 items  
>  
>1. "Secret Plan Outlines The Unthinkable" - Arkin column  
>2. "U.S. Works Up Plan for Using Nuclear Arms" - L.A. Times  
>3. "Nuclear Plan Meant To Deter" - L.A. Times  
>4. "U.S. Nuclear Plan Sees New Weapons and New Targets" - N.Y. Times  
>5. "Rattling New Sabers" - N.Y. Times  
>6. "U.S. Tries To Dampen Fear Abroad On Policy" - N.Y. Times  
>7. "Allies Unperturbed By U.S. Nuclear List" - Wash. Post

>  
>=====

>1. "Secret Plan Outlines The Unthinkable"  
>Los Angeles Times - March 10, 2002 - William M. Arkin column  
>  
>WASHINGTON -- The Bush administration, in a secret policy review completed  
>early this year, has ordered the Pentagon to draft contingency plans for  
>the use of nuclear weapons against at least seven countries, naming not  
>only Russia and the "axis of evil"--Iraq, Iran, and North Korea--but also  
>China, Libya and Syria.  
>  
>In addition, the U.S. Defense Department has been told to prepare for the  
>possibility that nuclear weapons may be required in some future  
>Arab-Israeli crisis. And, it is to develop plans for using nuclear weapons  
>to retaliate against chemical or biological attacks, as well as "surprising  
>military developments" of an unspecified nature.  
>  
>These and a host of other directives, including calls for developing  
>bunker-busting mini-nukes and nuclear weapons that reduce collateral

>damage, are contained in a still-classified document called the Nuclear  
>Posture Review (NPR), which was delivered to Congress on Jan. 8.  
>  
>Like all such documents since the dawning of the Atomic Age more than a  
>half-century ago, this NPR offers a chilling glimpse into the world of  
>nuclear-war planners: With a Strangelovian genius, they cover every  
>conceivable circumstance in which a president might wish to use nuclear  
>weapons--planning in great detail for a war they hope never to wage.  
>  
>In this top-secret domain, there has always been an inconsistency between  
>America's diplomatic objectives of reducing nuclear arsenals and preventing  
>the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, on the one hand, and the  
>military imperative to prepare for the unthinkable, on the other.  
>  
>Nevertheless, the Bush administration plan reverses an almost  
>two-decade-long trend of relegating nuclear weapons to the category of  
>weapons of last resort. It also redefines nuclear requirements in hurried  
>post-Sept. 11 terms.  
>  
>In these and other ways, the still-secret document offers insights into the  
>evolving views of nuclear strategists in Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld's  
>Defense Department.  
>  
>While downgrading the threat from Russia and publicly emphasizing their  
>commitment to reducing the number of long-range nuclear weapons, Defense  
>Department strategists promote tactical and so-called "adaptive" nuclear  
>capabilities to deal with contingencies where large nuclear arsenals are  
>not demanded.  
>  
>They seek a host of new weapons and support systems, including conventional  
>military and cyber warfare capabilities integrated with nuclear warfare.  
>The end product is a now-familiar post-Afghanistan model--with nuclear  
>capability added. It combines precision weapons, long-range strikes, and  
>special and covert operations.  
>  
>But the NPR's call for development of new nuclear weapons that reduce  
>"collateral damage" myopically ignores the political, moral and military  
>implications--short-term and long--of crossing the nuclear threshold.  
>  
>Under what circumstances might nuclear weapons be used under the new  
>posture? The NPR says they "could be employed against targets able to  
>withstand nonnuclear attack," or in retaliation for the use of nuclear,  
>biological, or chemical weapons, or "in the event of surprising military  
>developments."  
>  
>Planning nuclear-strike capabilities, it says, involves the recognition of  
>"immediate, potential or unexpected" contingencies. North Korea, Iraq,  
>Iran, Syria and Libya are named as "countries that could be involved" in  
>all three kinds of threat. "All have long-standing hostility towards the  
>United States and its security partners. All sponsor or harbor terrorists,  
>and have active WMD [weapons of mass destruction] and missile programs."  
>  
>China, because of its nuclear forces and "developing strategic objectives,"  
>is listed as "a country that could be involved in an immediate or potential

>contingency." Specifically, the NPR lists a military confrontation over the  
>status of Taiwan as one of the scenarios that could lead Washington to use  
>nuclear weapons.

>  
>Other listed scenarios for nuclear conflict are a North Korean attack on  
>South Korea and an Iraqi assault on Israel or its neighbors.

>  
>The second important insight the NPR offers into Pentagon thinking about  
>nuclear policy is the extent to which the Bush administration's strategic  
>planners were shaken by last September's terrorist attacks on the World  
>Trade Center and the Pentagon. Though Congress directed the new  
>administration "to conduct a comprehensive review of U.S. nuclear forces"  
>before the events of Sept. 11, the final study is striking for its  
>single-minded reaction to those tragedies.

>  
>Heretofore, nuclear strategy tended to exist as something apart from the  
>ordinary challenges of foreign policy and military affairs. Nuclear weapons  
>were not just the option of last resort, they were the option reserved for  
>times when national survival hung in the balance--a doomsday confrontation  
>with the Soviet Union, for instance.

>  
>Now, nuclear strategy seems to be viewed through the prism of Sept. 11. For  
>one thing, the Bush administration's faith in old-fashioned deterrence is  
>gone. It no longer takes a superpower to pose a dire threat to Americans.

>  
>"The terrorists who struck us on Sept. 11th were clearly not deterred by  
>doing so from the massive U.S. nuclear arsenal," Rumsfeld told an audience  
>at the National Defense University in late January.

>  
>Similarly, U.S. Undersecretary of State John R. Bolton said in a recent  
>interview, "We would do whatever is necessary to defend America's innocent  
>civilian population .... The idea that fine theories of deterrence work  
>against everybody ... has just been disproven by Sept. 11."

>  
>Moreover, while insisting they would go nuclear only if other options  
>seemed inadequate, officials are looking for nuclear weapons that could  
>play a role in the kinds of challenges the United States faces with Al Qaeda.

>  
>Accordingly, the NPR calls for new emphasis on developing such things as  
>nuclear bunker-busters and surgical "warheads that reduce collateral  
>damage," as well as weapons that could be used against smaller, more  
>circumscribed targets--"possible modifications to existing weapons to  
>provide additional yield flexibility," in the jargon-rich language of the  
>review.

>  
>It also proposes to train U.S. Special Forces operators to play the same  
>intelligence gathering and targeting roles for nuclear weapons that they  
>now play for conventional weapons strikes in Afghanistan. And cyber-warfare  
>and other nonnuclear military capabilities would be integrated into  
>nuclear-strike forces to make them more all-encompassing.

>  
>As for Russia, once the primary reason for having a U.S. nuclear strategy,  
>the review says that while Moscow's nuclear programs remain cause for  
>concern, "ideological sources of conflict" have been eliminated, rendering

>a nuclear contingency involving Russia "plausible" but "not expected."  
>  
>"In the event that U.S. relations with Russia significantly worsen in the  
>future," the review says, "the U.S. may need to revise its nuclear force  
>levels and posture."  
>  
>When completion of the NPR was publicly announced in January, Pentagon  
>briefers deflected questions about most of the specifics, saying the  
>information was classified. Officials did stress that, consistent with a  
>Bush campaign pledge, the plan called for reducing the current 6,000  
>long-range nuclear weapons to one-third that number over the next decade.  
>Rumsfeld, who approved the review late last year, said the administration  
>was seeking "a new approach to strategic deterrence," to include missile  
>defenses and improvements in nonnuclear capabilities.  
>  
>Also, Russia would no longer be officially defined as "an enemy."  
>  
>Beyond that, almost no details were revealed.  
>  
>The classified text, however, is shot through with a worldview transformed  
>by Sept. 11. The NPR coins the phrase "New Triad," which it describes as  
>comprising the "offensive strike leg," (our nuclear and conventional  
>forces) plus "active and passive defenses,"(our anti-missile systems and  
>other defenses) and "a responsive defense infrastructure" (our ability to  
>develop and produce nuclear weapons and resume nuclear testing).  
>Previously, the nuclear "triad" was the bombers, long-range land-based  
>missiles and submarine-launched missiles that formed the three legs of  
>America's strategic arsenal.  
>  
>The review emphasizes the integration of "new nonnuclear strategic  
>capabilities" into nuclear-war plans. "New capabilities must be developed  
>to defeat emerging threats such as hard and deeply-buried targets (HDBT),  
>to find and attack mobile and re-locatable targets, to defeat chemical and  
>biological agents, and to improve accuracy and limit collateral damage,"  
>the review says.  
>  
>It calls for "a new strike system" using four converted Trident submarines,  
>an unmanned combat air vehicle and a new air-launched cruise missile as  
>potential new weapons.  
>  
>Beyond new nuclear weapons, the review proposes establishing what it calls  
>an "agent defeat" program, which defense officials say includes a  
>"boutique" approach to finding new ways of destroying deadly chemical or  
>biological warfare agents, as well as penetrating enemy facilities that are  
>otherwise difficult to attack. This includes, according to the document,  
>"thermal, chemical or radiological neutralization of chemical/biological  
>materials in production or storage facilities."  
>  
>Bush administration officials stress that the development and integration  
>of nonnuclear capabilities into the nuclear force is what permits  
>reductions in traditional long-range weaponry. But the blueprint laid down  
>in the review would expand the breadth and flexibility of U.S. nuclear  
>capabilities.  
>

