

From: Janet Horman <JHorman@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: P/J Retreat
Date: Mon, 11 Mar 2002 17:23:06 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Howard:

I'm sure that we can discuss war and peace issues/disarmament/nuclear issues on Mon. afternoon or Tues..so that will work. We've got landmines scheduled for Wed. AM.

As to Nuclear posture-I'll put it in my report to the PWJ work area..but I don't think it will require action-since I'm already authorized to keep addressing disarmament questions. I'm most alarmed about the development of useable"smaller" nuclear weapons as the next stage in the arms race...and..of course..not to diminish the necessity for working on the disposal and disarming of the large ones.

Janet

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2002 4:55 PM
To: Janet Horman
Subject: P/J Retreat

Janet,

I'm looking forward to the Peace with Justice Coordinators retreat. I may have to miss the Monday morning and Wednesday morning sessions because of schedule conflicts. If you are going to discuss nuclear disarmament, and I hope you do, could it occur on Monday afternoon or some time on Tuesday?

Howard

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

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

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

Janet,

I'm looking forward to the Peace with Justice Coordinators retreat. I may have to miss the Monday morning and Wednesday morning sessions because of schedule conflicts. If you are going to discuss nuclear disarmament, and I hope you do, could it occur on Monday afternoon or some time on Tuesday?

Howard

Date: Mon, 11 Mar 2002 19:18:39 -0800 (PST)
From: hipkins james <debate44646@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re:
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Your idea for issue sounds good. I really do not have target date. We could get out as soon as you are ready. I am open as possible. Wait for reply from. I think we can fill in. The Bush rehtoric is getting worse each week. God knows what he will propose next week. Keep in touch and let me know.

Jim

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

Do You Yahoo!?
Try FREE Yahoo! Mail - the world's greatest free email!

<http://mail.yahoo.com/>

From: Michael Weiner mweiner@rac.org
To: "mupj@igc.org" mupj@igc.org
Subject: npr letter
Date: Mon, 11 Mar 2002 18:15:04 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

I'm sorry I've been slow with the letter. I will try to get us signed on by Wednesday. In the meantime, could you send me a list of the organizations that have signed on so far?

Thanks,
Mike

Michael Weiner
Legislative Assistant
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism
2027 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
phone: (202) 387-2800
fax: (202) 667-9070
mweiner@rac.org
<http://www.rac.org>

To: Michael Weiner <mweiner@rac.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: npr letter
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <23B701418684D21182F600A0C9D60D05AA6F27@racsrv.rac.org>
References:

At 06:15 PM 3/11/02 -0500, you wrote:

> In the meantime, could you send me a list of the organizations that
>have signed on so far? Thanks,
>Mike

Mike,

Here is the list you requested.

Howard

###

Signers of Letter to President Bush on Nuclear Posture Review
(as of 3-11-02)

Jeanette Holt, Associate Director, Alliance of Baptists

James Matlack, Director, Washington Office, American Friends Service Committee

Rev. Ken Sehested, Executive Director, Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America

Lonnie Turner, Representative to the Diplomatic/Business Community
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship

Rev. Joel J. Heim, Ph.D., Moderator, Disciples Peace Fellowship

Ronald J. Sider, President, Evangelicals for Social Action.

Murray Polner, Chair, Jewish Peace Fellowship

Rev. J. Daryl Byler, Director, Washington Office, Mennonite Central Committee, U.S.

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

Kathy Thornton, RSM, National Coordinator, NETWORK:
A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby

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

Pat Conover, Legislative Director, United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries

Meg Riley, Director, Washington Office for Faith in Action, Unitarian Universalist Association

PENDING

Church of the Brethren, Washington Office

Church Women United

Friends Committee on National Legislation

Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs

National Council of Churchs

Pax Christi, USA

Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism

Sojourners

United Methodist General Board of Church and Society

To: oneilsp@netzero.net
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter to Bush on NPR
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Steve,

When I sent around the first draft of the letter to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review, you indicated that you would sign. Please give me the name, title, and organizational name for the signer.

Thanks,
Howard

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0
Date: Tue, 12 Mar 2002 08:58:51 -0500
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Nuclear posture review & missile defense: 8 items

1. "Nuclear Use As 'Option' Clouds Issue" - L.A. Times
2. "'Rogue' Nations Policy Builds On Clinton's Lead" - Wash. Post
3. "Pentagon's Nuclear Plan Angers Targeted Nations" - AP
4. "Critics Fault Rumsfeld For Cutting Oversight Of Antimissile Plan" - Boston Globe
5. "Russia Assails U.S. Stance On Arms Reduction" - N.Y. Times
6. "U.S. Nuclear Report Threatens To Widen New Rift With Russia" - W.S. Journal
7. "America As Nuclear Rogue" - N.Y. Times
8. "Our Evolving Nuclear Posture" - Wash. Times editorial

=====

1. "Nuclear Use As 'Option' Clouds Issue"
Los Angeles Times - March 12, 2002 - By Doyle McManus, Times Staff Writer

News Analysis

WASHINGTON During the Cold War, the purpose of U.S. nuclear weapons was straightforward: to deter an attack on the United States by the other nuclear superpower, the Soviet Union.

But now the most frightening threats to American security come not from nuclear powers, but from terrorists such as Osama bin Laden and rogue states such as Iraq. The Pentagon's proposed new nuclear strategy, outlined in a secret report that came to light last week, is intended to make atomic weapons useful again by making them threatening to a new set of enemies.

The report, called the Nuclear Posture Review, proposed building a new generation of atomic weapons designed not to destroy the nuclear arsenals of Russia or China but to attack underground command posts and biological weapon facilities.

The overall purpose, Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld wrote, is "to provide the president with a range of options to defeat any aggressor."

But the study has provoked vigorous debate among nuclear strategists on several counts.

Should the United States use nuclear weapons against nonnuclear forces, a significant change in policy? Will the new strategy make it more likely that the United States or any other nuclear power, a group that includes China, India and Pakistan, would use atomic weapons in a crisis? And do we even know that nuclear weapons would successfully deter terrorists or tyrants?

"We thought we could deter the Soviet Union, because the Soviets had a lot of people and other assets to protect," said Hans Binnendijk, a nuclear

weapon expert at the Pentagon's National Defense University. "But we're not sure that theology works anymore. . . . Rogue states and nonstate actors [such as terrorists] have less to lose."

Bush administration officials acknowledge that it will be difficult to deter attacks by rogue states or terrorists. But they said the report's emphasis on new kinds of nuclear weapons is intended to make that kind of deterrence possible not to make a nuclear war easier to start.

"We all want to make the use of weapons of mass destruction less likely," National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice said in a television interview. "The way that you do that is to send a very strong signal to anyone who might try to use weapons of mass destruction against the United States that [they] would be met with a devastating response."

But liberal critics argue that the administration's new course is hazardous too.

"This is a very dangerous policy," said Joseph Cirincione, a nuclear proliferation expert at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. "The test is: How would we feel if other countries adopted the same policy? I'm not talking about rogue states. What if India developed nuclear weapons to go after terrorists in the Himalayas? Would we feel safer then?"

Administration officials said the new policy, which is still evolving, wasn't designed principally to deal with terrorists but rather with the threat of biological weapons, especially in the hands of a regime such as Saddam Hussein's in Iraq.

A Counter to Threat of Biological Warfare

If a hostile regime attacked the United States with a virulent biological agent such as smallpox, the casualty figures could resemble those from a nuclear exchange, one official said.

"Because the facts of biological weapons are so enormous, we have to do all we can to deter their use," a senior official said. "One of the ways you deter is to make it clear you're not ruling any options off the table."

Thus, in the administration's view, building new nuclear weapons designed for use against smaller countries doesn't make their use any more likely. Instead, it should make their use less likely by deterring attacks against the United States.

The same logic is behind the Pentagon's interest in building new "Earthpenetrating weapons" with nuclear warheads to destroy underground bunkers, such as those Bin Laden used in Afghanistan.

"If we were in a conventional war with a country that used biological weapons against our soldiers or our homeland, I can envision a president retaliating by using these weapons against their leaders," Binnendijk said. "And if that becomes a credible threat if their leaders know it's there then it also becomes a deterrent."

But critics don't buy that argument.

"The administration has . . . eliminated the line between nuclear weapons and chemical and biological weapons," Cirincione said. "They talk about 'weapons of mass destruction' as if mustard gas were the equivalent of a nuclear weapon that could destroy a city. It just isn't true."

"The United States used to tell countries that if they did not acquire nuclear weapons, we would not attack them with our nuclear weapons. This administration has abandoned that policy. . . . Now there's no reason for other countries to refrain from acquiring nuclear weapons."

U.S. military strategists considered using nuclear weapons several times in the last half century but always shied away.

During the Cold War, Pentagon officials considered using nuclear weapons against Communist forces in China, North Korea and North Vietnam. And the United States stationed thousands of nuclear artillery shells and other tactical nuclear weapons in Western Europe for use in the event of a Soviet ground invasion.

In 1991, President Bush warned that he might retaliate with nuclear weapons if Iraqi leader Hussein used chemical weapons against U.S. forces. But Bush later wrote that he never intended to carry out the threat.

In 1996, during the Clinton administration, Defense Secretary William J. Perry renewed the warning, saying a nation that used chemical weapons "would have to fear the consequences of a response from any weapon in our inventory."

In a sense, one official said, the Bush administration is merely taking that policy and calling for new weapons to make it more effective.

Some Want Debate to Focus on Strategic Issues

Administration officials did not seem especially perturbed by the leak of the Nuclear Posture Review, even though the report was officially classified. Some said privately that a national debate on nuclear strategy might be healthy.

But they complained that newspapers that reported on the issue focused on the report's list of seven countries as nuclear targetsRussia, China, North Korea, Iran, Iraq, Syria and Libyamore than larger strategic issues.

"The main thing we're trying to do is to reduce our dependence on nuclear weapons," a senior official said. "That report isn't just about new nuclear systems. It also says we should rely more on conventional weapons and on defensive systems."

=====

2. "Rogue' Nations Policy Builds On Clinton's Lead"
Washington Post - March 12, 2002 - By Walter Pincus, Washington Post Staff Writer

The Bush administration's nuclear posture review, which listed seven rogue nations as possible targets for U.S. nuclear weapons, follows a pattern set five years ago by a nuclear directive signed by thenPresident Bill Clinton.

The Clinton presidential decision directive, called PDD60, reduced the number of U.S. nuclear weapons targeted for immediate launch on Russian conventional forces while adding several types of targets in China. PDD60 was seen as preparing the groundwork for sharp reductions in U.S. nuclear weapons by declaring an end to the Reagan doctrine of fighting and winning a nuclear war.

The Clinton directive also introduced the postCold War concept of preparing targets in other countries, which it termed "adaptive planning," a former senior Pentagon official said. That same phrase is used in the Bush report.

Under that concept, contingency plans were drawn up during the Clinton administration to target countries other than Russia and China as had been done in earlier administrations, but this time to include "rogue" nations. Uptodate intelligence was kept on weapons of mass destruction facilities in Iran, Iraq, North Korea and other "rogue" nations. Updates were continuously passed to nuclear target planners at the U.S. Strategic Command, this official said.

"There were no immediate plans on the shelf for target packages [for those countries] to give to bombers or missile crews, but we could produce targeting information for those countries within hours," the former official said.

He said visitors to the U.S. Strategic Command in the 1990s, who had the required security clearances, were shown the capabilities of adaptive planning. Classified charts displayed the chemical, biological or nuclear facilities in rogue nations that could be hit by nuclear weapons. In addition, the official said, "We could show even the distribution of the plumes of chemical or biological fallout after the attack took place."

"Nothing has changed," this official said, as far as he could tell from reading recent reports about classified sections of the Bush review, which was sent to Congress in early January. He noted that one author of the Clinton directive who worked on nuclear issues and PDD60 in the Pentagon, Franklin Miller, today works in a senior position dealing with nuclear weapons as a staff member of President Bush's National Security Council.

Another former Pentagon official noted yesterday that contingency nuclear targeting of Iran dates to the hostage crisis of 1979, and that of Iraq to the Persian Gulf War in 1991.

In advance of Operation Desert Storm, thenPresident George H.W. Bush wrote to Iraqi President Saddam Hussein saying that any use of biological or chemical weapons against U.S. or coalition forces could result in "the strongest possible response," a phrase widely interpreted to imply nuclear retaliation.

The Clinton administration picked up that concept in 1996, when thenDefense Secretary William Perry said, "If some nation were to attack the United

States with chemical weapons, then they would have to fear the consequences of a response from any weapon in our inventory. . . . We could make a devastating response without the use of nuclear weapons, but we would not forswear the possibility."

That idea also appeared in PDD60 and is repeated in the Bush review.

Among other parallels between the Clinton directive and the recent Bush nuclear posture review is the concept that nuclear weapons would remain the cornerstone of U.S. security for the foreseeable future. Bush's document, however, sets the need for such weapons out at least 50 years.

Clinton called for retention of the triad of land and seabased intercontinental missiles plus strategic bombers, while the Bush review calls for development of a new generation of these delivery systems: a new landbased ICBM by 2020, a new submarinelaunched missile and submarine to launch it by 2030, and a new heavy bomber by 2040.

Some arms control specialists have criticized the Bush nuclear posture review for appearing to lower the threshold on the possible use of such weapons.

"What the nuclear posture review does is [it] details and confirms that the Bush administration is seeking to increase, not decrease, the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. foreign and military policy," said Darryl Kimball, director of the nonprofit Arms Control Association.

In London yesterday, the first stop on a tour that will take him to the Middle East, Vice President Cheney dismissed the idea that the posture review indicated that Washington was preparing preemptive nuclear strikes on Iraq or other nations mentioned.

Cheney described the report as one required by Congress "on the overall state of our capabilities and [it] gives some idea of the directions we'd like to move in in the future." The vice president went on: "But the notion that I've seen reported in the press that somehow this means we are preparing preemptive nuclear strikes . . . I'd say that's a bit over the top."

3. "Pentagon's Nuclear Plan Angers Targeted Nations"
Philadelphia Inquirer - March 12, 2002 - By Burt Herman, Associated Press

MOSCOW Russia demanded answers, China said it was "deeply shocked," and Iran likened the United States to terrorists yesterday over reports that they had been targeted for nuclear strikes under a Pentagon contingency plan.