>In addition to the new weapons systems, the review calls for incorporation  
>of "nuclear capability" into many of the conventional systems now under  
>development. An extended-range conventional cruise missile in the works for  
>the U.S. Air Force "would have to be modified to carry nuclear warheads if  
>necessary." Similarly, the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter should be modified to  
>carry nuclear weapons "at an affordable price."

>  
>The review calls for research to begin next month on fitting an existing  
>nuclear warhead into a new 5,000-pound "earth penetrating" munition.

>  
>Given the advances in electronics and information technologies in the past  
>decade, it is not surprising that the NPR also stresses improved satellites  
>and intelligence, communications, and more robust high-bandwidth  
>decision-making systems.

>  
>Particularly noticeable is the directive to improve U.S. capabilities in  
>the field of "information operations," or cyber-warfare. The intelligence  
>community "lacks adequate data on most adversary computer local area  
>networks and other command and control systems," the review observes. It  
>calls for improvements in the ability to "exploit" enemy computer networks,  
>and the integration of cyber-warfare into the overall nuclear war database  
>"to enable more effective targeting, weaponeering, and combat assessment  
>essential to the New Triad."

>  
>In recent months, when Bush administration officials talked about the  
>implications of Sept. 11 for long-term military policy, they have often  
>focused on "homeland defense" and the need for an anti-missile shield. In  
>truth, what has evolved since last year's terror attacks is an integrated,  
>significantly expanded planning doctrine for nuclear wars.

>  
>William M. Arkin is a senior fellow at the Johns, Hopkins University School  
>of Advanced International Studies in, Washington and an adjunct professor  
>at the U.S. Air Force School of, Advanced Airpower Studies. He is also a  
>consultant to a number of, nongovernmental organizations and a regular  
>contributor to the, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.

>  
>=====

## >2. "U.S. Works Up Plan for Using Nuclear Arms"

>L.A. Times - March 9, 2002 - By Paul Richter, Times Staff Writer

>  
>Military: Administration, in a secret report, calls for a strategy against  
>at least seven nations: China, Russia, Iraq, Iran, North Korea, Libya and  
>Syria.

>  
>WASHINGTON -- The Bush administration has directed the military to prepare  
>contingency plans to use nuclear weapons against at least seven countries  
>and to build smaller nuclear weapons for use in certain battlefield  
>situations, according to a classified Pentagon report obtained by the Los  
>Angeles Times.

>  
>The secret report, which was provided to Congress on Jan. 8, says the  
>Pentagon needs to be prepared to use nuclear weapons against China, Russia,  
>Iraq, North Korea, Iran, Libya and Syria. It says the weapons could be used  
>in three types of situations: against targets able to withstand nonnuclear

>attack; in retaliation for attack with nuclear, biological or chemical  
>weapons; or "in the event of surprising military developments."  
>  
>A copy of the report was obtained by defense analyst and Times contributor  
>William Arkin. His column on the contents appears in Sunday's editions.  
>Officials have long acknowledged that they had detailed nuclear plans for  
>an attack on Russia. However, this "Nuclear Posture Review" apparently  
>marks the first time that an official list of potential target countries  
>has come to light, analysts said. Some predicted the disclosure would set  
>off strong reactions from governments of the target countries.  
>  
>"This is dynamite," said Joseph Cirincione, a nuclear arms expert at the  
>Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington. "I can imagine  
>what these countries are going to be saying at the U.N." Arms control  
>advocates said the report's directives on development of smaller nuclear  
>weapons could signal that the Bush administration is more willing to  
>overlook a long-standing taboo against the use of nuclear weapons except as  
>a last resort. They warned that such moves could dangerously destabilize  
>the world by encouraging other countries to believe that they, too, should  
>develop weapons.  
>  
>"They're trying desperately to find new uses for nuclear weapons, when  
>their uses should be limited to deterrence," said John Isaacs, president of  
>the Council for a Livable World. "This is very, very dangerous talk . . .  
>Dr. Strangelove is clearly still alive in the Pentagon."  
>  
>But some conservative analysts insisted that the Pentagon must prepare for  
>all possible contingencies, especially now, when dozens of countries, and  
>some terrorist groups, are engaged in secret weapon development programs.  
>  
>They argued that smaller weapons have an important deterrent role because  
>many aggressors might not believe that the U.S. forces would use  
>multi-kiloton weapons that would wreak devastation on surrounding territory  
>and friendly populations.  
>  
>"We need to have a credible deterrence against regimes involved in  
>international terrorism and development of weapons of mass destruction,"  
>said Jack Spencer, a defense analyst at the conservative Heritage  
>Foundation in Washington. He said the contents of the report did not  
>surprise him and represent "the right way to develop a nuclear posture for  
>a post-Cold War world."  
>  
>A spokesman for the Pentagon, Richard McGraw, declined to comment because  
>the document is classified.  
>  
>Congress requested the reassessment of the U.S. nuclear posture in  
>September 2000. The last such review was conducted in 1994 by the Clinton  
>administration. The new report, signed by Secretary of Defense Donald H.  
>Rumsfeld, is now being used by the U.S. Strategic Command to prepare a  
>nuclear war plan.  
>  
>Bush administration officials have publicly provided only sketchy details  
>of the nuclear review. They have publicly emphasized the parts of the  
>policy suggesting that the administration wants to reduce reliance on

>nuclear weapons.

>

>Since the Clinton administration's review is also classified, no specific  
>contrast can be drawn. However, analysts portrayed this report as  
>representing a break with earlier policy.

>

>U.S. policymakers have generally indicated that the United States would not  
>use nuclear weapons against nonnuclear states unless they were allied with  
>nuclear powers. They have left some ambiguity about whether the United  
>States would use nuclear weapons in retaliation after strikes with chemical  
>or nuclear weapons.

>

>The report says the Pentagon should be prepared to use nuclear weapons in  
>an Arab-Israeli conflict, in a war between China and Taiwan, or in an  
>attack from North Korea on the south. They might also become necessary in  
>an attack by Iraq on Israel or another neighbor, it said.

>

>The report says Russia is no longer officially an "enemy." Yet it  
>acknowledges that the huge Russian arsenal, which includes about 6,000  
>deployed warheads and perhaps 10,000 smaller "theater" nuclear weapons,  
>remains of concern.

>

>Pentagon officials have said publicly that they were studying the need to  
>develop theater nuclear weapons, designed for use against specific targets  
>on a battlefield, but had not committed themselves to that course.

>

>Officials have often spoken of the advantages of using nuclear weapons to  
>destroy the deep tunnel and cave complexes that many regimes have been  
>building, especially since the Persian Gulf War of 1991. Nuclear weapons  
>give off powerful shock waves that can crush structures deep in the Earth,  
>they point out.

>

>Officials argue that large nuclear arms have so many destructive side  
>effects, from blast to heat and radiation, that they become  
>"self-detering." They contend the Pentagon needs "full spectrum  
>deterrence"--that is, a full range of weapons that potential enemies  
>believe might be used against them.