A classified report sent by the U.S. Defense Department to Congress outlined the possible use of nuclear weapons against countries that possess or are developing weapons of mass destruction. The "nuclear posture review" identified seven nations: China, Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Russia and Syria.

Explanations over the weekend by Secretary of State Colin L. Powell and national security adviser Condoleezza Rice that the United States does not

plan to use nuclear weapons did not satisfy Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov.

He said Russia expected answers from a "higher level" that would "make things clear and calm the international community, convincing it that the United States does not have such plans."

Russian Defense Minister Sergei Ivanov, en route yesterday to Washington on a previously scheduled trip, said he would ask Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld for an explanation.

China's Foreign Ministry spokesman Sun Yuxi said "China, like other countries, is deeply shocked" to be one of the seven, adding, "The U.S. side bears the responsibility to make an explanation on this matter."

Sun said China and the United States had an agreement not to target each other with nuclear weapons and said China's small nuclear arsenal threatened no nation.

Iran tagged by President Bush as part of an "axis of evil" offered an angry response.

Government spokesman Abdollah Ramezanladeh said the report showed that America would never observe international laws on use of nuclear weapons, the official Islamic Republic News Agency reported.

"The Islamic Republic believes that the era of using force to push forward international relations is long past, and those who resort to the logic of force follow exactly the same logic as terrorists, although they are in the position of power," Ramezanladeh told the news agency.

Other countries named in the report were silent.

The Iraqi newspaper Babil, owned by President Saddam Hussein's eldest son, reported on the U.S. move without comment and officials said nothing.

Nations not cited in the U.S. report reacted gingerly.

The Times of London was more measured, saying the nuclear policy review was simply a theoretical exercise examining the circumstances in which nuclear weapons might be used.

"This is less Dr. Strangelove than the territory that comes with superpower status," the paper said in an editorial.

4. "Critics Fault Rumsfeld For Cutting Oversight Of Antimissile Plan"
Boston Globe - March 9, 2002 - By Susan Milligan, Globe staff

WASHINGTON Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld's littlepublicized decision to reduce internal oversight and monitoring of the US missile defense program has raised fresh concern among scientists and lawmakers who think that the costly experimental program should have more, not less, scrutiny.

The program, which traces its roots to the "star wars" missile shield proposed by the Reagan administration, has drawn political fire because of questions about its cost, effectiveness, and usefulness against a wide range of potential threats. For example, a March 4 General Accounting Office report disclosed that the missile failed a 1997 test, even though reports at the time said it had been successful.

In the past five years, three of five antimissile tests have hit their targets, according to the Pentagon. Critics note, however, that the tests have been radically altered to increase the probability of success. Only a single decoy missile has been deployed, rather than the scores expected in an actual attack, and the target missile has been equipped with a homing beacon to guide the interceptor.

Despite the questions, Rumsfeld announced in January that the program would be subject to less internal oversight, and critics say it would get less independent monitoring of its tests.

Lieutenant Colonel Rick Lehner, a spokesman for the Missile Defense Agency, said the new configuration does not shut out congressional oversight. Lehner said the change was simply an effort to streamline what was otherwise a cumbersome bureaucratic process.

"The guidance given to MDA is to develop the technology for missile defense as soon as possible," he said. "In order to do that, there are some obvious changes to the normal development and acquisitions process."

With a January directive, Rumsfeld elevated the program to agency status. His directive frees the Missile Defense Agency from normal Pentagon requirements that program managers show they have passed certain milestones before the program can be continued.

Usually, managers of weapons systems have to periodically demonstrate that the program is progressing and indicate how close it is to meeting its intended purpose. Removing that requirement means that the program could move along more swiftly, unimpeded by questions from elsewhere in the Defense Department or from lawmakers tracking its progress.

The agency would have more authority to move money around within its own budget, rankling critics who believe that the change could shield the process from congressional appropriators and dilute the role of Congress in deciding where and how federal dollars are spent.

"This new MDA program seems to be designed to spend money, not necessarily to reach results," said Representative Martin T. Meehan, Democrat of Lowell and a member of the House Armed Services Committee. "We're investing [nearly] \$8 billion in missile defense this year, and we're being asked not to attach any strings onto that money. I don't think that's the kind of accountability the taxpayers demand."

Theodore Postol, a physicist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a frequent critic of the missile defense program, charged that the new agency was intended to push through what he called a questionable program

without holding it to historical Pentagon standards.

"I think it's designed to basically remove all requirements for performance, so there's no standard for judging the system," Postol said.
"They essentially remove all standards whatsoever from the process."

It is unclear whether Rumsfeld can make the changes unilaterally, said staff members and lawmakers in both parties. But Congress could use its appropriations power to pressure the defense secretary to reverse himself if there is enough concern on Capitol Hill, the staff members said.

Some members of Congress are already grumbling that the Bush administration is not consulting with them, particularly on military matters.

But Lehner insisted that "oversight from Congress hasn't changed at all," pointing out that Congress has control over overall budgeting.

But some lawmakers and defense specialists disagree. "There's a question there as to whether there's going to be enough oversight," said William Lynn, vice president of DFI International and an undersecretary of defense during the Clinton administration. "The question is, are we going to get something that works?"

About \$60 billion has been spent on the missile defense program since the mid-1980s. This year's budget is \$7.8 billion, an increase of more than 50 percent over last year, and President Bush is asking Congress for \$7.8 billion for next year.

Democrats in both houses are expected to try to use the missile defense issue as a way to discuss the role of the US military in the post-Sept. 11 world. Some Democrats have begun to question the scope and vision of the administration's mission against terrorism, but are skittish about criticizing the president while US troops are in combat.

But supporters of missile defense argue that the current crisis reinforces the need for such a weapon by showing how dangerous the world remains.

"The prospects are very good and obviously dramatically improved since 9/11," said Representative Mark Kirk, an Illinois Republican on the House Armed Services Committee.

As a reserve naval officer, Kirk was at the Pentagon in 1994, when a North Korean missile, later determined to be a test weapon, was spotted cruising toward the US West Coast. Commanders discussed two unpalatable options: waiting until the missile landed and thus risking the annihilation of 4 million Americans in Seattle or firing back at North Korea, potentially killing even more.

Fortunately, Kirk recalled, the missile landed short of US shores. "We looked at each other and said, 'There is no moral option here,' " he said. "The two options we had involved the deaths of millions of people. If we had missile defense, we would have a moral option."

=====

5. "Russia Assails U.S. Stance On Arms Reduction"
New York Times - March 12, 2002 - By Michael Wines

MOSCOW, March 11 — Defense Minister Sergei B. Ivanov of Russia warned today that the American proposal in arms reduction talks to "warehouse" excess warheads instead of destroying them would not only encourage nuclear proliferation, but could even set off a new kind of arms race.

Mr. Ivanov's statement, in written answers to questions from The New York Times, was issued as he flew to Washington for four days of talks on arms control, terrorism and other issues. It underscored the fact that despite hopes of sealing a major arms reduction agreement by late May, when President Bush plans to visit Moscow, the two sides remain at loggerheads as to what arms reduction actually means.

Russian negotiators, who propose cutting their nuclear force to as few as 1,500 warheads, insist that any excess warheads be destroyed, along with launch vehicles and other essentials. That was the practice in every previous nuclear arms reduction accord.

The Bush administration has said it wants to reduce the 6,000-warhead arsenal of the United States to between 1,700 and 2,200 warheads. But it intends to keep an unspecified share of those excess warheads and their carriers in storage, ready for retrieval in a matter of weeks or months if necessary.

Today, Mr. Ivanov said Russian policy "is based on the irreversibility of the reduction of strategic weapons." The American proposal — to store the warheads, and retrofit some idled missiles and planes with high-precision conventional bombs — is unacceptable, he said.

"Can such a reduction be considered a real one? Make your own judgment," Mr. Ivanov said today. "If, at a certain point, the United States considers the situation to be taking an `unfavorable turn,' then within several weeks, months or years the number of operationally deployed warheads may be restored to the desired level."

He maintained that other nations would feel compelled to warehouse their own nuclear weapons for emergencies, worsening the problem of controlling nuclear arms stocks. He also predicted that the American plan would start a new kind of arms race by forcing other nations — presumably, Russia — to develop speedier methods of restoring idled nuclear weapons to battle readiness.

The Kremlin echoed Mr. Ivanov's sober view of the nuclear arms situation today by officially condemning a leaked Pentagon report that includes Russia among seven nations identified as plausible targets for American nuclear strikes. The report, a periodic review of nuclear strategy, focuses largely on the need to deter or defeat nations like Iraq that are thought to be developing weapons of mass destruction that could be used in regional wars against American allies or as terrorist weapons.

The report's authors conclude that while relations with Russia have dramatically improved, the United States should make contingencies for an unanticipated reversal that could revive cold war hostilities.

Today the Russian foreign minister, Igor S. Ivanov, called on the Bush administration to explain the report. His spokesman, Aleksandr Yakovenko, told reporters it remained to be seen "to what point this information corresponds to reality.

"If it does, how can you reconcile it with declarations of the United States that it no longer considers Russia as an enemy?" he said.

After two days of silence, China's government also issued a statement saying it was "deeply shocked" by newspaper reports that it, too, was among the seven nations labeled potential targets. The classified analysis identified Beijing as a potentially hostile power with an expanding nuclear force, and speculated that the United States could respond with nuclear weapons should China launch an attack on Taiwan.

The spokesman for China's Foreign Ministry, Sun Yuxi, demanded an explanation of the report, saying the United States and China had long agreed not to regard each other as targets for nuclear arms.

He also stressed China's opposition to using or threatening to use nuclear weapons against a nonnuclear nation, an underlying theme of the Pentagon report. The report discusses at length the possibility of using small nuclear arms on precise targets to wipe out chemical or biological weapons sites in locations like underground bunkers that are invulnerable to ordinary bombs.

One rationale for considering this possibility is that chemical and biological weapons can be as devastating as nuclear ones, and that the United States might have no choice were it faced with clear evidence that such arms were about to be used against its citizens.

American officials have strongly defended the Pentagon analysis, saying it is a duty of military planners to prepare for any conceivable war. While the document outlines potential nuclear strategies, they say, it does not change American policy and does not imply that any of the nations mentioned have in fact been made nuclear targets.

At least one ally, Germany, weighed in with a similar assessment today, perhaps to blunt criticism in Germany itself of a Social Democratic/Greens government that is facing a tough election campaign this year and has allied itself with the Bush administration's war on terrorism, despite criticism from the left wing. "There are no U.S. plans for attack. That is an exaggeration that does not correspond with reality," said the government's spokesman, Uwe Karsten Heye.

6. "U.S. Nuclear Report Threatens To Widen New Rift With Russia"
Wall Street Journal - March 12, 2002 - By Rick Jervis, Special to The Wall Street Journal

MOSCOW PostSept. 11, Russia and the U.S. resembled a pair of dreamyeyed lovers. These days, they look like they're about to file for divorce.

A series of squabbles have cast a pall over the entente cordiale that blossomed after Russian President Vladimir Putin backed the U.S. war in Afghanistan. Having once united against international terrorism, the countries have turned on each other.

The latest irritant is a secret U.S. Defense Department policy review, which U.S. media reports say outlines a contingency plan to use nuclear weapons against at least seven countries including Russia that could threaten the U.S. Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov said if the reports were true, they "can cause only regret and concern, not only from Russia but from the entire world community."

Russian Defense Minister Sergei Ivanov said he would seek an explanation from U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld when he meets him in Washington.

Russian conservatives say the reports proved talk of a new era in relations between Moscow and Washington is wishful thinking. "Russia faces friendly nuclear strike" was the headline in the daily *Kommersant*.

Among liberals, there is disappointment that parts of the Washington establishment still see Russia as an enemy. The nuclear posture review showed the U.S. was still far from its declared aim of "moving away from mutually assured destruction to a fundamentally new, nonadversarial relationship" with Russia, says Sergei Rogov, director of the prestigious USACanada Institute. "Putin and Bush talk about our countries being allies against terrorism, but in fact the real strategic relationship hasn't changed."

The nuclear row will do nothing to assuage nerves already frayed by a burgeoning trade war between the two countries. In an apparent riposte to the Bush administration's imposition of tariffs of up to 30% on imported steel, Moscow imposed a ban on U.S. poultry imports Sunday, saying they didn't meet Russian food safety standards.

But other grievances already had been building up. Russia was annoyed by the U.S. decision to send military advisers to Georgia to help train a counterterrorism unit. It also was irritated that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has just held some of its biggest military exercises in years in Poland and Norway, close to Russia's western borders. Russia's chief of general staff, Gen. Anatoly Kvashnin, said NATO still viewed Russia as a potential adversary, showing how little had changed since the Cold War.

It wasn't supposed to be like this. When Mr. Putin backed the antiterror coalition last year, there were hopes of a new, grand bargain that would break the Cold War mold. Mr. Putin would share intelligence on terrorism with the U.S. and acquiesce to the U.S. military deployment in Central Asia, once Russia's backyard. He tacitly would accept NATO expansion, even if the former Soviet Baltic states joined. In exchange, he would get a new nucleararms reduction treaty, U.S. support for Russia's efforts to join the World Trade Organization, and a bigger Russian voice in NATO.

But so far, Mr. Putin has little to show for his wooing of Washington. Progress on the nuclear treaty has been painfully slow: Russia says the fault lies with the Americans, who it claims are insisting on stockpiling decommissioned nuclear weapons rather than destroying them. Foreign

Minister Ivanov has hinted it's now unlikely that the agreement would be ready for signing by the time U.S. President George W. Bush comes to Moscow in May.

As far as NATO goes, Russia is now being offered a new relationship, with the creation of a NATORussia Council that would discuss issues such as peacekeeping operations, arms proliferation and sea and air rescue missions. But a British initiative that would have given Russia wide decisionmaking powers in the alliance was vetoed by the U.S.

Meanwhile, even Washington's enthusiasm for Russia's WTO bid appears to be dwindling. Last week, U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick said the Russian poultry ban made it unlikely Congress would repeal the JacksonVanik amendment, a 1974 sanction which made the granting of mostfavorednation tariff levels contingent on the lifting of Soviet curbs on emigration. Removal of JacksonVanik has been seen in Russia as a small but crucial step toward WTO membership.