>

>The Pentagon was actively involved in planning for use of tactical nuclear  
>weapons as recently as the 1970s. But it has moved away from them in the  
>last two decades.

>

>Analysts said the report's reference to "surprising military developments"  
>referred to the Pentagon's fears that a rogue regime or terrorist group  
>might suddenly unleash a wholly unknown weapon that was difficult to  
>counter with the conventional U.S. arsenal.

>

>The administration has proposed cutting the offensive nuclear arsenal by  
>about two-thirds, to between 1,700 and 2,200 missiles, within 10 years.  
>Officials have also said they want to use precision guided conventional  
>munitions in some missions that might have previously been accomplished  
>with nuclear arms.

>

>But critics said the report contradicts suggestions the Bush administration

>wants to cut the nuclear role.

>

>"This clearly makes nuclear weapons a tool for fighting a war, rather than

>detering them," said Cirincione.

>

>=====

>3. "Nuclear Plan Meant To Deter"

>Los Angeles Times - March 11, 2002 - By David G. Savage, Times Staff Writer

>

>Defense: Newly revealed contingencies are designed to make clear that

>biological and chemical attacks "would be met with a devastating response,"

>Rice says.

>

>WASHINGTON -- U.S officials on Sunday defended the Pentagon's contingency

>plans for expanded use of nuclear weapons, saying the intent is to deter

>other nations from using biological or chemical weapons against Americans.

>

>The Bush administration wants to "send a very strong signal to anyone who

>might try to use weapons of mass destruction against the United States,"

>National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice said on NBC's "Meet the Press."

>

>"The only way to deter such a use is to be clear it would be met with a

>devastating response," she said.

>

>Secretary of State Colin L. Powell described the policy as "prudent

>military planning," not a plan for imminent attack.

>

>"There are nations out there developing weapons of mass destruction.

>Prudent planners have to give some consideration as to the range of options

>the president should have available to him to deal with these kinds of

>threats," Powell said on CBS' "Face the Nation."

>

>The White House was responding to a Los Angeles Times story Saturday that

>revealed that the Pentagon has drawn up plans that arms control experts say

>could signal a reversal of a decades-long policy of relegating nuclear

>weapons to a last resort.

>

>Responding to new threats since the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, the Bush

>administration now wants to consider using nuclear weapons to respond to

>biological and chemical attacks, as well as nuclear strikes, on the U.S. or

>its allies. They also are contemplating using smaller weapons that can

>better target new challenges faced in war zones: deeply dug caves and

>reinforced bunkers.

>

>Arms control advocates warn that such moves could destabilize world

>relations by encouraging other nations to develop such weapons, but some

>conservative analysts say the Pentagon must prepare for a changed world,

>where dozens of countries, and some terrorist groups, have secret weapon

>programs.

>

>The classified Pentagon report cited five nations--Iraq, North Korea, Iran,

>Libya and Syria--as posing a new level of threat to the United States that

>could require a nuclear response. The report also cites nuclear powers

>Russia and China but makes clear that Russia is no longer considered a U.S.

>adversary.

>

>The disclosure of U.S. nuclear contingency planning could complicate  
>diplomacy efforts by Vice President Dick Cheney, who arrived in London on  
>Sunday for a 10-day, 12-nation swing through Europe and the Middle East to  
>discuss with allies the next phase of the U.S.-led war against terrorism.

>

>Administration officials went out of their way Sunday to assert that  
>military planners have not targeted any nation for a nuclear attack but  
>rather are preparing for how to respond if others resort to weapons of mass  
>destruction.

>

>"Right now, today, not a single nation on the face of the Earth is being  
>targeted by an American nuclear weapon on a day-to-day basis," Powell said.

>

>Powell worried that the leak of the Pentagon report will "get the  
>international community upset."

>

>"We should not get all carried away with some sense that the United States  
>is planning to use nuclear weapons in some contingency that is coming up in  
>the near future," he said. "It is not the case."

>

>In fact, Rice said the report's big news is that Russia is no longer  
>considered an enemy. "This is a report that recognizes that, thanks to our  
>new strategic relationship with Russia, the likelihood of nuclear war with  
>Russia is less likely now than at any time and that we can indeed reduce  
>our nuclear forces by two-thirds and intend to do that whether Russia does  
>or not."

>

>Two U.S. senators on the Armed Services Committee confirmed that military  
>planners are thinking more broadly about possible use of nuclear weapons.

>

>"Originally, much of our nuclear policy was predicated on nuclear versus  
>nuclear," said Sen. John W. Warner (R-Va.), referring to the Cold War era,  
>when the U.S. squared off with the Soviet Union.

>

>"Now, with the advent of these other weapons of mass destruction, the  
>purpose of the report was to think through our policy, given the growing  
>number of types of weapons of mass destruction," said Warner, the senior  
>Republican on the Armed Services Committee.

>

>Appearing with him on CNN, Sen. Joseph I. Lieberman (D-Conn.) said the leak  
>of the Pentagon planning report might serve as a warning to potential  
>adversaries.

>

>"Frankly, I don't mind some of these renegade nations who we have reason to  
>believe are working themselves to develop nuclear weapons--and I'm thinking  
>of Iraq and Iran and North Korea here--to think twice about the willingness  
>of the United States to take action to defend our people and our values and  
>our allies," he said.

>

>White House officials made clear that the term "weapons of mass  
>destruction" referred not just to nuclear bombs but also to chemical and  
>biological weapons. Air Force Gen. Richard B. Myers, chairman of the Joint

>Chiefs of Staff, included "high explosives" in his definition of the term.

>

>The Pentagon report "simply states our deterrence posture, of which nuclear weapons are a part," Myers said on CNN's "Late Edition with Wolf Blitzer."

>

>"This preserves for the president all the options that a president would want to have in case this country or our friends and allies were attacked with weapons of mass destruction, be they nuclear, biological, chemical or, for that matter, high explosives," Myers said.

>

>"This is all about deterrence," he added. "We certainly hope to deter other actors in this world from taking steps with weapons of mass destruction that could have devastating effects on our population and the population of our friends and our allies."

>

>The classified report, called the Nuclear Posture Review, was prepared after the terrorist attacks on New York and the Pentagon. It was sent to Congress on Jan. 8.

>

>The report marks the first time an official list of potential targets has been revealed. It describes a series of scenarios that could call for U.S. use of nuclear weapons, including a Chinese attack on Taiwan, a North Korean attack on South Korea or an Iraqi attack on Israel or its neighbors.

>

>News of the Pentagon's planning was met with amazement and anger in foreign capitals, according to news reports.

>

>Dmitry Rogozin, a leading Russian lawmaker, said the U.S. report was intended to intimidate Moscow. "They've brought out a big stick, a nuclear stick that is supposed to scare us and put us in our place," Rogozin said in a TV interview.

>

>In Cairo, Libyan official Ali Abd Al-Salam al-Turiki said he found it hard to believe the U.S. was contemplating using nuclear weapons. "I don't think this is true," he said. "I don't think America is going to destroy the world."

>

>=====

>4. "U.S. Nuclear Plan Sees New Weapons and New Targets"

>New York Times - March 10, 2002 - By Michael R. Gordon

>

>WASHINGTON, March 9 — Outlining a broad overhaul of American nuclear policy, a secret Pentagon report calls for developing new nuclear weapons that would be better suited for striking targets in Iraq, Iran, North Korea, Syria and Libya.

>

>The Nuclear Posture Review, as the Pentagon report is known, is a comprehensive blueprint for developing and deploying nuclear weapons. While some of the report is unclassified, key portions are secret.

>

>In campaigning for office President Bush stressed that he wanted to slash the number of nuclear weapons and develop a military that would be suited for the post-cold war world.

>

>The new Pentagon report, in fact, finds that non-nuclear conventional

>weapons are becoming an increasingly important element of the Pentagon  
>arsenal. But the report also indicates that the Pentagon views nuclear  
>weapons as an important element of military planning.

>

>It stresses a need to develop earth- penetrating nuclear weapons to destroy  
>heavily fortified underground bunkers, including those that may be used to  
>store chemical and biological weapons. It calls for improving the  
>intelligence and targeting systems needed for nuclear strikes and argues  
>that the United States may need to resume nuclear testing.

>

>The New York Times obtained a copy of the 56-page report. Elements of the  
>report were reported today by the Los Angeles Times.