So far, Mr. Putin has kept his counsel. He dismissed nationalist criticism of a future U.S. military presence in Georgia, long considered part of Russia's sphere of influence, saying it was "no tragedy" for Russia. On steel, chicken, and the nuclear issue, he's been silent. He's declined to answer critics who say his foreign policy is too proAmerican: With popularity ratings that consistently top 70%, he knows he doesn't have to.

But some fear that unless Mr. Putin can point to some tangible benefits from his prowestern policy, bureaucratic resistance will grow. There are plenty of people who would be happy to see the U.S.Russian love affair degenerate into just another fling.

7. "America As Nuclear Rogue"
New York Times editorial - March 12, 2002

If another country were planning to develop a new nuclear weapon and contemplating preemptive strikes against a list of nonnuclear powers, Washington would rightly label that nation a dangerous rogue state. Yet such is the course recommended to President Bush by a new Pentagon planning paper that became public last weekend. Mr. Bush needs to send that document back to its authors and ask for a new version less menacing to the security of future American generations.

The paper, the Nuclear Posture Review, proposes lowering the overall number of nuclear warheads, but widens the circumstances thought to justify a possible nuclear response and expands the list of countries considered potential nuclear targets. It envisions, for example, an American president threatening nuclear retaliation in case of "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."

In a world where numerous countries are developing nuclear, biological and chemical weapons, it is quite right that America retain a credible nuclear deterrent. Where the Pentagon review goes very wrong is in lowering the threshold for using nuclear weapons and in undermining the effectiveness of

the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

The treaty, long America's main tool for discouraging nonnuclear countries from developing nuclear weapons, is backed by promises that as long as signatories stay nonnuclear and avoid combat alongside a nuclear ally, they will not be attacked with nuclear weapons. If the Pentagon proposals become American policy, that promise would be withdrawn and countries could conclude that they have no motive to stay nonnuclear. In fact, they may well decide they need nuclear weapons to avoid nuclear attack.

The review also calls for the United States to develop a new nuclear warhead designed to blow up deep underground bunkers. Adding a new weapon to America's nuclear arsenal would normally require a resumption of nuclear testing, ending the voluntary moratorium on such tests that now helps restrain the nuclear weapons programs of countries like North Korea and Iran.

Since the dawn of the nuclear age, American military planners have had to factor these enormously destructive weapons into their calculations. Their behavior has been tempered by the belief, shared by most thoughtful Americans, that the weapons should be used only when the nation's most basic interest or national survival is at risk, and that the unrestrained use of nuclear weapons in war could end life on earth as we know it. Nuclear weapons are not just another part of the military arsenal. They are different, and lowering the threshold for their use is reckless folly.

8. "Our Evolving Nuclear Posture" Washington Times editorial - March 12, 2002 -

Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld's mandate was to transform the military into a force capable of defeating the postCold War threats America faces. Since September 11, Mr. Rumsfeld has correctly decided that he can — no, must — transform the force at the same time we fight a major war. Part of the transformation that is still in the planning stage is described in the January "Nuclear Posture Review." The issues concerning the production and possible use of nuclear weapons are vastly different from those we faced when NATO stood against the Warsaw Pact. Recognizing this, the NPR moves us out of the Cold War "Mutually Assured Destruction" dogma into the postSeptember 11 world. Mr. Rumsfeld is rethinking the unthinkable and coming up with some cold, clear ideas.

The facts are what they are. The NPR points out that 12 nations have nuclear weapon programs, 28 have ballistic missiles, 13 have biological weapons and 16 have chemical weapons. The NPR also says North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria and Libya are among countries that could be involved in immediate, potential or unexpected contingencies, meaning a nuclear war, sooner rather than later. The report says that an IraqiIsraeli conflict could escalate into a nuclear conflict.

It is no surprise that most of the nations named in the NPR sponsor and harbor terrorists and have programs to produce weapons of mass destruction and missiles to carry them. To deal with these threats, the NPR proposes we develop new, cleaner tactical nuclear weapons that can root out the terrorists who dig so deep into mountain caves that our conventional

weapons can't reach them. The moral bar against using nuclear weapons comes from the widespread destruction they cause, killing hundreds or thousands of civilians. If small, clean, nuclear weapons are developed that will not cause those kinds of casualties, there may be a place for them in our arsenal.

The most frightening part of the NPR raises the need to develop and use nuclear weapons to respond to chemical, biological and other attacks it euphemistically calls "surprising military developments." The threat of a suitcasesized nuclear weapon being smuggled into the United States must be among them. The Russians have them, the Chinese may have them, and if anything is certain, terrorists are seeking them actively.

All of which leads us to the somewhat puzzling fact that Russia has been downgraded as a nuclear threat, reportedly at the bequest of President Bush himself. Mr. Bush obviously sets great store by his relationship with Russian President Vladimir Putin, but the fact remains that Russia is the only country in the world with a nuclear arsenal to match that of the United States. Even if Russia at this time may be an unlikely nuclear opponent, its lack of control of its weapons is a huge cause for concern.

Any nation that exports nuclear terrorism, or allows it to operate from within its borders, must know that America will do whatever it takes to prevent such an attack against us. The Soviets understood the "mutual" part of "Mutually Assured Destruction." Our new adversaries must come to understand that whatever horrible damage they may inflict on us, the retaliation will be such that the "destruction" will not be "mutual" at all.

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

X-Lotus-FromDomain: UCC
From: conoverp@ucc.org
To: mupj@igc.org
Date: Tue, 12 Mar 2002 09:33:57 -0500
Subject: meetings

Hi Howard,

I will almost certainly not be able to attend the meeting on the 22nd. I have a conflict with the Domestic Human Needs - Justice for Women and Families Working Group that meets at 1:00.

I had a note in my calander about a nuclear disarmament meeting today (3/12) at FCNL at 9:00. Did I fail to note a change of schedule or is this just some other kind of error on my part?

Shalom, Pat

To: conoverp@ucc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: meetings
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <85256B7A.005021CB.00@UCCLN2.ucc.org>
References:

At 09:33 AM 3/12/02 -0500, you wrote:

>
Pat,

This morning's meeting was one that David Culp of FCNL set up on legislative issues involving nuclear disarmament. Sorry you missed it. We would welcome some one else from UCC at the March 22 meeting.

Howard

From: SCCORP@aol.com
Date: Tue, 12 Mar 2002 10:41:54 EST
Subject: Re: UMC-Church & Society Retreat
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 7.0 for Windows US sub 121

Thanks for your prompt response.

Camp Highroad is located between Oatlands (hwy 15) and Aldie (hwy 50). Use hwy 495 and take the 50W exit go past Gilberts Corner about 1.7 miles to the first right past Aldie. You are now on hwy 734 (Snicker's Turnpike). The Camp sign is large and blue. You will cross a culvert and a bridge. The junction with hwy 733 (Lime Kiln Road). Turn right less than 1 miles to junction hwy 763 (Steptoe Road). Turn left about .6 miles to Camp Highroad.

Highroad Program Center Map is at the junction. At this time I do not know the building we will be in but it is expected to be OAK LODGE. I will be sending out further information when all reservations are in.

Betty/Janet

To: gseinstitute@topica.com
From: Global Security Institute zack@gseinstitute.org
Subject: GSI: PENTAGON REPORT REVEALS DANGEROUS SHIFT IN US NUCLEAR DOCTRINE
Date: Tue, 12 Mar 2002 09:18:57 -0800
Reply-To: zack@gseinstitute.org
X-Topica-Id: <1015953435.inmta008.27062.1022407>
X-Topica-Loop: 1700001278
List-Help: <http://topica.com/lists/gseinstitute/>
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:gseinstitute-unsubscribe@topica.com>
List-Subscribe: <mailto:gseinstitute-subscribe@topica.com>
List-Archive: <http://topica.com/lists/gseinstitute/read>
User-Agent: Microsoft-Outlook-Express-Macintosh-Edition/5.02.2022

GLOBAL SECURITY INSTITUTE

<http://www.GlobalSecurityInstitute.org>

PENTAGON REPORT REVEALS DANGEROUS SHIFT IN US NUCLEAR DOCTRINE

GSI Statement
March 12, 2002

SAN FRANCISCO: The details leaked to the *Los Angeles Times* this week about the US Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) make explicit a dangerous shift in US nuclear policy that threatens to violate US legal and political obligations and dramatically undermine US security.

"If the Nuclear Posture Review is the best that we can do, it is a political roadmap to ultimate catastrophe," said Global Security Institute president Jonathan Granoff. "We are a country which spends more on its conventional military forces than the next 15 nations combined. If we must rely on the threat to use nuclear weapons against non nuclear weapons states, and if we must develop new nuclear weapons -- essentially becoming a proliferator -- to obtain security, then what are we saying to the rest of the world?"

The NPR, a partially classified document that will guide the Pentagon's nuclear planning, expands the role of nuclear weapons beyond their core function as a deterrent against nuclear attack, suggesting that nuclear weapons could be used in a variety of circumstances, including against non-nuclear countries. The NPR even calls for the development of new low-yield "mini-nukes" that could be used against hardened underground bunkers. Though the administration has insisted that the NPR represents

a general plan rather than a specific policy, this linguistic slight of hand has not diminished international concern in Russia, China, and the United Kingdom and other NATO allies.

DANGEROUS AND DESTABILIZING

The NPR reflects a major shift in the military and ethical rationale for nuclear weapons, no longer defining them as devices of deterrence, but as weapons of war. It blurs the distinction between nuclear and non-nuclear weapons, and erodes the norms against nuclear use.

According to Princeton Professor and GSI Advisor Frank Von Hippel, who was interviewed about the NPR by the *New York Times*, if the US were to use nuclear weapons, "we would have violated a taboo that we've had in place since Nagasaki. With our enormous conventional superiority, that would be the ultimate in stupidity and self destructiveness. By using nuclear weapons, we would make it permissible for others to use them against us."

By lowering the threshold of the threat to use weapons of mass destruction, we undercut the moral prohibition against any use of such a device. This increases the likelihood of their use against the United States, and undermines US ability to criticize such immoral activity by others.

"Rather than working toward strengthening control of fissile material and diminishing reliance on nuclear weapons, the NPR implicitly lauds their political and military value, thus stimulating proliferation," said Jonathan Granoff. "If 9-11 has taught us anything, it is that we must now strengthen the global norm against the use of nuclear weapons. The Posture Review does just the opposite."

INCONSISTENT WITH LEGAL AND POLITICAL OBLIGATIONS

The United States is legally and politically bound by the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) to negotiate the elimination of nuclear weapons. This ratified Treaty is the supreme law of the land under the US Constitution and at the NPT's 2000 Review Conference the US pledged an "unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals."

Additionally the US has promised its allies and adversaries that its nuclear weapons exist only to deter their use by others, and will not be used against non-nuclear states, unless such states attacks the US in conjunction with a nuclear state. These promises, called negative security assurances, are part of the bargain the US made with 182 countries that have forsaken nuclear weapons development.

The development of new nuclear weapons also raises legal and political questions. Since building new nuclear weapons almost certainly requires new nuclear tests, these policies represent a rejection of the ten-year nuclear testing moratorium and

the death knell for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).

In the wake of announcing a withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM), Bush administration policies such as refusing to ratify the CTBT, developing new nuclear arms, and implicitly threatening nuclear use against non-nuclear states, threaten to undermine the credibility of the United States. The international community will question whether the US is negotiating in good faith to implement its treaty obligations under the non-proliferation regime. It is irresponsible to play fast and loose with the non-proliferation regime. Nothing could be more dangerous than a world without legal constraints on developing nuclear arsenals.

MISLEADING

The Bush administration has been trumpeting its recent agreement with Russia to cut nuclear arms as a dramatic rethinking of US nuclear force structure. When the administration's new rules for counting nuclear weapons are taken into account, however, the proposed cuts are little more than those contemplated nearly a decade ago by the Clinton administration. Without a treaty regime, the cuts will be unverifiable and easily reversible.

With an accounting flourish worthy of an Enron executive, the claim of reducing the arsenal to about 2,200 by 2012 proves deceptive. For under the plan, according to the Natural Resource Defense Council, an additional 7,800 intact warheads, and components for 5,000 more (for a total of 15,000) will remain in storage ready for deployment upon a mere Presidential directive.

THE ROLE OF CITIZENS

This April, GSI, through its Middle Powers Initiative, will host a Strategy Consultation at the United Nations, in conjunction with the review process of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, gathering high-level international diplomats to discuss strategies for preserving and strengthening the NPT.

There are several steps citizens can take as well. A first step is to gather reliable information about the issue (news articles are referenced below), and make it a priority in one's thinking, acting, and philanthropy. Second, write letters to the media and elected representatives. And third, and perhaps most important, is to make a regular habit of visiting elected representatives in their district offices at least twice a year to discuss those issues of greatest concern.

RESOURCES:

"AMERICA AS NUCLEAR ROGUE" *New York Times* Editorial. March 12, 2002
<http://www.nytimes.com/2002/03/12/opinion/ 12TUE1.html>

WILLIAM M. ARKIN, "Secret Plan Outlines the Unthinkable," *Los Angeles Times*, March 10, 2002 <http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/la-op-arkinmar10.story>

PAUL RICHTER, "U.S. Works Up Plan for Using Nuclear Arms," *Los Angeles Times*, March 9, 2002 <http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-030902bombs.story>

MICHAEL R. GORDON, "Nuclear Arms for Deterrence or Fighting?" *New York Times*, March 11 <http://www.nytimes.com/2002/03/11/international/11ASSE.html>

NATURAL RESOURCE DEFENSE COUNCIL
analysis: <http://www.nrdc.org/media/pressreleases/020213a.asp>

<http://www.GlobalSecurityInstitute.org>

==^=====

=

This email was sent to: mupj@igc.org

EASY UNSUBSCRIBE click here: <http://topica.com/u/?b1db9C.b2zezs>
Or send an email to: gstinstitute-unsubscribe@topica.com

T O P I C A -- Register now to manage your mail!

<http://www.topica.com/partner/tag02/register>

==^=====

=

From: Marsusab@aol.com
Date: Tue, 12 Mar 2002 15:09:59 EST
Subject: ELCA and Letter to President on Nuclear Posture Review
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 138

Dear Howard:

Please sign the ELCA on as follows to the Letter to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review:

The Rev. Mark B. Brown
Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs
Division for Church in Society
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

To: conoverp@ucc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: meetings
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <85256B7A.005021CB.00@UCCLN2.ucc.org>
References:

At 09:33 AM 3/12/02 -0500, you wrote:

>
Pat,

This morning's meeting was one that David Culp of FCNL set up on legislative issues involving nuclear disarmament. Sorry you missed it. We would welcome some one else from UCC at the March 22 meeting.

Howard

To: conoverp@ucc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: meetings
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <85256B7A.00761AC4.00@UCCLN2.ucc.org>
References:

At 04:22 PM 3/12/02 -0500, you wrote:

>
>
>Thanks for the message.
>
>I went over to FCNL at 9:00 but didn't find the meeting. Too bad.
>
>Sshalom, Pat
>

Pat, It was in the Methodist Building.

Howard

To: mupj@igc.org
From: gsinstitute@topica.email-publisher.com
Subject: GSI: "Rethink the unthinkable" by Senator Douglas Roche, O.C.
Date: Sun, 12 Mar 2002 16:21:15 -0800
X-Topica-Id: <1015978884.svc004.19954.1000027>
X-Topica-Loop: 1700001278

GLOBAL SECURITY INSTITUTE

<http://www.GlobalSecurityInstitute.org>

The following commentary by Senator Douglas Roche, O.C., was published in Canada's Globe and Mail newspaper <<http://www.theglobeandmail.com>> . Senator Roche is Chairman of the Middle Powers Initiative, which recently became a central program of the Global Security Institute.

Rethink the unthinkable

The idea of waging nuclear war is taking flight in Washington. Canada must protest, says DOUGLAS ROCHE, former chair of the UN Disarmament Committee

By DOUGLAS ROCHE

Tuesday, March 12, 2002 – Print Edition, Page A19

Nuclear weapons are back on the front pages, with news of a Bush administration policy document, the U.S. Nuclear Posture Review, which projects the role of nuclear weapons into the future -- not as deterrents, but for the purpose of waging wars. The document even names potential targets. This document and the thinking behind it are reckless. They not only jeopardize international law but the support of America's closest allies. Canada must state its opposition immediately.

The document also breaks a commitment. In 2000, the United States joined the other nuclear-weapons states in making an "unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination" of their nuclear arsenals. The United States made this commitment at a review conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which, with 187 nations involved, is the world's largest arms-control and disarmament treaty.

There are still 31,000 nuclear weapons in the world, most of them American or Russian, with lesser amounts held by the United Kingdom, France and China, India, Pakistan and Israel. At least 5,000 of the U.S. and Russian nuclear weapons are maintained on hair-trigger alert, meaning they could be fired on 15 minutes notice.

The Bush administration has offered cuts in the nuclear weapons the United States deploys, but is reinforcing its maintenance of core stocks and planning the development of new ones. By rejecting the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, it is holding open the door to resumed nuclear testing. This has greatly worried many non-nuclear weapons countries and

has already led to charges that the United States is acting in bad faith. The Non-Proliferation Treaty insists that negotiations for elimination should be held in "good faith."

Periodically, the United States reviews its policies on nuclear weapons; it did so last year, the results of which are seen in this week's alarming headlines. "Behind the administration's rhetorical mask of post-Cold War restraint," comments the U.S. National Resources Defence Council, a prestigious non-profit organization of scientists, lawyers and environmental specialists, "lie expansive plans to revitalize U.S. nuclear forces, and all the elements that support them, within a so-called 'New Triad' of capabilities that combine nuclear and conventional offensive strikes with missile defences and nuclear-weapons infrastructure."

According to the council's analysis, the Bush team assumes that nuclear weapons will be part of U.S. military forces at least for the next 50 years; it plans an extensive and expensive series of programs to modernize the existing force, including a new ICBM to be operational in 2020 and a new heavy bomber in 2040.

The administration's Nuclear Posture Review says that there are four reasons to possess nuclear weapons: to "assure allies and friends"; "dissuade competitors"; "deter aggressors"; and "defeat enemies." Over the next 10 years, the White House's plans call for the United States to retain a total stockpile of intact nuclear weapons and weapons components roughly seven to nine times larger than the publicly-stated goal of 1,700 to 2,200 "operationally deployed weapons."

Moreover, the U.S. administration has ordered the Pentagon to draft contingency plans for the use of nuclear weapons against at least seven countries, naming not only the "axis of evil" (Iraq, Iran and North Korea) but also Russia, China, Libya and Syria.

This position has prompted the editors of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists to move the minute hand of their "Doomsday Clock" forward two minutes -- to seven minutes to midnight, the same position as when the clock made its debut in 1947. "Despite a campaign promise to rethink nuclear policy, the Bush administration has taken no significant steps to alter nuclear targeting policies or reduce the alert status of U.S. nuclear forces," said George A. Lopez, chairman of the Bulletin's board of directors.

The shift in U.S. policy has immense implications for Canada and the other members of NATO. NATO has traditionally presented its nuclear doctrine as one of deterrence, not war. Canada is now caught in the middle, between its international legal obligations to support negotiations for the elimination of nuclear weapons, or to support the United States in its determination to keep them. All this will come to a head at an important Non-Proliferation Treaty meeting at the United Nations, starting April 8.

Canada has higher obligations to international law, as it is being developed in the United Nations system, than it does to its friendship with the United States, which is violating the very law that Canada stands for. Good friends don't let their friends drive drunk. It's time for Canada to blow the whistle on its U.S. friends in Washington, who are veering out of control in their pursuit of nuclear weapons.

Because of its military strength and commanding position as the world's lone superpower, the United States occupies the central position when it comes to making progress on nuclear disarmament. NATO's stance -- that nuclear weapons remain "essential" -- would fold in an instant if the United States took action in entering comprehensive negotiations for elimination. Russia and China, struggling to move their economies into strong positions, do

not want to engage in a new nuclear arms race, which is precisely what they fear will happen if and when the United States actually deploys a National Missile Defence system.

Most people do not realize that the United States spends \$100-million (U.S.) a day maintaining its nuclear weapons. Because Washington is pouring huge new sums into its defence budget -- it will soon be spending, at \$400-billion annually, more than the next 15 countries combined -- the international community has become rightfully alarmed about U.S. intentions.

Nor is the rest of the world reassured when we see the Pentagon's Web site proclaiming the U.S. intention to weaponize space and thus ensure "full-spectrum dominance" on land, sea, air and space.

Douglas Roche is an independent senator from Alberta and Canada's former ambassador for disarmament. He is a former chairman of the UN Disarmament Committee.

<http://www.GlobalSecurityInstitute.org>

[Update your profile](#) or [unsubscribe](#) here.
Delivered by [Topica Email Publisher](#).

X-Originating-IP: [199.95.168.36]
From: "Myungsun Han" mhan624@hotmail.com
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Questions about UMC Peace with Justice
Date: Tue, 12 Mar 2002 20:58:16 -0500

Hello from NJ.

Hi! My name is Myungsun Han and I am a student of Drew Theological school.

In this semester, I am taking UMC history, doctrine, and polity with Dr. Kenneth Rowe. One of the assignments of that class is to research one of the caucuses in UMC that I am interested and to submit a 15 page long paper.

I am very interested in Pacifism and peace movement. I have two reasons for my interest. First, my home country, Korea, is one of the vibrant places where the military conflict is going on. Furthermore, what president Bush recently said about North Korea, an axis of evil, makes the possibility of the military conflict in Korea more serious than before. Secondly, I plan to major in radical reformation history. I am very interested in non-violence and peaceful life of the people in the radical reformation tradition such as Mennonite.

Personally, I don't want to only write a paper about your caucus. I do want to make this chance to get me involved in the peace studies.

Thus, please, let me have information about your caucus. I have read several news settlers, *peace leaf*, at UMC center at Drew, but I want some more information.

First, I want to know about the history of your caucus.

Secondly, I want to know about the activities of your caucus inside of UMC and outside of UMC.

Thirdly, I want to know about the relationship between your caucus and the magazine, *Social Action*.

Fourthly, I want to know how I can join in you and how I can make contribution to your caucus.

If you need my address, I will give it to you. And if it costs money to send material about your caucus to me, I am willing to pay.

I am really glad to have such a nice caucus in our Methodist tradition. I am so proud.

Thank you and I am expecting for your answer.

Bye.

🌹 Myungsun Han

E-mail: mhan624@hotmail.com
Homepage: <http://cafe.godpeople.com/mhan624/>

MSN Photos is the easiest way to share and print your photos: [Click Here](#)

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0
Date: Wed, 13 Mar 2002 09:26:17 -0500
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Nuclear posture review & missile defense: 7 items

1. "Democrats Divide Over Nuclear Plan" - L.A. Times
2. "Missile Defense Outlay Draws Bipartisan Fire" - A.P.
3. "Hints Of Nuclear-Policy Shift Raise Several Questions" - USA Today editorial
4. "The Nuclear Posture" - Wash. Post editorial
5. "Nuclear Targets" - L.I. Newsday editorial
6. "A Twisted Posture" - Bost. Globe editorial
7. "Mini-Nukes Vs. Bio-Bombs" - C.S. Monitor editorial

=====

1. "Democrats Divide Over Nuclear Plan"
Los Angeles Times - March 13, 2002- By Greg Miller, Times Staff Writer

Defense: The terrorism threat plays against concerns that new bombing scenarios will make U.S. a rogue nation.

WASHINGTON -- Several leading Senate Democrats voiced concern Tuesday with a Pentagon plan that calls for the development of new breeds of nuclear weapons and an expansion of the list of nations against whom such warheads might be used.

But as the administration continued to downplay the aggressive tone of the so-called Nuclear Posture Review, there were also abundant signs that many lawmakers from both parties are prepared to consider profound changes to the nation's nuclear contingency plans.

Many Republicans voiced support for the report and argued that its central goal--the deterrence of strikes against the United States and its allies--is consistent with the nation's long-standing nuclear policy. "I do not believe it changes our basic U.S. approach," said Sen. Arlen Specter (R-Pa.).

And several high-ranking Democrats said the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks made them more inclined to back a more aggressive nuclear posture.

Changed Environment in Washington

"There are nations and groups adversarial to U.S. interests that have gotten the mind set that the United States is a paper tiger," said Sen. Bob Graham (D-Fla.), chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee. The Pentagon's call for new weapons and a wider range of scenarios in which to use them, he said, "sounds like a step in the right direction."

Such receptive reactions to a report that many nuclear experts--and some foreign leaders--have condemned underscores the extent to which the terrorist attacks have altered the course of defense policy debate in

Washington.

For much of the last decade, policymakers have largely been preoccupied with finding ways to reduce the size of the United States' nuclear arsenal and with persuading other nations to combat the proliferation of nuclear weapons and technology.

In testimony Tuesday on the Hill, Secretary of State Colin L. Powell stressed that fighting the spread of nuclear weapons remains a paramount goal. Noting that the number of U.S. nuclear warheads has shrunk by two-thirds over the last decade, he said, "The philosophy of President Bush, the philosophy of this administration, is to continue driving down the number of nuclear weapons."

But the report calls for, among other things, the development of "low-yield" nuclear weapons that could be used against smaller targets such as underground bunkers or chemical weapon facilities. The report also recommends adding such hostile nations as Iraq, Iran, North Korea, Libya and Syria to the nation's nuclear targeting plans.

Many members of both parties, including Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle (D-S.D.), simply withheld judgment.

Daschle noted that the report's urging of the development of more precise nuclear weapons contradicts earlier signals from the Pentagon. But he offered no direct criticism of the report itself. "We need more information before we come to any conclusions," he said.

Democrats See Diplomatic Setback

But several prominent Democrats expressed dismay, saying the Pentagon's proposal would put the United States on a rogue course likely to erode the nation's diplomatic leverage and encourage other countries to pursue or expand their own nuclear capabilities.

Sen. Carl Levin (D-Mich.), chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, said the plan could "reverse the direction of where arms control has been going for decades," and he vowed to press the White House for details on the extent to which it intends to pursue the report's recommendations.

Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.), a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, said the United States risks being labeled "a rogue nation going off and finding ways to use nuclear weapons."

Sen. John F. Kerry (D-Mass.), a prospective presidential candidate, said the report undermines U.S. credibility as it pressures other countries to resist developing nuclear weapons of their own. "It's very disturbing. It reduces all our bona fides on the proliferation issue."

Though the White House has a significant amount of discretion in formulating nuclear contingency plans, several key elements of the report would require cooperation from Congress.

The administration can modify existing weapon platforms, a Democratic

leadership aide said, but would need approval from Congress to develop new varieties of weapons under the terms of a 1994 statute.

And of course, Congress controls the Pentagon's purse strings. Asked what leverage lawmakers have on administration nuclear policy, Levin replied: "The leverage is funding."

2. "Missile Defense Outlay Draws Bipartisan Fire"

Baltimore Sun - March 13, 2002 - By Associated Press

Members of Congress also criticize report on use of N-weapons

WASHINGTON - Republican and Democratic lawmakers questioned yesterday the Bush administration's spending on missile defense, arguing that a terrorist is more likely to attack by truck or by boat.

"Why would someone send a missile when they can just put it in a suitcase?" Republican Rep. Christopher Shays of Connecticut asked a panel of experts at a hearing on protecting the United States from terrorism. "It's inexcusable for this administration not to recognize that possibility and act on it."

"We can't afford to waste billions of dollars" because of the Bush administration's "theological fascination with missile defense," said Democratic Rep. Dennis Kucinich of Ohio. "No threat assessment exists to justify the spending."

U.S. intelligence agencies say it is far more probable that a bomb would be delivered by a truck or a boat than by a ballistic missile. A non-missile attack would be cheaper and more reliable and could not be traced easily to the country responsible.

Kucinich also railed against recent administration comments that the United States might use a nuclear weapon in a first strike, calling it the "height of immorality ... to throw that stuff around as if it were casual locker-room banter."