>

>One of the most sensitive portions of the report is a secret discussion of  
>contingencies in which the United States might need to use its "nuclear  
>strike capabilities" against a foe.

>

>During the cold war, the United States used nuclear weapons to deter a  
>Soviet attack on Western Europe.

>

>But now, the Pentagon report says, the nation faces new contingencies in  
>which nuclear weapons might be employed, including "an Iraqi attack on  
>Israel or its neighbors, or a North Korean attack on South Korea or a  
>military confrontation over the status of Taiwan." Another theme in the  
>report is the the possible use of nuclear weapons to destroy enemy stocks  
>of biological weapons, chemical arms and other arms of mass destruction.

>

>Pentagon and White House officials turned down repeated requests for  
>interviews on the report. The Pentagon issued a statement this evening  
>noting that the purpose of the review was to analyze nuclear weapons  
>requirements, not to specify targets.

>

>"It does not provide operational guidance on nuclear targeting or  
>planning," the Pentagon statement said. "The Department of Defense  
>continues to plan for a broad range of contingencies and unforeseen threats  
>to the United States and its allies. We do so in order to deter such  
>attacks in the first place."

>

>"This administration is fashioning a more diverse set of options for  
>detering the threat of weapons of mass destruction," the Pentagon  
>statement continued. "That is why the administration is pursuing advanced  
>conventional forces and improved intelligence capabilities. A combination  
>of offensive and defensive, and nuclear and non-nuclear capabilities is  
>essential to meet the deterrence requirements of the 21st century."

>

>Critics responded to the report by complaining that the Bush administration  
>was not only pushing for the development of new types of nuclear weapons,  
>but broadening the circumstances in which they might be used.

>"Despite their pronouncements of wanting to slash nuclear arms, the Bush  
>administration is reinvigorating the nuclear weapons forces and the vast  
>research and industrial complex that support it," said Robert S. Norris, a  
>senior research associate at the Natural Resources Defense Council and an  
>expert on nuclear weapons programs. "In addition the Bush administration  
>seems to see a new role for nuclear weapons against the `axis of evil' and

>other problem states."

>

>Classified versions of the report were provided to Congress in January but  
>the disclosure now could become a public relations problem for Vice  
>President Dick Cheney, who is scheduled to leave on Sunday for a 10-day  
>trip to Britain and Middle Eastern countries. The disclosure of the  
>administration's ambitious nuclear plans is likely to spark criticism from  
>European groups that have long supported more traditional approaches to  
>arms control. Middle Eastern leaders may be alarmed to learn that the  
>Pentagon sees Iraq, Iran, Syria and Libya as potential nuclear battlegrounds.

>

>One of the most sensitive portions of the report is its discussion of  
>countries that do not have nuclear arms. Recalling the Cuban missile  
>crisis, the report noted that the United States might be caught by surprise  
>if an adversary suddenly displayed a new ability involving weapons of mass  
>destruction or if a nuclear arsenal changes hands as a result of a coup in  
>a foreign land.

>

>"In setting requirements for nuclear strike capabilities, distinctions can  
>be made among the contingencies for which the United States must be  
>prepared," the Pentagon report states. "Contingencies can be categorized as  
>immediate, potential or unexpected."

>

>"North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria and Libya are among the countries that  
>could be involved in immediate, potential or unexpected contingencies," it  
>added. "All have long-standing hostility toward the United States and its  
>security partners; North Korea and Iraq in particular have been chronic  
>military concerns."

>

>It said, "All sponsor or harbor terrorists, and all have active" programs  
>to create weapons of mass destruction and missiles.

>

>Among Iraq, Iran, Syria or Libya none has nuclear weapons, though Iraq and  
>Iran are making a serious effort to acquire them, according to American  
>intelligence.

>

>American intelligence officials believe that North Korea may have enough  
>fissile material for one or two nuclear weapons, but there is considerable  
>debate as to whether it has actually produced one.

>

>Significantly, all of those countries have signed the Nuclear  
>Nonproliferation Treaty. Washington has promised that it will not use  
>nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapon states that have signed the  
>Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty unless those countries attack the United  
>States or its allies "in alliance with a nuclear weapon state."

>

>The policy was intended to discourage outsider nations from seeking to  
>develop nuclear weapons. But conservatives argue that Washington should be  
>able to threaten the use of nuclear weapons as a way to deter one state  
>from attacking the United States with chemical or biological weapons.

>

>Earlier this month, Richard Boucher, the State Department spokesman,  
>repeated the policy but then added that "if a weapon of mass destruction is  
>used against the United States or its allies, we will not rule out any

>specific type or response." His qualified statement along with the Pentagon  
>report raises the question of whether the Bush administration still plans  
>to abide by the longstanding policy.

>  
>One former senior American officials said that the development of new  
>weapons to attack non-nuclear states would not in itself contradict  
>American policy since it would be no more than a contingency. But using  
>them would contradict the policy, he said, unless the nations violated  
>their commitments to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty by developing  
>nuclear weapons.

>  
>"I would not say that developing a bunker-busting nuclear weapon for use  
>against these countries would by itself violate that pledge," the former  
>American official said. "But using nuclear against them would unless they  
>violated their assurance by acquiring nuclear weapons."

>  
>The Pentagon report discussed other contingencies as well. The report  
>stated that China is also a potential adversary and is modernizing its  
>nuclear and conventional forces. While Russia has the most formidable  
>nuclear force, the report took the view that relations with Moscow have  
>vastly improved.

>  
>"As a result, a contingency involving Russia, while plausible, is not  
>expected," the report states. Still, the report said that the United States  
>cannot be sure that relations with Russia will always be smooth and thus  
>must be prepared to "revise its nuclear force levels and posture."

>  
>In addition to surveying the potential situations in which nuclear weapons  
>might be employed, the report discusses the sort of force that might be  
>needed. The Bush administration has said that it plans to reduce strategic  
>nuclear weapons to between 1,700 and 2,200 warheads, a big reduction from  
>the 6,000 or so nuclear weapons that the United States has now.

>  
>Critics of the Bush administration say the cuts are roughly the same as the  
>those foreseen by the Clinton administration, which agreed that future  
>strategic arms treaty should reduce nuclear weapons to between 2,000 and  
>2,500 warheads. While the reductions projected by the Bush administration  
>seem deeper, the Pentagon has changed the rules for counting nuclear  
>weapons and no longer counts bombers or nuclear missile submarines that are  
>in the process of being overhauled.

>  
>Adding new detail to previous briefings, the Pentagon says that its future  
>force structure will have the following components. By 2012, the United  
>States will have 14 Trident submarines with two in overhaul at one time.  
>They will be part of a triad that will include hundreds of Minuteman III  
>land-based missiles and about 100 B-52 H and B-2 bombers.

>  
>"This will provide an operationally deployed force of 1,700 to 2,200  
>strategic nuclear warheads and a wide range of options for a responsive  
>force to meet potential contingencies," the report says.

>  
>But the Pentagon report said that nuclear planning is not merely a question  
>of numbers. The Pentagon also wants to improve existing nuclear weapons and  
>possibly develop new ones.