The administration comments came after news reports on its new Nuclear Posture Review, which says the Pentagon is developing contingency plans for using nuclear weapons against countries developing weapons of mass destruction.

The United States has never ruled out using nuclear weapons against a nuclear-armed enemy, said Secretary of State Colin Powell, contending that the policy should deter any would-be attacker.

"We think it is best for any potential adversary out there to have uncertainty in his calculus," Powell said Sunday.

"People are playing with the apocalypse," said Kucinich, top Democrat on the national security subcommittee. "These are doomsday scenarios ... [and] it needs to be challenged."

Shays, the subcommittee chairman, said he hesitated to mention the first-strike comments "because I don't give them any validity."

Democratic Sen. Jack Reed of Rhode Island raised the issue with Powell at a Senate Appropriations subcommittee hearing. The senator cited news reports that led him to believe "we are at least suggesting the pre-emptive use of nuclear weapons" while developing new types of nuclear weapons. "It seems to me that we are turning away from what was our traditional approach to arms control," he said.

Trying to dampen the concerns, Powell said: "There is no way to read that document and come to the conclusion that the United States will be more likely or will more quickly go to the use of nuclear weapons. Quite the contrary."

He noted that America's "overwhelming, conventional non-nuclear capacity" made its potential use of nuclear weapons even more remote.

The United States will continue to reduce its stockpiles of nuclear weapons, which have already fallen below 10,000, less than half the 20,000 in the arsenal a decade ago, Powell said.

3. "Hints Of Nuclear-Policy Shift Raise Several Questions" USA Today editorial - March 13, 2002

In the four days since a secret Pentagon report surfaced suggesting new and wider uses for nuclear weapons, the Bush administration has gone to great lengths to paint it as nothing more than a planning document for possible ways to update the nation's military preparedness.

In that light, the report, leaked first in the Los Angeles Times, makes sense. Since the end of the Cold War, and particularly following the events of Sept. 11, the nation's nuclear script has needed considerable updating.

No longer does a single nation pose the greatest threat to our security. No longer can the United States depend on a policy of mutually assured destruction to scare off enemies that may be willing to destroy themselves in order to attack the USA.

But nuclear weaponry is only one part of the difficult yin and yang that form U.S. nuclear policy. Equally important is maintaining the diplomatic effort aimed at guaranteeing that the unthinkable nuclear attack never comes to pass.

If the administration were to accept Pentagon planners' new nuclear blueprint, it could gut key treaties and international taboos that have helped curb the use and proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Among them:

*Bans on nuclear testing. The United States has observed a worldwide moratorium on testing since the first Bush administration. It signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and has punished countries such as Pakistan

and India that flouted world opinion by testing anyway.

But if some suggestions in the Defense Department report were adopted as policy, it could increase pressure to resume testing for new nuclear weapons that would be designed to blow up deep underground bunkers. That would trash the regime that now helps restrain the testing ambitions of nuclear wannabes such as North Korea, Iran and others.

*The historically high threshold for the use of nuclear weapons. In all of the international crises since 1945, when the United States dropped two atomic bombs on Japan to end World War II, no nation has used nuclear weapons in anger. The new nuclear policy review proposes widening the potential circumstances for using nuclear weapons, expands the list of possible targets to include for the first time nations without nuclear weapons and lowers the bar for considering pre-emptive strikes.

That risks destroying the effectiveness of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Designed to deter others from developing nuclear weapons, it promises that as long as they resist and stay out of nuclear conflicts, they won't face nuclear attack. Withdrawing that commitment is an invitation to a score of other nations, some politically unstable, to jump on the nuclear bandwagon.

Vice President Cheney has dismissed concerns about the nuclear review as "over the top." Secretary of State Colin Powell called it only "conceptual planning." National security adviser Condoleezza Rice tried to argue that, in spite of its content, it doesn't lower the threshold for nuclear exchange.

If the document represents contingency plans and not new policy, that's good. Undercutting the agreements, written and unwritten, that have helped maintain nuclear stability and restrain atomic adventurism is too high a price to pay for U.S. muscle flexing.

=====

4. "The Nuclear Posture"

Washington Post editorial - March 13, 2002

Recent reports about the Bush administration's review of U.S. nuclear weapons strategy have tended to obscure the fact that much of what the administration laid out in the congressionally mandated report isn't new. For more than a decade, the United States has sought to deter rogue states from using weapons of mass destruction by publicly suggesting that it might respond with a nuclear strike, and Pentagon planners have backed the threat by laying out theoretical targeting plans for Iraq, Iran and other such states. The policy, which the Clinton administration continued from the first Bush presidency, has been a success: Saddam Hussein, who used chemical weapons against his own people in the 1980s, did not dare to employ them against U.S. troops or allies during or after the Persian Gulf War. You wouldn't know it from recent scaremongering headlines and overheated rhetoric, but in this aspect the Bush review has merely reaffirmed a sensible strategy.

Other aspects of the strategic review, however, raise questions that merit congressional scrutiny. When the review was completed in January, the

administration trumpeted its own headline: a reduction of operational and deployed U.S. nuclear warheads from the current total of 6,000 to a level between 1,700 and 2,200 over the next 10 years. Again, there was less news here than it may have seemed; the Clinton administration arrived at a similar figure in formulating its proposal for nuclear reductions. But while the previous administration described its proposed force as meant to deter a possible Russian threat, the Bush administration insists that Russia does not enter into its calculations. The 2,000-warhead figure, say President Bush's planners, was arrived at by estimating only the force needed to deter rogue states and to dissuade China from contemplating a nuclear buildup that would put it on a par with the United States. While that effort to move strategic thinking beyond the Cold War is admirable, the conclusions don't appear to match the new theory: Two thousand active warheads seems more than necessary to deter Iraq or counter China, while the fact that the figure matches that previously deemed necessary for Russia seems an odd coincidence. If deterrence of Russia were really not needed, then a larger number of weapons could probably be deactivated.

In fact, the Bush plan does call for a hedge against the possibility that a hostile government will regain power in Moscow. But because the 2,000 warheads supposedly don't serve this purpose, the administration argues that it must preserve the warheads it takes off weapons during the planned reduction, thus allowing for a relatively quick buildup to a force of 4,600 warheads. Like some U.S. critics, Russia is loudly objecting to this plan; administration officials reply that previous arms control agreements have not provided for warhead destruction, and that any deal mandating destruction would favor Russia, which unlike the United States has preserved the ability to mass-manufacture new warheads. The administration should be pressed to weigh such arguments against the benefits of guaranteeing the destruction of thousands of Russian nukes -- and the risks of leaving such weapons intact when their vulnerability to accidents or theft is the subject of well-justified alarms.

Administration officials say their new strategy will ultimately decrease U.S. reliance on nuclear weapons, because they will develop "new capabilities," such as high-tech conventional weapons and missile defenses, to counter weapons of mass destruction. That is a promising scenario, but it is undermined by another old idea: the development of new nuclear weapons, including low-yield warheads that could be aimed at smaller targets or deeply buried bunkers. The administration's plan to develop designs for such arms over the next three years is troubling; the presence of such weapons in the U.S. arsenal could dangerously lower the threshold for launching a nuclear attack, while inviting a new arms race among existing and aspiring nuclear powers. The Bush administration is right to focus more of its strategic planning on deterring rogue states; but developing new nuclear weapons for that threat is neither necessary nor sensible.

5. "Nuclear Targets"

Long Island Newsday editorial - March 12, 2002

The Pentagon's new policy shift is a warning, not an attack plan, and is actually overdue.

Don't overreact to the disclosure over the weekend that the Pentagon is shifting nuclear- attack planning away from Cold War targets and toward rogue nations developing weapons of mass destruction, such as Iraq and Iran. The change is simply the latest in a series of broad strategic reassessments, not a guide to nuclear targeting, as some alarmist critics saw it.

In truth, the rethinking of U.S. nuclear policy is more than a decade overdue. The geopolitical landscape has changed since the end of the Cold War. The new threats arise from nations that are not as risk-averse as the Soviet Union in their development and possible deployment of nuclear, biological or chemical weapons.

The policy review makes for unsettling reading. It details every possible circumstance in which a president might choose to use nuclear weapons. Yet the issue of deterrence is haunted by an absurdity: Nuclear weapons are too powerful and too frightening for a rational leader ever to consider using them, but to convince an adversary of the certainty of mutually assured destruction - the basis of deterrence - that leader has to develop credible weapons and plans for a war he never wants to wage.

That is what the new nuclear review is all about. It tells North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Libya, Syria, Russia - even China - that the United States has contingency plans for attacks or counter-attacks on them if they present a threat to this nation, its allies or its vital interests. The review also calls for the development of new tactical nuclear weapons such as bunker-busting mini-nukes to penetrate reinforced storage areas or caves containing biological weapons.

In concept, the new policy isn't much different from the old Cold War policy. The main difference is that the Soviets were conservative war planners who could be counted on not to take rash actions that could result in a U.S. nuclear response. No such assurance can be drawn from Iraq's Saddam Hussein, who has proved willing to take huge risks and who needs to face a strong deterrent.

There are some valid concerns about whether the new, more flexible policy would lower the threshold for using nuclear arms. But as Secretary of State Colin Powell - hardly a hawk - said, the policy review is the basis for "prudent military planning," not a plan for imminent attack. That should unruffle a few doves' feathers.

6. "A Twisted Posture" Boston Globe editorial - March 12, 2002

THE BUSH administration's classified new Nuclear Posture Review, presented to Congress in early January and leaked this month to The Los Angeles Times, proposes new departures in the nation's military planning that are questionable at best and, at worst, truly dangerous and destabilizing.

The Nuclear Posture Review, signed by Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, amounts to a blueprint for undertaking what Joseph Cirincione, director of

the Non-Proliferation Center at the Carnegie Endowment, calls "a major expansion of the role of nuclear weapons in US military policy." The new posture calls for new nuclear weapons, new missions and uses for those weapons, and a readiness to resume nuclear testing.

These are among the changes in US nuclear doctrine that make the leaked review dangerous. The hawkish proponents of these changes were lobbying for mininukes and deep-penetrating bunker-busters well before the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11. They were also proposing resumed nuclear testing before that nightmarish atrocity. The reality, however, is that nothing in the Nuclear Posture Review would be likely to deter or counter the threat from terrorists sharing Osama bin Laden's demented notion of a holy war against America.

The review threatens to become destabilizing - and therefore to expand rather than reduce American security risks - because it recommends a lowering of the threshold for the use of nuclear weapons. Until now, America's nuclear arsenal was plainly meant only to deter other nuclear powers - principally the defunct Soviet Union - from using nuclear weapons against the United States or from invading Western Europe.

Now those limits on the envisaged uses of nuclear weapons are to be abandoned. The new posture recommends that nuclear weapons "could be employed against targets able to withstand nonnuclear attack," in response to another country's use of chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons, and "in the event of surprising military developments."

If America, with its enormous technological and military advantages, says it is willing to resort to nuclear weapons under such vague conditions, what might nuclear states such as India and Pakistan be willing to do? And if the Pentagon conducts new tests of smaller, more usable nuclear warheads, why would India, Pakistan, and China not follow suit, ending the current suspension of nuclear tests and provoking a nuclear arms race?

The Pentagon's plan for enhancing "nuclear capability" and lowering the barrier against the use of nuclear weapons holds little hope of deterring new threats from terrorists or being able to eradicate Saddam Hussein's bioweapons, but it does increase the risk that nuclear weapons will be used in war. It should be revised to preserve the purely deterrent uses of nuclear weapons.

7. "Mini-Nukes Vs. Bio-Bombs"
Christian Science Monitor editorial - March 13, 2002

In a secret blueprint given to Congress, the Pentagon warns of a need for the US to build small nuclear bombs for potential use against an enemy that sets off - or even just develops - either a biological or chemical weapon.

So far, the Nuclear Posture Review isn't a plan of action. President Bush and Congress must decide whether to make such new types of mini-nukes, and when to use them. That could take five years.

But news of the idea has sparked a debate on the military and moral wisdom

of using the "nonconventional" weapon of a nuclear device (no matter how small) against a "nonconventional" weapon of mass destruction (no matter how big). In particular, a new nuclear device might penetrate chemical or biological weapons facilities underground.

The debate is not exactly new. The US deployed tactical nuclear weapons in West Europe in case of a Soviet land invasion. What's new is the suggestion that a preemptive strike with a nuclear device might be needed if a terrorist-minded nation gets close to deploying weapons of mass destruction.

Even before Sept. 11, the Bush administration contended that the mere possession of mini-nukes by the US would be a "hedge" to deter countries from developing chemical or biological weapons. Since then, the risk of such attacks seems more plausible.

"If the US is to have a flexible deterrent, it must be able to adapt its nuclear forces to changing strategic conditions," John Gordon, US under-secretary for nuclear security, told Congress last month.

As a military strategy to defend the US or its allies, the Pentagon may be right. But the administration must also weigh the long-term effects of such a course.

Will it justify other nations' obtaining mini-nukes? What happens to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and its grand bargain that nuclear nations not hit non-nuclear ones in return for those nations not having such weapons? How widespread would be the damage from these bombs? And can they be made without live testing?

The answers to such questions should not be as secret as this Pentagon paper. Congress, as well as President Bush, can educate Americans about a shift in nuclear strategy, and its implications. Public debate can help lead to the strongest defense.

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

To: kj@mfsaweb.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\iclt.188.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Kathryn,

I'm sending the letter to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review as a Word attachment. If you need it as text, please let me know.

We will welcome some one from MFSA as a signer: name, title, and organization. The deadline is 5:00 p.m., Wednesday, March 13.

Shalom,
Howard

X-Sender: methodi176@mail.earthlink.net
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)
Date: Wed, 13 Mar 2002 10:41:13 -0500
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Kathryn J. Johnson" <kj@mfsaweb.org>
Subject: Re: Letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review

Howard,

Many thanks for sending the document. I'd like to sign on for MFSA.