>  
>The report cites the need to improve "earth-penetrating weapons" that could  
>be used to destroy underground installations and hardened bunkers.  
>According to a secret portion of the Pentagon study, more than 70 nations  
>now use underground installations. It notes that the only earth-penetrating  
>weapon that exists is that B61 Mod 11 bomb and that it has only a limited  
>"ground-penetration capability."  
>  
>The report argues that better earth-penetrating nuclear weapons with lower  
>nuclear yields would be useful since they could achieve equal damage with  
>less nuclear fallout. New earth-penetrating warheads with larger yield  
>>would be needed to attack targets that are buried deep underground. The  
>report said it is very hard to identify such underground targets but that  
>American Special Operations Forces could be used for the mission.  
>  
>Another capability which interests the Pentagon are radiological or  
>chemical weapons that would employed to destroy stockpiles of chemical or  
>biological agents. Such "Agent Defeat Weapons" are being studied. The  
>report also argues that Washington needs to compress the time it takes to  
>identify new targets and attack them with nuclear weapons, a concept it  
>calls "adaptive planning."  
>  
>In general, the Pentagon report stresses the need for nuclear weapons that  
>>would be more easy to use against enemy weapons of mass destruction because  
>they would be of variable or low yield, be highly accurate and could be  
>quickly targeted.  
>  
>Pentagon officials say this gives the United States another tool to knock  
>out enemy chemical, biological or nuclear weapons. But critics say that the  
>Bush administration is, in effect, lowering the nuclear threshold by  
>calling for the development of nuclear weapons that would be easier to use.  
>  
>The need to maintain the capability to rapidly expand the American nuclear  
>arsenal in a crisis, such as "reversal of Russia's present course," is also  
>a theme of the report. The Pentagon calls the this hedge "the responsive  
>force." The notion that the United States is reserving the right to rapidly  
>increase its nuclear forces has been an important concern for Moscow, which  
>has pressed Washington to agree to binding limits and even destroy some of  
>its warheads.  
>The Responsive Force, the Pentagon report says, "retains the option for the  
>leadership to increase the number of operationally deployed forces in  
>proportion to the severity of an evolving crisis," the Pentagon report  
>said. As part of this concepts, bombs could be brought out of the  
>non-deployed stockpile in days or weeks. Other efforts to augment the force  
>could take as long as a year.  
>  
>To maintain the nuclear infrastructure a number of steps are planned. The  
>Pentagon says that an "active" stock of warheads should be maintained which  
>>would incorporate the latest modifications and have the key parts.  
>  
>The report says that the United States needs a new capability to produce  
>plutonium "pits," a hollow sphere made out of plutonium around which  
>explosives are fastened. When the explosives go off they squeeze the  
>plutonium together into a critical mass, which allows a nuclear explosion.

>The Pentagon said the production of Tritium for nuclear warheads will  
>resume during the fiscal 2003 year.

>  
>Another sensitive political point involves the report's discussion of the  
>United States moratorium on nuclear testing. The Bush administration has  
>refused to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban treaty, but says it has no  
>plans yet to resume nuclear testing. But the report suggests that it might  
>be necessary to resume testing to make new nuclear weapons and ensure the  
>reliability of existing ones.

>  
>"While the United States is making every effort to maintain the nuclear  
>stockpile without additional nuclear testing, this may not be possible in  
>the indefinite future," it said.

>  
>=====

#### >5. "Rattling New Sabers"

>New York Times - March 10, 2002 - by John H. Cushman Jr.

>  
> WASHINGTON, March 9 — In setting forth major changes in the kinds of  
>nuclear weapons the United States builds, and in their kinds of targets, a  
>secret report to Congress describes in detail the military gains the  
>Pentagon is seeking. But it says much less about the diplomatic price the  
>Pentagon is willing to pay.

>  
>The supposed gains will take years to achieve, since it takes time to  
>design, test and deploy any new weapon, nuclear or conventional.

>  
>The diplomatic fallout, on the other hand, may be immediate, affecting Vice  
>President Dick Cheney's reception on a 10-day trip to Europe and the Middle  
>East that begins Sunday. His mission, in part, is to build support for the  
>administration's war on terror and to build pressure on Iraq, which the  
>administration accuses of developing weapons of mass destruction. Now his  
>audiences in Europe and the Islamic world are likely to find the report  
>unsettling, the Europeans from an arms-control perspective, the Arabs  
>because it includes Iraq, Syria, Libya and Iran among the nations that  
>might be hit by nuclear weapons in some speculative crisis.

>  
>Not that a strike would be lightly undertaken — far from it. The Pentagon's  
>chief use for nuclear weapons has long been to deter, not defeat, an enemy,  
>and that remains the policy. The report, a comprehensive "Nuclear Posture  
>Review" required by Congress, does much to weave conventional weapons into  
>the nuclear mix in a way that leaves commanders alternatives to even a  
>limited nuclear strike.

>  
>But unlike the old strategic formula of mutual assured destruction, or MAD,  
>in which nuclear superpowers deter each other into a détente, the  
>Pentagon's new saber-rattling is meant to signal something different. That  
>is a unilateral assured destruction, so that no dictator could seek safety  
>for himself or his weapons of mass destruction in some deep bunker where no  
>conventional weapon could destroy them.

>  
>Critics are bound to argue that Mr. Bush is making a radical and dangerous  
>shift to a first-strike policy.

>

>But in the nuclear standoff of the cold war, the United States never  
>declared a no-first-strike policy against its nuclear adversaries; it  
>simply made massive retaliation a credible threat by building a triad of  
>air, land and sea weapons, enough of which, in theory, would survive any  
>plausible first strike by the Soviet Union, the only real strategic threat  
>that the United States faced.

>  
>Now that threat is gone, replaced by new ones, and the Pentagon is  
>describing its plan as a "New Triad" comprising a smaller number of nuclear  
>weapons, a new generation of advanced conventional weapons, and defenses  
>against weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear missiles.

>  
>Even though a pre-emptive, limited nuclear strike might be contemplated in  
>an unexpected emergency, it would probably be a last resort. Otherwise,  
>anyone considering such a strike would be open to scorn as some sort of  
>latter-day Dr. Strangelove embracing the bomb.

>  
>"The United States and allied interests may not warrant nuclear use, and  
>potential targets may not require nuclear strikes," the report says.

>  
>Indeed, the United States has not gone so far as to renounce its pledge —  
>made similarly by all the other big nuclear powers — not to make a nuclear  
>attack on any country that has none.

>  
>But the Pentagon's plans to build nuclear weapons expressly for such an  
>attack, just in case, undermines the credibility of that pledge, which  
>underpins the Nonproliferation Treaty.

>  
>The Pentagon's nuclear force will continue to shrink both in numbers, and  
>in megatonnage, as some of the new weapons would carry small  
>special-purpose warheads. That does not alter the Bush administration's  
>unapologetic premise that the quilt of arms control agreements stitched  
>together in the negotiations of the cold war era should be consigned to the  
>reliquary.

>  
>"That old process is incompatible with the flexibility U.S. planning and  
>forces now require," the report says of the old arms control process of the  
>20th century.

>  
>Why was the Pentagon untroubled by the diplomatic objections that may  
>quickly follow from allies and adversaries alike? Partly because it never  
>expected that the document describing its plan to Congress would become  
>public.

>  
>Partly because some of the countries it names as adversaries have few  
>allies with which to share their predictable outrage at being listed for  
>attack in cases of "immediate, potential and unexpected contingencies."

>  
>And partly because a nuclear superpower is always thinking the unthinkable,  
>and often building weapons that can do the unthinkable. Deterrence  
>ultimately requires both the right kind of weapons to do the job and the  
>expressed willingness to use them.

>  
>"The assets most valued by the spectrum of potential adversaries in the new

>security environment may be diverse and, in some cases, U.S. understanding  
>of what an adversary values may evolve," the Pentagon report explains.

>  
>"Nuclear attack options that vary in scale, scope, and purpose will  
>complement other military capabilities. The combination can provide the  
>range of options needed to pose a credible deterrent to adversaries whose  
>values and calculations of risk and gain and loss may be very different from  
>and more difficult to discern than those of past adversaries."

>  
>=====

>6. "U.S. Tries To Dampen Fear Abroad On Policy"  
>New York Times - March 11, 2002 - By Eric Schmitt

>  
>WASHINGTON, March 10 — Secretary of State Colin L. Powell said today that  
>there was no cause for international alarm over a secret Pentagon policy  
>review that identifies countries like Iran, Iraq and North Korea as  
>potential targets for future American nuclear attacks.

>  
>Secretary Powell and Gen. Richard B. Myers, the chairman of the Joint  
>Chiefs of Staff, were among the top foreign policy and national security  
>aides who took to the Sunday television news programs to tamp down fears  
>among European groups and Middle Eastern leaders that the disclosure of the  
>administration's ambitious nuclear plans suggested that an American nuclear  
>attack was in the works as a part of the war on terrorism.

>  
>"We should not get all carried away with some sense that the United States  
>is planning to use nuclear weapons in some contingency that is coming up in  
>the near future," Secretary Powell said on the CBS News program "Face the  
>Nation." "It is not the case. What the Pentagon has done with this study is  
>sound, military, conceptual planning and the president will take that  
>planning and he will give his directions on how to proceed."

>  
>General Myers said on the CNN program "Late Edition": "This is, again, not  
>a plan. This preserves for the president all the options that a president  
>>would want to have in case this country or our friends and allies were  
>attacked with weapons of mass destruction."

>  
>Few governments offered a public response as news of the report emerged  
>over the weekend. The two nuclear powers listed as potential adversaries,  
>Russia and China, made no official comment, but the unofficial response was  
>frequently caustic.

>  
>"I think this will be shocking to most people here," said Yan Xuetong,  
>director of the Institute of International Relations at Qinghua University  
>in China. "The Bush administration seems determined to go back toward a  
>cold war strategy."

>  
>Among those who took the reports at face value, the reaction echoed the  
>blunt assessment of one top Russian legislator. Since Sept. 11, the  
>legislator said, Americans "have somewhat lost touch with the reality in  
>which they live."

>  
>That notion of a new American unpredictability flowed through many of the  
>foreign responses.

>  
>One expert said the disclosure was likely to prove a severe embarrassment  
>to Prime Minister Tony Blair of Britain, who has given blanket support to  
>the American antiterror strategy.  
>  
>"Finding out now that at the same time Britain was doing that, Pentagon  
>planners were considering the possibility of having to use nuclear weapons  
>against Iran must make Tony Blair feel that Britain's position has been  
>seriously undermined," said Menzies Campbell, the foreign affairs spokesman  
>for Britain's Liberal Democrat party and a member of Parliament.

>  
>Vice President Dick Cheney arrived in London today for talks with Mr.  
>Blair, the first stop of a swing through Europe and the Middle East.

>  
>In Syria, another county listed as a potential target, Foreign Minister  
>Farouk al-Sharaa said his nation would complain to the United Nations  
>Security Council should the reports prove true. But the head of the  
>country's Strategic Studies Institute, Haitham al-Keilani, dismissed the  
>Pentagon report as a move to intimidate America's foes in the Middle East  
>during a period of exceptional regional turmoil.

>  
>Iraq was typically defiant today, saying the United States is fixated not  
>on controlling weapons of mass destruction, but on eliminating the  
>government of Saddam Hussein. In Iran, the cabinet spokesman, Abdullah  
>Ramezanzadeh, said at a news conference that the United States was "capable  
>of attacking any country," but that Iran did not currently regard itself as  
>a direct target.

>=====

>7. "Allies Unperturbed By U.S. Nuclear List"  
>Washington Post - March 11, 2002 - By Sharon LaFraniere, Washington Post  
>Foreign Service

>  
>Iranians, Russians Criticize Report

>  
>MOSCOW, March 10 -- Reports that the United States is reexamining where to  
>target its nuclear arsenal drew a subdued response this weekend, with some  
>European leaders dismissing the project as routine military planning.

>  
>The strongest reaction came from Iran, identified in a 56-page report with  
>six other countries as a possible nuclear adversary. While the Iranian  
>government did not comment, former president Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani  
>accused the United States of trying to frighten other countries into  
>submission.

>  
>"America thinks that if a military threat looms large over the head of  
>these seven countries, they will give up their logical demands," Rafsanjani  
>told the official Islamic Republic News Agency.

>  
>The Tehran Times newspaper, which is close to Iran's hard-liners, said the  
>report "indicates that the U.S. administration is going to wreak havoc on  
>the whole world in order to establish its hegemony and domination."

>  
>A draft U.S. presidential directive currently under review identifies  
>China, North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Libya and Syria as countries more likely

>than in the past to require the U.S. military to draw up plans for nuclear  
>weapons use. The possibility of nuclear war with Russia, the only country  
>whose nuclear arsenal rivals that of the United States in size, was  
>considered less likely than in the past.

>  
>The British Foreign Office and the Italian defense minister characterized  
>the report as ordinary military strategizing. "Military forces from time to  
>time evaluate their long-term programs even when it is hypothetical,"  
>Antonio Martino, the Italian minister, told the ANSA news agency. A NATO  
>spokesman said it was too soon to comment.

>  
>Libya's African affairs minister, Ali Abd Salam Turiki, told reporters in  
>Cairo he found the report hard to believe. "I don't think this is true," he  
>said, according to the Associated Press. "I don't think America is going to  
>destroy the world."

>  
>The military blueprint shows that the United States still sees Russia as a  
>geopolitical rival and wants to weaken it, said Col. Gen. Leonid Ivashov, a  
>former top Defense Ministry official who often voices the views of the  
>military's conservative wing.

>  
>"It's about time Russian politicians realized this and stopped having  
>illusions that Washington wishes Moscow well," Ivashov said.

>  
>One leading Russian lawmaker with ties with the Kremlin accused the Bush  
>administration of intimidation tactics. "They've brought out a big stick --  
>a nuclear stick -- that is supposed to scare us and put us in our place,"  
>said Dmitri Rogozin, chairman of the international affairs committee of the  
>lower house of parliament.

>  
>Vyacheslav Nikonov, president of the Politika foundation that analyzes  
>political trends, said drawing up contingency plans for a nuclear war with  
>Russia was an unseemly gesture for a country that says it is Russia's friend.

>  
>"If Americans are interested in cooperating with Russia in the  
>anti-terrorist operation, if they mean to continue cooperation along the  
>periphery of Russian borders, if they mean to sharply reduce strategic  
>weapons, Bush's directive is a very negative signal, which I think will be  
>perceived accordingly by the Russian leadership," he said.

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

>  
>

To: interfaithnd, ogabc@aol.com, thart@episcopalchurch.org, joe@fcn.org, rsider@speakeasy.net  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Revision in letter to Bush on NPR  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\iclt.188.doc;  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Colleagues,

I propose the following changes in the letter to President Bush on Nuclear Posture Review. The first two reflect suggestions from Catherine Gordon, Presbyterian Washington Office, for tightening the language. The changes in the next two relate to information published this weekend and derived from the classified NPR. The change in (6) reflects another suggestion received.

If any one who has previously signed the letter wants to withdraw because of these changes, please let me know. Those of you who have not signed, please let me know by 5:00 p.m., Wednesday, March 13 if you want to sign.

First paragraph:

We the undersigned representatives of religious organizations were encouraged by the meetings you and Russian President Vladimir Putin held last November in Washington and Texas. Together you told the world that the United States and Russia are now friends rather than military rivals. You each promised to make substantial reductions in strategic nuclear weapons. This follows through on your desire to move beyond the Cold War and its doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD). We look forward to your signing a specific agreement on strategic arms reductions when you meet in Moscow in May.

Third paragraph:

From this perspective we are, however, discouraged by what Pentagon planners have produced in the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). We have several concerns we would like to share with you.

Other paragraphs:

(3) Mutual assured destruction. We are especially disappointed that the doctrine of mutual assured destruction remains intact in the Pentagon's Nuclear Posture Review. The NPR specifies that "preplanning is essential for immediate and potential contingencies". It indicates that "a contingency involving Russia, while plausible, is not expected." Nevertheless, the approximately 3,500 strategic warheads in active deployment and reserve are of sufficient magnitude to cover numerous targets in Russia, as they now do under the single integrated operational plan (SIOP). Thus, in actuality the MAD doctrine prevails.

(5) Expanded role. The Pentagon plan expands the role of nuclear weapons beyond the primary role of deterring nuclear-weapon states from attacking the United States and its allies. The Nuclear Posture Review speaks of flexibility for a range of contingencies. This includes immediate, potential, or unexpected contingencies involving North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Libya. The NPR indicates that nuclear weapons could be employed against targets able to withstand non-nuclear attack or in retaliation for use of nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons. In contrast, previous U.S. policy specified no first use of nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapon state not allied with a nuclear-weapon state. We are greatly disturbed that your administration wants to expand rather than contract the role of nuclear weapons in the 21st century.

(6) Testing. Change "This seems to go..." to "This goes...". Change second "seems" to "appears".

The entire letter as revised is sent as a Word attachment.

Shalom,

Howard

To: ograbc@aol.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Revised letter to Bush on NPR  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\iclt.188.doc;  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Colleagues,

I propose the following changes in the letter to President Bush on Nuclear Posture Review. The first two reflect suggestions from Catherine Gordon, Presbyterian Washington Office, for tightening the language. The changes in the next two relate to information published this weekend and derived from the classified NPR. The change in (6) reflects another suggestion received.