Rev. Kathryn J. Johnson
Executive Director
Methodist Federation for Social Action

At 09:18 AM 3/13/2002 -0500, you wrote:

>Kathryn,
>
>I'm sending the letter to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review as a
>Word attachment. If you need it as text, please let me know.
>
>We will welcome some one from MFSA as a signer: name, title, and
>organization. The deadline is 5:00 p.m., Wednesday, March 13.
>
>Shalom,
>Howard
>
>Attachment Converted: "c:\my documents\kj webmail\attach\iclt.188.doc"
>
>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.
Methodist Federation for Social Action
212 East Capitol St., NE
Washington, DC 20003
(202) 546-8806
(202) 546-6811 (fax)
www.mfsaweb.org

MFSA: An independent voice for justice in the United Methodist Church.

From: "Charlotte V. Davenport, csjp" <csjp@igc.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: interfaith sign-on letter
Date: Wed, 13 Mar 2002 11:07:09 -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 V5.00.2615.200

Dear Howard,

We have been out of the country and want to be sure to sign-on this latest
later re: Nuclear Posture Review. We may already be on your list, but just
in case please add our name.

Ann Rutan, csjp, President
Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace

Organization name: Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace may be what you want to
use.

Thanks for including us.

Charlotte Davenport, csjp

P.S. I saw a response from somebody about something on the 22nd of March...
what is happening?

Charlotte

Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
Subject: FW: ACTION ALERT US AS NUCLEAR ROGUE
Date: Wed, 13 Mar 2002 11:30:57 -0500
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 9.0, Build 9.0.2910.0
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600
Importance: Normal

Dear Brink supporters,

PLEASE FORWARD THIS MESSAGE TO YOUR LISTS AND CONTACTS and call attention to our Message Campaign. Your participation in this campaign will help make it a success. Thank you. Esther

Extraordinary times call for action.

"AMERICA AS NUCLEAR ROGUE"

The dirty details of the Pentagon's Nuclear Posture review are now out and condemnation must follow. For as the NY Times said in today's lead editorial "If another country were planning to develop a new nuclear weapon and contemplating pre-emptive strikes against a list of non-nuclear powers, Washington would rightly label that nation a dangerous rogue state ("America as Nuclear Rogue," 3/12/02-Click here for full article.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2002/03/12/opinion/>

In the name of fighting the spread of weapons of mass destruction the U.S. is lowering the threshold for their use. In the process our government is making a mockery of its pledge under the nuclear Non-Proliferation treaty (NPT) to work towards the elimination of nuclear weapons.

We are heading to a world of increased nuclear threats and dangers—where the taboo against using nuclear weapons is being eroded—where plans are in place for using these weapons for war fighting. And nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert are the front line of usability.

NOW is the time to send a message to politicians and the media. The U.S. should be taking the lead to PREVENT the use of nuclear weapons. We should be working with the Russians to get all nuclear weapons off high-alert—and set a standard that no nuclear nations should have their weapons ready for a quick launch. We should make sure that nuclear reductions are irreversible and that no NEW nuclear weapons are developed.

Below you'll find a sample letter to the editor to respond to the current stories on the Nuclear Posture Review.

"FRIENDS DON'T THREATEN FRIENDS WITH NUCLEAR WEAPONS MESSAGE CAMPAIGN"
Not only is President Bush threatening war and the use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear nations, he continues to keep thousands of weapons on high-alert aimed at Russia.

The upcoming U.S. Russian Summit (May 23-25, along with preliminary meetings between US and Russia, provide excellent opportunities for both sides to end this cold war policy.

Using the theme "FRIENDS DON'T THREATEN FRIENDS WITH NUCLEAR WEAPONS" The Brink campaign is launching a MESSAGE campaign to send faxes to President Bush and President Putin calling on them to:

Remove all nuclear weapons from high alert status

Takes steps to see that nuclear warheads slated for elimination will be rapidly removed from missiles and stored, secured and verified

Sign a binding agreement that all nuclear weapons slated for elimination will be dismantled so that reductions in arsenals are irreversible

Attached to this message is a text version of a reprintable FAX/flyer along with Talking Points and What You Can Do if sending a fax is a problem.

A .pdf version showing the colors and a picture of Bush and Putin is available at <http://www.criticalmassproductions.net/Faxb.pdf>. Be warned: this 400K file can take up to 5 minutes to download.

YOU CAN GET UP TO 10 FREE COPIES OF THE TWO-COLOR FAX/FLYER WITH A PICTURE OF BUSH AND PUTIN by sending a reply to this message at prgrm@backfromthebrink.net today.

WRITE A LETTER TO THE EDITOR! ORDER YOUR FAX/FLYERS! SEND A FAX TO THE PRESIDENTS. JUST BE SURE YOUR VOICE IS HEARD.

Peace,
Ira Shorr and Esther Pank

SAMPLE LETTER TO THE EDITOR ON NPR REVELATIONS

In the name of keeping us safe from the spread of nuclear weapons the Bush administration is scaring me to death. They've bought the Pentagon's plan to build a new--supposedly more usable--nuclear weapon, to threaten nations that might be developing nuclear weapons with nuclear strikes, and to continue the Cold War policy of keeping scores of nuclear weapons poised for a quick launch against Russia (which will only spur Russia to keep the weapons they have aimed at us on a hair-trigger).

What are we thinking? Isn't threatening the large-scale destruction of innocent people the ultimate act of terror? That's what using nuclear weapons means.

The Bush administration should be acting to get all nuclear weapons off hair-trigger alert, working with Russia on irreversible reductions in nuclear arsenals, and beefing up arms control and non-proliferation programs.

Most importantly we should stop this game of nuclear chicken. Saying we plan to use nuclear weapons to stop the spread of weapons of mass

destruction, leaves us looking like a nuclear rogue state.

Your name and address.

Please send copies of your letter when printed to the Brink Campaign.

Esther Pank
Back from the Brink Campaign
6856 Eastern Avenue, NW, # 322
Washington DC 20012
202.545.1001 ph
202.545.1004 fax
prgrm@backfromthebrink.net

STAY TUNED FOR THE NEW, IMPROVED BRINK CAMPAIGN WEBSITE AT
www.backfromthebrink.org coming soon.

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Text Fax.doc"

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Flyer_Whatyoucando.doc"

To: interfaithnd
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: FW: ACTION ALERT US AS NUCLEAR ROGUE
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Flyer_Whatyoucando.doc; C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Text Fax.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues,

I want to share with you material from Bank from the Brink on dealing with the Nuclear Posture Review and the upcoming meeting of President Bush and President Putin.

Howard

>Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
>From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
>To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
>Subject: FW: ACTION ALERT US AS NUCLEAR ROGUE
>Date: Wed, 13 Mar 2002 11:30:57 -0500
>X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
>X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 9.0, Build 9.0.2910.0
>X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600
>Importance: Normal
>
>Dear Brink supporters,
>
>PLEASE FORWARD THIS MESSAGE TO YOUR LISTS AND CONTACTS and call attention to
>our Message Campaign. Your participation in this campaign will help make it
>a success. Thank you. Esther
>
>Extraordinary times call for action.
>
>"AMERICA AS NUCLEAR ROGUE"
>The dirty details of the Pentagon's Nuclear Posture review are now out and
>condemnation must follow. For as the NY Times said in today's lead
>editorial "If another country were planning to develop a new nuclear weapon
>and contemplating per-emptive strikes against a list of non-nuclear powers,
>Washington would rightly label that nation a dangerous rogue state ("America
>as Nuclear Rogue," 3/12/02-Click here for full article.
><http://www.nytimes.com/2002/03/12/opinion/>
>
>In the name of fighting the spread of weapons of mass destruction the U.S.
>is lowering the threshold for their use. In the process our government is
>making a mockery of its pledge under the nuclear Non-Proliferation treaty
>(NPT) to work towards the elimination of nuclear weapons.
>
>We are heading to a world of increased nuclear threats and dangers—where the
>taboo against using nuclear weapons is being eroded—where plans are in place
>for using these weapons for war fighting. And nuclear weapons on
>hair-trigger alert are the front line of usability.

>
>NOW is the time to send a message to politicians and the media. The U.S.
>should be taking the lead to PREVENT the use of nuclear weapons. We should
>be working with the Russians to get all nuclear weapons off high-alert—and
>set a standard that no nuclear nations should have their weapons ready for a
>quick launch. We should make sure that nuclear reductions are irreversible
>and that no NEW nuclear weapons are developed.

>
>Below you'll find a sample letter to the editor to respond to the current
>stories on the Nuclear Posture Review.

>
>*****
>"FRIENDS DON'T THREATEN FRIENDS WITH NUCLEAR WEAPONS MESSAGE CAMPAIGN"
>Not only is President Bush threatening war and the use of nuclear weapons
>against non-nuclear nations, he continues to keep thousands of weapons on
>high-alert aimed at Russia.

>
>The upcoming U.S. Russian Summit (May 23-25, along with preliminary meetings
>between US and Russia, provide excellent opportunities for both sides to end
>this cold war policy.

>
>Using the theme "FRIENDS DON'T THREATEN FRIENDS WITH NUCLEAR WEAPONS" The
>Brink campaign is launching a MESSAGE campaign to send faxes to President
>Bush and President Putin calling on them to:

>
> Remove all nuclear weapons from high alert status
> Takes steps to see that nuclear warheads slated for elimination will be
>rapidly removed from missiles and stored, secured and verified
> Sign a binding agreement that all nuclear weapons slated for elimination
>will be dismantled so that reductions in arsenals are irreversible

>
>Attached to this message is a text version of a reprintable FAX/flyer along
>with Talking Points and What You Can Do if sending a fax is a problem.

>
>A .pdf version showing the colors and a picture of Bush and Putin is
>available at <http://www.criticalmassproductions.net/Faxb.pdf>. Be warned:
>this 400K file can take up to 5 minutes to download.

>
>YOU CAN GET UP TO 10 FREE COPIES OF THE TWO-COLOR FAX/FLYER WITH A PICTURE
>OF BUSH AND PUTIN by sending a reply to this message at
>prgrm@backfromthebrink.net today.

>
>WRITE A LETTER TO THE EDITOR! ORDER YOUR FAX/FLYERS! SEND A FAX TO THE
>PRESIDENTS. JUST BE SURE YOUR VOICE IS HEARD.

>
>Peace,
>Ira Shorr and Esther Pank

>
>*****
>SAMPLE LETTER TO THE EDITOR ON NPR REVELATIONS

>
>In the name of keeping us safe from the spread of nuclear weapons the Bush
>administration is scaring me to death. They've bought the Pentagon's plan

>to build a new--supposedly more usable--nuclear weapon, to threaten nations
>that might be developing nuclear weapons with nuclear strikes, and to
>continue the Cold War policy of keeping scores of nuclear weapons poised for
>a quick launch against Russia (which will only spur Russia to keep the
>weapons they have aimed at us on a hair-trigger).

>
>What are we thinking? Isn't threatening the large-scale destruction of
>innocent people the ultimate act of terror? That's what using nuclear
>weapons means.

>
>The Bush administration should be acting to get all nuclear weapons off
>hair-trigger alert, working with Russia on irreversible reductions in
>nuclear arsenals, and beefing up arms control and non-proliferation
>programs.

>
>Most importantly we should stop this game of nuclear chicken. Saying we
>plan to use nuclear weapons to stop the spread of weapons of mass
>destruction, leaves us looking like a nuclear rogue state.

>
>Your name and address.
>

>Please send copies of your letter when printed to the Brink Campaign.

>*****

>Esther Pank
>Back from the Brink Campaign
>6856 Eastern Avenue, NW, # 322
>Washington DC 20012
>202.545.1001 ph
>202.545.1004 fax
>prgrm@backfromthebrink.net

>
>STAY TUNED FOR THE NEW, IMPROVED BRINK CAMPAIGN WEBSITE AT
>www.backfromthebrink.org coming soon.

>
>
>
>Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Text Fax.doc"
>
>Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Flyer_Whatyoucando.doc"
>

To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: FW: ACTION ALERT US AS NUCLEAR ROGUE
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <NEBBKJHCMLACLOPKCPPBMEFJCHAA.prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
References:

Esther, Ira,

I forwarded your material to the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. We have a sign-on letter going to President Bush on Friday. I'll send you a copy.

Howard

To: glaszakovits_gb@brethren.org, turner@onebox.com, J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org, cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org,

mweiner@rac.org, egbertl4pj@yahoo.com, conoverp@ucc.org

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

Subject: Web site matters

Cc:

Bcc:

X-Attachments:

In-Reply-To:

References:

To: Web Site Steering Committee

I consider the above named persons to constitute the Steering Committee for the www.zeronukes.org web site because you represent sponsoring organizations. I will communicate with you via e-mail to keep you informed of what I am doing, to ask your advice as we move along, and sometimes to request approval on certain matters. You can reply only to me or to all as you choose.

(1) We have sufficient backing to get the web site underway. At Catherine Gordon's suggestion I propose that the home page indicate that this is "A Project of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament" and list the sponsoring organizations. The Interfaith Committee doesn't have a formal structure or official membership. Sign-on letters carry the organizational names of the signers. This project would follow this precedent. Is this a fair use of the name of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament?

(2) I have licensed the domain name of www.zeronukes.org, and also www.zero-nukes.org to protect the name. As I type that latter, I realize that it reads clearer. Which do you think we should activate?

(3) I have a proposal from Colin Delany to design the web site for a fee of \$3,150. He designed www.shieldofdreams.org for the Council for a Livable World. His web site, www.edesigns-graphics.com, describes his qualifications and lists other web sites he has designed. You can check out his work if you want to.

I would like to obtain one or two other proposals, especially to get a better idea on what a fair price would be. Please give me your suggestions for web designers.

(4) We don't have enough money yet to hire a consultant. By this time next week I should know whether a couple of sources will be coming through.

(5) I have sought sponsorship mainly from denominational offices. I am still waiting to hear from Friends, United Methodist, Lutheran, Episcopal, and American Baptist offices and National Council of Churches. As I expected, Jerry Powers says that the U.S. Catholic Conference can't be a sponsor. Therefore, I would like to ask Pax Christ, USA so that we can show Catholic sponsorship. Among other reasons Pax Christ represents the Catholic segment most committed to zero nukes.

(6) Lastly as the nuclear posture debate heats up, I believe that this web site will have a vital function.