If any one who has previously signed the letter wants to withdraw because of these changes, please let me know. Those of you who have not signed, please let me know by 5:00 p.m., Wednesday, March 13 if you want to sign.

First paragraph:

We the undersigned representatives of religious organizations were encouraged by the meetings you and Russian President Vladimir Putin held last November in Washington and Texas. Together you told the world that the United States and Russia are now friends rather than military rivals. You each promised to make substantial reductions in strategic nuclear weapons. This follows through on your desire to move beyond the Cold War and its doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD). We look forward to your signing a specific agreement on strategic arms reductions when you meet in Moscow in May.

Third paragraph:

From this perspective we are, however, discouraged by what Pentagon planners have produced in the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). We have several concerns we would like to share with you.

Other paragraphs:

(3) Mutual assured destruction. We are especially disappointed that the doctrine of mutual assured destruction remains intact in the Pentagon's Nuclear Posture Review. The NPR specifies that "preplanning is essential for immediate and potential contingencies". It indicates that "a contingency involving Russia, while plausible, is not expected." Nevertheless, the approximately 3,500 strategic warheads in active deployment and reserve are of sufficient magnitude to cover numerous targets in Russia, as they now do under the single integrated operational plan (SIOP). Thus, in actuality the MAD doctrine prevails.

(5) Expanded role. The Pentagon plan expands the role of nuclear weapons beyond the primary role of deterring nuclear-weapon states from attacking the United States and its allies. The Nuclear Posture Review speaks of flexibility for a range of contingencies. This includes immediate, potential, or unexpected contingencies involving North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Libya. The NPR indicates that nuclear weapons could be employed against targets able to withstand non-nuclear attack or in retaliation for use of nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons. In contrast, previous U.S. policy specified no first use of nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapon state not allied with a nuclear-weapon state. We are greatly disturbed that your administration wants to expand rather than contract the role of nuclear weapons in the 21st century.

(6) Testing. Change "This seems to go..." to "This goes...". Change second "seems" to "appears".

The entire letter as revised is sent as a Word attachment.

Shalom,

Howard

To: tlheath@churchwomen.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Letter to President Bush on Nuclear Posture Review  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\iclt.188.doc;  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Tiffany,

I am sending as a Word attachment the sign-on letter to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review. I would like to hear from you by Wednesday afternoon, March 13 if you will sign.

If you need the letter as text rather than an attachment, let me know.

Shalom,  
Howard

From: Sam Garman <sam@fcnl.org>  
To: "mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>  
Cc: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>  
Subject: briefing attendees as of 3/11 @ 10:30am  
Date: Mon, 11 Mar 2002 10:18:57 -0500  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Dean Jones, World Peacemakers  
Judy Coode, Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns  
Lauren Schumer, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism  
Michael Weiner, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism  
Pat Conover, United Church of Christ  
Rev. Lonnie Turner, Cooperative Baptist Fellowship  
Wendy Starman, Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative  
Jenny Lin, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) Washington Office  
Erica Newport Miller, Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative  
Paul Renshaw - Churches Together in Britain and Ireland  
Jennifer Potter - Methodist Church  
Dr.David Sinclair - Church of Scotland

Sam Garman  
Legislative Intern  
Friends Committee on National Legislation  
245 Second Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20002-5795  
phone: 202-547-6000, ext. 120  
fax: 202-547-6019

Date: Sat, 09 Mar 2002 22:35:26 -0600

From: "Joel J. Heim" <jheim@cc.edu>

User-Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows; U; Windows NT 5.1; en-US; rv:0.9.4) Gecko/20011019 Netscape6/6.2

X-Accept-Language: en-us

To: mupj@igc.org

Subject: Sign-On Letter

Howard,

Again, thanks for your work on this.

Please sign me on as:

Rev. Joel J. Heim, Ph.D.

Moderator, Disciples Peace Fellowship

To: hipkins james <debate44646@yahoo.com>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re:  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <20020311180934.2907.qmail@web10705.mail.yahoo.com>  
References:

At 10:09 AM 3/11/02 -0800, you wrote:  
>Have you scheduled a board meeting?

No board meeting this spring. Among other things the P/J Coordinators are having their annual retreat in April. I would like to a couple of them from the East and have a board meeting in the fall.

>I have wondering about an issue of the Peace Leaf.

I have in the works a sign-on letter to Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review. That could be the basis for an issue of Peace Leaf with some other articles. I can produce much of what is necessary if you agree. If so, what deadline?

Howard

Date: Mon, 11 Mar 2002 10:09:34 -0800 (PST)  
From: hipkins james <debate44646@yahoo.com>  
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>

Have you scheduled a board meeting? Are you planning on having one. We will be gone the last week of April.

I have wondering about an issue of the Peace Leaf. What do you think? Bush is becoming very dangerous. His commitment to use atomic weapons sounds as if the man gone off his rocker. He has delusions of power. Also, just uncovered more in Ohio on Waste from Manhattan Project in Dayton and Marion,OH. Friegthening to say the least. I don't know if the blame is on a citizenry what seems want to pull in its neck and close its ears, or the unprincipled public servants who only want to protect their behinds. Any way....Let me hear from you. God the MATURE YEARS WITH Carly's commentary. Excellent. Thank her for our copy.\\

Jima nd Char

---

Do You Yahoo!?  
Try FREE Yahoo! Mail - the world's greatest free email!  
<http://mail.yahoo.com/>

Date: Mon, 11 Mar 2002 13:32:19 -0500  
From: Ron Sider <rsider@speakeasy.net>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Revision in letter to Bush on NPR

Still glad to sign.  
Ron Sider

"Howard W. Hallman" wrote:

> Dear Colleagues,  
>  
> I propose the following changes in the letter to President Bush on Nuclear  
> Posture Review. The first two reflect suggestions from Catherine Gordon,  
> Presbyterian Washington Office, for tightening the language. The changes  
> in the next two relate to information published this weekend and derived  
> from the classified NPR. The change in (6) reflects another suggestion  
> received.  
>  
> If any one who has previously signed the letter wants to withdraw because  
> of these changes, please let me know. Those of you who have not signed,  
> please let me know by 5:00 p.m., Wednesday, March 13 if you want to sign.  
>  
> First paragraph:  
> We the undersigned representatives of religious organizations were  
> encouraged by the meetings you and Russian President Vladimir Putin held  
> last November in Washington and Texas. Together you told the world that  
> the United States and Russia are now friends rather than military rivals.  
> You each promised to make substantial reductions in strategic nuclear  
> weapons. This follows through on your desire to move beyond the Cold War  
> and its doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD). We look forward to  
> your signing a specific agreement on strategic arms reductions when you  
> meet in Moscow in May.  
>  
> Third paragraph:  
> From this perspective we are, however, discouraged by what Pentagon  
> planners have produced in the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). We have  
> several concerns we would like to share with you.  
>  
> Other paragraphs:  
> (3) Mutual assured destruction. We are especially disappointed that the  
> doctrine of mutual assured destruction remains intact in the Pentagon's  
> Nuclear Posture Review. The NPR specifies that "preplanning is essential  
> for immediate and potential contingencies". It indicates that "a  
> contingency involving Russia, while plausible, is not expected."  
> Nevertheless, the approximately 3,500 strategic warheads in active  
> deployment and reserve are of sufficient magnitude to cover numerous  
> targets in Russia, as they now do under the single integrated operational  
> plan (SIOP). Thus, in actuality the MAD doctrine prevails.  
>  
> (5) Expanded role. The Pentagon plan expands the role of nuclear weapons

> beyond the primary role of deterring nuclear-weapon states from attacking  
> the United States and its allies. The Nuclear Posture Review speaks of  
> flexibility for a range of contingencies. This includes immediate,  
> potential, or unexpected contingencies involving North Korea, Iraq, Iran,  
> Syria, and Libya. The NPR indicates that nuclear weapons could be employed  
> against targets able to withstand non-nuclear attack or in retaliation for  
> use of nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons. In contrast, previous  
> U.S. policy specified no first use of nuclear weapons against any  
> non-nuclear-weapon state not allied with a nuclear-weapon state. We are  
> greatly disturbed that your administration wants to expand rather than  
> contract the role of nuclear weapons in the 21st century.