Shalom,
Howard

To: bgirtonm@ncccusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\iclt.188.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Brenda,

As Lisa Wright was leaving town, she told me that she had forwarded to you the sign-on letter to President Bush on Nuclear Posture Review. I am also sending it to you as a Word attachment.

I hope you will sign. My deadline is today, Wednesday, March 13 by 5:00 p.m., but I'm willing to let this slip until mid-morning on Thursday.

I hope that you will sign. Call me at 301 896-0013 if you have any questions.

Shalom,
Howard

To: glaszakovits_gb@brethren.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\iclt.188.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Greg,

I understand that you are at a General Board meeting but may be reviewing your e-mail. I would like to get you to sign the letter to President Bush on Nuclear Posture Review. I am sending it as a Word attachment.

My deadline is today, Wednesday, March 13 at 5:00 p.m. EST, but I'm willing to let it slip until mid-morning on Thursday.

I hope to hear from you.

Howard

X-Sender: pni-01/imap.comlink.org@127.0.0.1
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1
Date: Wed, 13 Mar 2002 17:21:21 +0000
To: peacenews@gn.apc.org
From: Ippy D <editorial@peacenews.info>
Subject: **NEW** online news service from PN

Dear Friends

As groups and organisations listed in the 2002 Housmans World Peace Database (available from <worldpeace@gn.apc.org>, usual price GBP£95), we thought you would probably want to hear about some of the changes we have made to the Peace News website that might be of benefit to you:

1. We have launched an online news service (see details below), to which you can submit your news stories and reach an international network of activists and campaigners;
2. We have substantially redesigned the site - making it more user friendly;
3. We have published the whole of the current issue of Peace News online in an improved format, making our publication more accessible to an English-language-speaking international audience (if anyone wants to translate any of our material (into Castilian Spanish and French would be particularly good!) for reposting on the site, we would be delighted to hear from you!);
4. We have made it easier for you submit information about your forthcoming events, for posting in our events diary.

We apologise if you have heard some of this before (such is the nature of email by word-of-mouth and mass distribution lists!), but hope you get time to take a look at what we are trying to do with our site and that what you find is both useful and informative.

With very best wishes

Ippy

Hello lovely people all over the world

APOLOGIES FOR X-POSTINGS

But please forward this message to anyone you think would be interested.

On Friday 1 March Peace News begins offering a limited news service on the website <http://www.peacenews.info>

Please note: This is a separate and additional service to the existing online publishing of our print magazine

We hope, in time, that this will be a forum for both publicly displaying news from the international peace/antimilitarist movements, but also for inspiring and sharing our activist and campaigning tactics within our community - a place we can meet to hear about what specifically nonviolent, peace/antimilitarist activists are doing.

Unlike the rather fantastic indymedia network (see <http://www.indymedia.org>), this service is provided by a non-profit company (Peace News Ltd) based in London and has a relatively narrow focus. News stories cannot be submitted directly to the site (as a Ltd company we are open to being sued by big business etc under the notoriously unfair English libel laws!), but please send your stories to editorial@peacenews.info with the first word of the subject line "NEWS".

As well as coming directly from our London office, news will also be posted by a group of volunteer stringers around the world (if you are interested in becoming a PN news stringer drop us a line at editorial@peacenews.info to discuss becoming a "trusted user" of the system). The amount, type and freshness of news on the site reflects a combination of the type and frequency of news submitted to us, and the capacity we have at any given time for actually publishing stories. We hope this capacity will increase over time and with more enthusiastic volunteer input!

This area of our site is dedicated to bringing you relevant short news items from all over the world. It is intended to be both supplementary and complementary to our quarterly magazine - Peace News - which is published in London by Peace News Ltd.

****Editorial objectives****

We aim to publish short news stories written by nonviolent activists and campaigners from around the world which meet our editorial objectives.

Peace News' editorial objectives:

1. To support and connect nonviolent and anti-militarist movements around the world;
2. To provide a forum where such movements can develop common perspectives;
3. To take up and promote issues suitable for international campaigning;
4. To promote pacifist analysis by testing assumptions against contemporary events;
5. To promote and give critical support to nonviolent revolution.

****Criteria for news stories****

As well as meeting our editorial objectives, we like short, snappy news stories which reflect the concerns and activities of nonviolent activists and campaigners. The general kind of "categories" of news we will publish include:

- Conscientious Objection
- Antimilitarism
- Anti-war
- Arms trade
- Environmental
- Peace prisoners
- Nuclear (waste, power, weapons, testing etc)
- Other (peace, general)

We particularly welcome news stories from/about people living outside of western Europe and the US.

****Submit your news****

Send your news and pictured to editorial@peacenews.info

- Texts should be submitted in English and be no more than 300 words long.
- They should include: a headline; brief outline of text (max 50 words); the author (not compulsory); any contact details for groups mentioned in the text; the source and URL of source; the news story itself.
- Images may be submitted as either colour or black and white jpegs. Files should be no bigger than 60k. Please include a caption and any credit.

****How you can help Peace News online news service****

You can help this project by

- submitting news stories
- becoming a Peace News online news service volunteer
- placing a link to our site from yours (drop a line to webmaster@peacenews.info to let us know - and for reciprocation purposes)
- sending us a donation towards our work
- taking out a subscription to our quarterly paper-copy magazine, Peace News

****The small print****

- Peace News does not necessarily actively endorse or support groups or individuals posting news on the site.
- News will only be posted if we feel it meets our editorial objectives and does not threaten the political or practical integrity of the company.

Peace News Ltd reserves the right to:

- edit all material submitted
- refuse to print any material without recourse
- remove published news items at any point without recourse

Unfortunately we have not yet developed our links page. But why should we when you can find thousands of links to activist and campaigning groups and other ngo's at Norbert's Bookmarks?

Check it out at <http://www.betterworldlinks.org>!

Peace News for nonviolent revolution

5 Caledonian Road, London N1 9DY, Britain

Tel:+44 20 7278 3344 Fax:+44 20 7278 0444

<http://www.peacenews.info>

Editor: Ippy <editorial@peacenews.info>

Admin and Finance: John Courtneidge and Lesley Harrison <admin@peacenews.info>

Website manager: Daniel Sewe <webmaster@peacenews.info>

News editor: Lindsay Barnes <news@peacenews.info>

Reviews editor: Simon Dixon <reviews@peacenews.info>

Promotions <promos@peacenews.info>

Peace News is produced in cooperation with War Resisters' International

The revolution starts with you

Reply-To: <agreenblat@ncccusa.org>
From: "Andrew Greenblatt" <agreenblat@ncccusa.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] Revision in letter to Bush on NPR
Date: Wed, 13 Mar 2002 13:12:33 -0500
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400
Importance: Normal

Dear Howard,

Great letter! It is always comforting to read the thoughts of thoughtful people in these times of trouble. It makes me feel that I may not be so crazy for thinking these same thoughts.

Feel free to add my name if it helps:

Andrew Greenblatt, Coordinator
Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorites
475 Riverside Dr., Ste. 850
New York, NY 10115

212-870-2155
agreenblat@ncccusa.org

Thanks again,
Andrew

-----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@fcnl.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 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-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.

(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

----- 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/>

Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: FW: ACTION ALERT US AS NUCLEAR ROGUE
Date: Wed, 13 Mar 2002 13:34:27 -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 V5.00.2919.6600

Thank's Howard.

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2002 11:42 AM
To: prgrm@backfromthebrink.net
Subject: Re: FW: ACTION ALERT US AS NUCLEAR ROGUE

Esther, Ira,

I forwarded your material to the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. We have a sign-on letter going to President Bush on Friday. I'll send you a copy.

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-Originating-IP: [156.40.62.151]
From: "Kelly Diamond" kgdime@hotmail.com
To: mupj@igc.org
Cc: sciladam@aol.com, holronfost@aol.com
Subject: Re: Sessions on the Social Principles
Date: Wed, 13 Mar 2002 12:05:40 -0800
X-OriginalArrivalTime: 13 Mar 2002 20:05:41.0037 (UTC)
FILETIME=[7356FDD0:01C1CAC]

Hi Howard,

The deadline for the next Messenger is this Friday. I was thinking it would be great to tie the name of this class into the "open hearts, open minds, open doors" theme but can't quite figure out how to do that. Any ideas? I'm still thinking....The other idea I had for a title was "The United Methodist Church Speaks on Social Issues", but I'm not crazy about it.

I think we should also have a paragraph promoting it, in addition to the outline. Here's a draft:

How can the United Methodist Church help us make sense of what's happening in the world? Using the Social Principles of the UMC as a starting point, this class, led by Howard Hallman, will explore many different contemporary and controversial topics. Join us for thought-provoking and lively discussions about resource utilization, responsible consumption, abortion, divorce, war, corporate responsibility, poverty, death penalty and much more. CHRISTIANS GRAPPLE WITH SOCIAL ISSUES will meet April 7th through May 12 in room 203.

Let me know what you think! Thanks, Kelly

>From: "Howard W. Hallman"
>To: kgdime@hotmail.com
>Subject: Sessions on the Social Principles
>Date: Sat, 09 Mar 2002 11:56:37 -0500
>
>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
>
>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.

Chat with friends online, try MSN Messenger: [Click Here](#)

To: "Kelly Diamond" <kgdime@hotmail.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Sessions on the Social Principles
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <F103FoFnC6XcL4hsT9J0001f708@hotmail.com>
References:

Kelly,

I can't think of a way to tie into the "open" series. I'm satisfied with "Christians Grapple with Social Issues", but I'll accept whatever you decided upon.

Your paragraph for the Messenger is fine, except I would add "cloning, stem cell research" because of the current controversy.

Are you going to get it in the Messenger?

Howard

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

Ron,

At the Outreach Committee we talked about how we could help promote Peace with Justice Sunday and tie into it with displays and information. What date is it scheduled?

Shalom,
Howard

From: "ANTHONY VENTO" <tvpcusa1@prodigy.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Revision in letter to Bush on NPR
Date: Wed, 13 Mar 2002 20:42:32 -0500
X-MSMail-Priority: High
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700
X-Mimeole: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Hello Howard,
If it is not too late, I would love to sign on to the letter as written
below.

It was a great gathering yesterday at the Methodist building. Thanks for
your hand in it.

FYI: I've just returned home from the road, and sent an email and phone
message to Dave Robinson about the deadline for signing on. He therefore
will have only just now been sent the newest version of the letter. (I sent
him the early version when you first sent it out.) So, unless you hear from
him, please just sign me onto the letter. (Dave would have to make the
endorsement call on behalf of Pax Christi USA as an organization.)

You can sign me as follows:

Tony Vento
Program Director
Pax Christi USA
532 West Eighth Street
Erie, PA, 16502-1343

Thanks again, Howard, for initiating this, and so much more.

Christ's peace be with 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: <interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com>; <ogabc@aol.com>;
<thart@episcopalchurch.org>; <joe@fcnl.org>; <rsider@speakeasy.net>
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2002 12:10 PM
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 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-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.
>
> (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

>
> ----- 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/>
>
>

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

From: "oneilsp" <oneilsp@netzero.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Letter to Bush on NPR
Date: Thu, 14 Mar 2002 08:15:07 -0500
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700
Importance: Normal

Hello Howard,

You may sign my name:

Bro. Steven P. O'Neil, SM
Office of Justice & Peace
Marianists, New York Province

Thanks,
Steve

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2002 7:02 AM
To: oneilsp@netzero.net
Subject: Letter to Bush on NPR

Steve,

When I sent around the first draft of the letter to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review, you indicated that you would sign. Please give me the name, title, and organizational name for the signer.

Thanks,
Howard

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

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

Sign Up for NetZero Platinum Today
Only \$9.95 per month!
<http://my.netzero.net/s/signup?r=platinum&refcd=PT97>

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0
Date: Thu, 14 Mar 2002 08:35:26 -0500
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Nuclear-related issues: 7 items

[Nuclear-related excerpts from Bush press conference]

1. "Bush Puts Nuclear Use In 'Options Available'" - L.A. Times
2. "Bush Appears Eager Now To Sign A Nuclear Pact With Russia" - N.Y. Times
3. "Bush Backs An Accord On Nuclear Arms Cuts" - Wash. Post
4. "Nuclear Plan Changes Calculus Of Deterrence" - W.S. Journal
5. "The Real Problems With Our Nuclear Posture" - Krepinevich OpEd
6. "Nuts About Nukes" - McGrory column
7. "A Pretty Poor Posture For A Superpower" - McNamara and Graham OpEd

=====

Press Conference by the President - March 13, 2002

Q The Pentagon is calling for the development of low-yield nuclear weapons that could be used against China, Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Russia, and Syria. Can you explain why the United States is considering this new policy, and how it might figure into the war on terrorism?

THE PRESIDENT I presume you're referring to the nuclear review that was recently in the press. Well, first of all, the nuclear review is not new. It's gone on for previous administrations. Secondly, the reason we have a nuclear arsenal that I hope is modern, upgraded, and can work, is to deter any attack on America. The reason one has a nuclear arsenal is to serve as a deterrence.

Secondly, ours is an administration that's committed to reducing the amount of warheads, and we're in consultations now with the Russians on such a -- on this matter. We've both agreed to reduce our warheads down to 1,700 to 2,200. I talked with Sergey Ivanov yesterday, the Minister of Defense from Russia, on this very subject.

I think one of the interesting points that we need to develop and fully explore is how best to verify what's taking place, to make sure that there's confidence in both countries. But I'm committed to reducing the amount of nuclear weaponry and reducing the number of nuclear warheads. I think it's the right policy for America, and I know we can continue to do so and still keep a deterrence.

Q Why a policy, though, that might go after a country like Libya or Syria?

THE PRESIDENT First of all, we've got all options on the table, because we want to make it very clear to nations that you will not threaten the United States or use weapons of mass destruction against us, or our allies or friends.

* * *

Q Mr. President, back to nuclear issues, the Russian Defense Minister

expressed the hope today that agreements on the New Strategic Framework could be signed by the time of your visit next May in Moscow. Is it realistic? And second, are you ready to sign documents in a treaty form? And third, have you made progress on the issue of destroying versus storing nuclear warheads?

THE PRESIDENT Well, I share the Minister's optimism that we can get something done by May. I'd like to sign a document in Russia when I'm there, I think it would be a good thing. And, therefore, we've got to make sure that those who are interested in making sure that the Cold War relationship continues on are kind of pushed in the background. In other words, we've got to work hard to establish a new relationship.