>  
> (6) Testing. Change "This seems to go..." to "This goes...". Change  
> second "seems" to "appears".

>  
> The entire letter as revised is sent as a Word attachment.

>  
> Shalom,  
> Howard

>  
> -----  
> Name: iclt.188.doc  
> iclt.188.doc Type: Winword File (application/msword)  
> Encoding: base64  
> Download Status: Not downloaded with message  
>

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

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

Date: Mon, 11 Mar 2002 15:04:58 -0500  
From: Carol Blythe and Rick Goodman <blythe-goodman@erols.com>  
Reply-To: blythe-goodman@erols.com  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-DH397 (Win95; I)  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Nuclear Posture Review: 7 items

Howard, Stan Hasty is out of the country right now (in Cuba), but Jeanette Holt said you could list her as Associate Director, Alliance of Baptists. She can't sign the organization on without a board meeting, and didn't want to sign Stan on without asking him. She is sure he probably would, but hesitated to do that without talking to him, but she is very happy to have her name added so there are more Baptists listed!

I also forwarded the letter to Dwight Lundgren of American Baptists, and have not heard back from him.

Thanks for all your good and steady work -- Carol Blythe

PS -- I tried to call, but apparently wrote your phone number down incorrectly and then deleted the phone message.

To: blythe-goodman@erols.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Phone number  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <3C8D0DEA.637F@erols.com>  
References: <3.0.3.32.20020311094224.00690884@pop2.igc.org>

Carol,

Thanks for your Baptist contacts. My phone number is 301 896-0013,

Howard

From: SCCORP@aol.com  
Date: Mon, 11 Mar 2002 15:50:07 EST  
Subject: UMC-Church & Society Retreat  
To: mupj@igc.org  
X-Mailer: AOL 7.0 for Windows US sub 121

Dear Mr. Hallman

Since I have not received a reservation from you for the Peace with Justice Retreat to be held on April 7-10, I must assume you did not receive our mailing.

The Retreat will be held at United Methodist Camp Highroad near Vienna, VA. The retreat begins with dinner on the 7th and ends with lunch on the 10th.

We need to know when to expect you if you are arriving by air, (which airport), or if you are driving or coming by train; your meal preference (vegetarian or special dietary needs), and if you are spending the night if you have a roommate preference.

The Camp does not provide linens, towels or blankets. We suggest a sleeping bag or sheets and pillowcase.

Meals are served at 8:00 am, 12:00 noon and 5:30 pm.

Dress is VERY CASUAL.

Please share with us your special interests or areas of concern for the agenda team.

I am sorry for the lateness of this information. Invitation packets and reservations forms were sent Thursday, Feb. 28, 2002.

You may respond by e-mail to: [Bhenderson@umc-gbcs.org](mailto:Bhenderson@umc-gbcs.org) or call 1-202-488-5659.

Betty Henderson

Registration after 4:30 pm on the 7th.

There is no smoking at any meetings at Highroad.

To: SCCORP@aol.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: UMC-Church & Society Retreat  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <18.1b8b8832.29be727f@aol.com>  
References:

Betty,

I live in Bethesda, Maryland, so I'll need directions from the Beltway.

I may have a conflict Monday morning and Wednesday morning. If that is the case, I'll commute, but I may want to stay overnight on Monday. Save me a space, and I'll let you know later. I'll certainly be there for the evening meals on Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday.

Howard

Reply-To: <lisaw@nccusa.org>  
From: "Lisa Wright" <nccwsdc@bellatlantic.net>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Cc: "Brenda Girton-Mitchell" <bgirtonm@nccusa.org>  
Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] Revision in letter to Bush on NPR  
Date: Mon, 11 Mar 2002 16:24:12 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4  
Importance: Normal

Dear Howard -

Sorry - I've been completely overwhelmed by things of late - and am out of town tomorrow through the 16th. I've forwarded the letter to our director, Brenda Girton-Mitchell. Please call tomorrow and check on status of an OK (with whoever answers the phone, or Brenda), just to follow up if I haven't heard anything by the end of today.

Thanks for your persistence!

Lisa

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

**From:** Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 11, 2002 12:10 PM  
**To:** interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com; ogabc@aol.com;  
thart@episcopalchurch.org; joe@fcnI.org; rsider@speakeasy.net  
**Subject:** [interfaithnd] Revision in letter to Bush on NPR

Dear Colleagues,

I propose the following changes in the letter to President Bush on Nuclear Posture Review. The first two reflect suggestions from Catherine Gordon, Presbyterian Washington Office, for tightening the language. The changes in the next two relate to information published this weekend and derived from the classified NPR. The change in (6) reflects another suggestion received.

If anyone who has previously signed the letter wants to withdraw because of these changes, please let me know. Those of you who have not signed, please let me know by 5:00 p.m., Wednesday, March 13 if you want to sign.

First paragraph:

We the undersigned representatives of religious organizations were

encouraged by the meetings you and Russian President Vladimir Putin held last November in Washington and Texas. Together you told the world that the United States and Russia are now friends rather than military rivals. You each promised to make substantial reductions in strategic nuclear weapons. This follows through on your desire to move beyond the Cold War and its doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD). We look forward to your signing a specific agreement on strategic arms reductions when you meet in Moscow in May.

Third paragraph:

>From this perspective we are, however, discouraged by what Pentagon planners have produced in the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). We have several concerns we would like to share with you.

Other paragraphs:

(3) Mutual assured destruction. We are especially disappointed that the doctrine of mutual assured destruction remains intact in the Pentagon's Nuclear Posture Review. The NPR specifies that "preplanning is essential for immediate and potential contingencies". It indicates that "a contingency involving Russia, while plausible, is not expected." Nevertheless, the approximately 3,500 strategic warheads in active deployment and reserve are of sufficient magnitude to cover numerous targets in Russia, as they now do under the single integrated operational plan (SIOP). Thus, in actuality the MAD doctrine prevails.

(5) Expanded role. The Pentagon plan expands the role of nuclear weapons beyond the primary role of deterring nuclear-weapon states from attacking the United States and its allies. The Nuclear Posture Review speaks of flexibility for a range of contingencies. This includes immediate, potential, or unexpected contingencies involving North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Libya. The NPR indicates that nuclear weapons could be employed against targets able to withstand non-nuclear attack or in retaliation for use of nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons. In contrast, previous U.S. policy specified no first use of nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapon state not allied with a nuclear-weapon state. We are greatly disturbed that your administration wants to expand rather than contract the role of nuclear weapons in the 21st century.

(6) Testing. Change "This seems to go..." to "This goes...". Change second "seems" to "appears".

The entire letter as revised is sent as a Word attachment.

Shalom,  
Howard

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:  
[interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com)

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to the [Yahoo! Terms of Service](#).

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-4736742-43-1015884969-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com  
X-Sender: wstarman@wesleysem.edu  
X-Apparently-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
To: "interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com" <interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com>  
Cc: CCTPP <cctpp@wesleysem.edu>  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
From: STARMAN WENDY <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>  
Mailing-List: list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com; contact interfaithnd-owner@yahoogroups.com  
Delivered-To: mailing list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com>  
Date: Mon, 11 Mar 2002 16:26:12 -0500  
Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] Nuclear Posture Review briefing on March 22

Howard,

Count me in! I'll see you on March 22.

Regards,

Wendy Starman

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
Sent: Friday, February 22, 2002 10:13 AM  
To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
Subject: [interfaithnd] Nuclear Posture Review briefing on March 22

Dear Colleagues:

We have rescheduled the meeting with Frank Miller of the National Security Council staff to provide a briefing for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on the Nuclear Posture Review. It will take place from 1:25 to 2:30 p.m., Friday, March 22 in Conference Room 2, Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.

Because we had a discussion of the Nuclear Posture Review on February 15 when Mr. Miller didn't show up, we have started to develop our position on the NPR. Therefore, we might want to work out our views in advance and be prepared to present them to Mr. Miller at the briefing. More on this later.

Shalom,  
Howard

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

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

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:  
interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

----- Yahoo! Groups Sponsor ----->

Buy Stock for \$4.

No Minimums.

FREE Money 2002.

<http://us.click.yahoo.com/BgmYkB/VovDAA/ySSFAA/nJ9qlB/TM>

----->

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:  
interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>