I also agree with President Putin that there needs to be a document that outlives both of us. What form that comes in, we will discuss. There is a -- I think David asked me this question, as a matter of fact, back in Slovenia, if I'm not mistaken, about storage versus destruction. We'd be glad to talk to the Russians about that. I think the most important thing, though, is verification, is to make sure whatever decision is made, that there is open verification so as to develop a level of trust.

There is a constraint, as well. I mean, the destruction of nuclear warheads requires a lot of work and a lot of detailed work, and that, in itself, is going to take time, and that's got to be a part of the equation, as well.

But those are all issues we're discussing. I had a good -- very good discussion with Sergey Ivanov yesterday. I'm confident that President Putin is interested in making a deal, coming up with a good arrangement that will codify a new relationship. The more Russia -- the more we work with Russia, the better the world will be. And we've got a good, close relationship with them. We've got a few sticking points. We've got an issue on chickens, for example, that some of you have followed. We made it pretty darned clear to them that I think we've got to get this chicken issue resolved and get those chickens moving from the United States into the Russian market. We laugh, but nevertheless it is a problem -- that we must honor agreements. But I believe we're going to have great relations with Russia and we're going to work hard to achieve them.

* * *

Q Mr. President, what do you make of the dust-up over the nuclear review? And have you made any decisions about its recommendations? In particular, what is your view about building smaller nuclear weapons, which some people believe would make them more likely to be used?

THE PRESIDENT Well, first of all, I view our nuclear arsenal as a deterrent, as a way to say to people that would harm America, don't do it. That's a deterrent, that there's a consequence. And the President must have all options available to make that deterrent have meaning. That's how I view the review.

Q But what is your thinking, sir, on smaller nuclear weapons, which some analysts believe would be a major departure and would make them more

likely --

THE PRESIDENT My interest is -- Jim, my interest is to reduce the threat of a nuclear war, is to reduce the number of nuclear warheads. I think we've got plenty of warheads to keep the peace. I'm interested in -- and that's what I told President Putin and told the country. If need be, we'll just reduce unilaterally to a level commiserate with keeping a deterrence and keeping the peace.

So I'm interested in having all -- having an arsenal at my disposal, or at the military's disposal, that will keep the peace. We're a peaceful nation and moving along just right and just kind of having a time, and all of a sudden, we get attacked and now we're at war, but we're at war to keep the peace.

And it's very important for people in America to understand that at least my attitude on this is that we're not out to seek revenge. Sure, we're after justice. But I also view this as a really good opportunity to create a lasting peace.

And so, therefore, the more firm we are and the more determined we are to take care of al Qaeda and deal with terrorism in all its forms, particularly that of global reach, that we have a very good chance of solving some difficult problems -- including the Middle East, or the subcontinent. But it's going to require a resolve and firmness from the United States of America.

One of the things I've learned in my discussions, and at least listening to the echo chamber out there in the world, is that if the United States were to waver, some in the world would take a nap when it comes to the war on terror. And we're just not going to let them do that. And that's why you hear me spend a lot of time talking to the American people -- at least, I hope I'm talking to them, through you -- about why this is going to take a long period of time, and why I'm so determined to remain firm in my resolve. And -- anyway.

1. "Bush Puts Nuclear Use In 'Options Available'"
Los Angeles Times - March 14, 2002 - By Greg Miller, Times Staff Writer

Politics: The president defends the notion of a more flexible arsenal as critical to fending off threats. Diplomacy is the top focus of his remarks.

WASHINGTON -- President Bush on Wednesday defended a politically charged Pentagon proposal to create new types of nuclear weapons and expand the nation's list of potential nuclear targets, saying that a commander in chief "must have all options available."

Bush backed the notion of a more flexible nuclear arsenal, suggesting that it is critical to deterring post-Cold War threats to the United States and its allies, even as he said his administration remains committed to nuclear arms reduction.

"We want to make it very clear to nations that you will not threaten the

United States or use weapons of mass destruction against us or our allies or friends," Bush said.

The president's remarks--his first since details of the classified Pentagon document emerged last weekend--came during a White House news conference that he called to pressure Senate Democrats who are blocking a White House appeals court nominee, Charles Pickering.

Bush complained bitterly about the Senate's treatment of Pickering but spent much of the 45-minute session discussing his administration's diplomatic efforts, his planned trip to Latin America next week and the progress of the evolving war on terrorism.

At one point, Bush described how his decisions on the war in Afghanistan have been colored by lessons he gleaned from the U.S. experience in Vietnam. He said he is careful to be sure that the nation's mission is clear and mindful of the need to separate military considerations from the pressures of domestic politics.

While stressing that the United States will be "judicious and wise" about troop deployments, he said that national objectives and military analysis, not political pressure, should guide deployment decisions.

"Politics ought to stay out of fighting a war," Bush said. "There was too much politics during the Vietnam War. There was too much concern in the White House about political standing."

Asked whether he worries that U.S. efforts to help other countries excise terrorist cells might escalate into more direct military involvement, Bush said he doesn't relish sending U.S. soldiers abroad but would not adhere to the post-Vietnam ethos in which "the definition of success in war was nobody lost their life."

He also sought to connect the objectives of the current conflict to those of the most storied--but also most costly--war of the 20th century. The war on terrorism, he said, "is more akin to World War II than it is to Vietnam. This is a war in which we fight for the liberties and freedom of our country."

His comments came as the bloodiest battle to date in Afghanistan--a 10-day engagement near Gardez in which eight Americans died--was winding down. In general, the U.S. military in Afghanistan has employed a strategy largely reliant on air strikes and proxy forces that has protected American soldiers from much of the front-line fighting.

Bush said he is pleased with the progress of the war. He said he does not know whether Osama bin Laden is alive but said that, at the least, the Al Qaeda leader is on the run, his terrorist network has been crippled and his host government has been destroyed.

"He's the ultimate parasite who found weakness, exploited, and met his match," Bush said of Bin Laden. "He has no place to train his Al Qaeda killers anymore."

Preparing for his trip to Mexico, El Salvador and Peru next week, Bush

praised House passage Tuesday of a bill that would allow thousands of foreigners to seek legal residency in the United States, even if they entered the country illegally. Currently, these immigrants are required to return to their native countries as they apply for green cards.

"That's a good reform," Bush said, adding that he hopes the Senate will move quickly to approve the bill. The measure is one ingredient in a package of immigration-easing reforms that Bush and Mexican President Vicente Fox were pursuing before the Sept. 11 attacks disrupted the talks.

Bush also sounded new warnings to Iraq, as Vice President Dick Cheney continued a trip to the Middle East seen largely as an effort by the administration to lay the groundwork for potential action against Iraqi President Saddam Hussein.

Iraq is among seven nations on the expanded list of potential U.S. nuclear targets listed in a classified Pentagon report that was submitted to Congress earlier this year, and whose contents were first reported in The Times on Saturday.

The document, called the Nuclear Posture Review, calls for the creation of "low-yield" nuclear weapons that could be used against smaller targets, including chemical or biological weapon facilities buried deep underground.

The document has created a stir in Washington, where several leading Democratic senators have expressed alarm at the report, saying it could undermine efforts to curb the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The review has also drawn protest from leaders of China, North Korea and other nations identified in the document as potential targets.

Bush sought to soften the aggressive posture outlined in the report but signaled that the United States is moving to strike a new balance between disarmament and deterrence.

"My interest is to reduce the threat of a nuclear war," Bush said, noting that the administration is pursuing disarmament negotiations with Russia and is even prepared to consider unilateral reductions in its nuclear arsenal.

But Bush did not back away from language in the report calling for new categories of weapons. "I view our nuclear arsenal as a deterrent, as a way to say to people that would harm America that . . . there is a consequence," Bush said. "And the president must have all options available to make that deterrent have meaning."

Bush opened his news conference by attacking Senate Democrats who have stymied the nomination of Pickering to the U.S. 5th Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans. Bush defended Pickering's commitment to civil rights and dismissed Democratic allegations that the nominee has a troubling record on issues ranging from employment discrimination to voting rights.

Pickering's nomination is scheduled for a vote today in the Senate Judiciary Committee, where it is expected to be defeated on a party-line vote. Bush argued the matter deserves consideration by the full Senate and

criticized Democrats for what he said is a pattern of obstructing worthy judicial candidates. He complained that only 40 of his 92 judicial nominees have so far been confirmed.

"This is unacceptable," Bush said. "It is a bad record for the Senate."

But Sen. Patrick J. Leahy (D-Vt.), chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, rejected Bush's complaints, saying the committee is moving quickly on the appointments but has been delayed by the need to "undo the damage of the last six years," in which Republicans who controlled the Senate repeatedly blocked the nominees of President Clinton.

2. "Bush Appears Eager Now To Sign A Nuclear Pact With Russia"

New York Times - March 14, 2002 - By Thom Shanker

WASHINGTON, March 13 — President Bush expressed optimism today that a deal on nuclear arms reduction would be ready for his meeting in May with President Vladimir V. Putin, and clearly moved from reluctance to enthusiasm about signing a formal agreement.

At a White House news conference, Mr. Bush also defended a Pentagon review of the nation's nuclear posture that included consideration of how these weapons might be used to destroy biological or chemical arms of an adversary like Iraq, Iran, Libya or Syria.

"We've got all options on the table, because we want to make it very clear to nations that you will not threaten the United States or use weapons of mass destruction against us or our allies or friends," he said.

He expanded on comments earlier in the day by Sergei B. Ivanov, the Russian defense minister, who said "some specific results have been achieved" in two days of talks here on nuclear arms reductions with Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld.

"I share the minister's optimism that we can get something done by May," Mr. Bush said. "I'd like to sign a document in Russia when I'm there. And it could be a good thing."

Although the president has said repeatedly that he is open on how a deal could be sealed with Russia, he has said just as often that a formal agreement is unnecessary, indicating that a handshake between allies would be sufficient given their warming relations.

Today, however, he seemed to embrace the Russian view wholeheartedly. "In other words, we've got to work hard to establish a new relationship," Mr. Bush said. "I also agree with President Putin that there needs to be a document that outlives both of us. And what form that comes in we will discuss."

At a Pentagon news briefing with Mr. Rumsfeld, Mr. Ivanov said that United States and Russian negotiators had exchanged drafts of a possible nuclear arms agreement and that he was particularly encouraged by progress in the area of "transparency" — or how the actions of each side would be clear to

the other as they reduce nuclear stockpiles over the next decade.

A senior Defense Department official said that during the talks, which will continue between Russian and American technical experts in Geneva next week, Pentagon officials explained how they planned to account for warheads that are not atop operational missiles, but are in storage, a continuing point of contention.

"There was some misunderstanding before," the official said. "They now understand some of the distinctions we're making. I'm not suggesting that everything has been worked out, that there are no differences between the U.S. and Russian sides. There continue to be."

Before arriving in Washington, Mr. Ivanov had warned that American proposals to keep warheads in storage instead of destroying them would encourage proliferation and, perhaps, set off a new arms race.

American officials have said that even after the United States cuts its 6,000-warhead nuclear arsenal to between 1,700 and 2,200 warheads, it would store hundreds of warheads in order to respond to future threats and unexpected contingencies.

Asked to describe the Russian reaction, Mr. Ivanov seemed to indicate that Russia might store some warheads as its arsenal dropped to as few as 1,500, although only until they could be properly destroyed.

"It is true that for some period of time, those warheads could be stored or shelved, but anyway, the time will inevitably come when those will have to be destroyed," Mr. Ivanov said.

3. "Bush Backs An Accord On Nuclear Arms Cuts"
Washington Post - March 14, 2002 - By Walter Pincus, Washington Post Staff Writer

President Eyes Pact For Moscow Summit

President Bush said yesterday he agreed with Russian President Vladimir Putin that the two leaders should seek an accord spelling out major cuts in U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals, hopefully during their summit in Moscow in May.

"There needs to be a document that outlives both of us," Bush said. "I'd like to sign a document in Russia when I'm there."

But Bush told reporters at a White House news conference that the form of agreement that would be signed remains to be settled. In the past, the president has talked of avoiding a formal treaty codifying the proposed reductions.

After meeting with Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld at the Pentagon yesterday, Russian Defense Minister Sergei Ivanov said experts from the two countries had already exchanged what he called "a future agreement." He said such "a legally binding document" would allow the arrangement to be

understandable "for the whole world and . . . reflect the transparency which we need to achieve between the two countries."

At the heart of any document would be the agreement by Bush and Putin announced during their Crawford, Tex., summit last year that each country would reduce by two-thirds over the next 10 years its number of operational warheads on missiles and bombs.

For both it means roughly going down from today's 6,000 warheads to about 2,000 warheads by 2012.

One issue that remains to be settled is what happens to the warheads that are taken out of operation. The Pentagon has said an undetermined number would be kept in reserve, where some could be redeployed within days or months. The Russians have argued that they should be destroyed.

Bush said the United States is "glad to talk to the Russians" about the "storage versus destruction" question, but "the destruction of nuclear warheads requires a lot of . . . detailed work and that in itself is going to take time."

Ivanov appeared to indicate that the issue may have been set aside. Asked whether Putin's demands for destruction of reduced warheads had been met, the Russian defense minister said, "For some period of time, those warheads could be stored or shelved." But, he added, "the time will inevitably come when those will have to be destroyed."

Both Bush and Ivanov said that verification of any reductions was also still an issue.

Bush called it "the most important thing." He described verification as something "we need to develop and fully explore . . . how best to verify what's taking place to make sure that there's confidence in both countries."

Along with negotiations with the Russians on nuclear warheads, Bush was also asked about the Pentagon's nuclear posture review, which was completed earlier this year.

The review has been described as directing development of a new low-yield nuclear weapon to attack hardened targets such as bunkers and targeting nuclear weapons on countries accused of developing weapons of mass destruction such as Iran, Iraq, North Korea, Libya and Syria.

Bush said the recent posture review was "not new" and pointed out that similar reviews of underlying policies surrounding deployment of U.S. nuclear weapons had "gone on for previous administrations." The last one, done in 1994 by the Clinton Pentagon, contained many of the same suggestions about the need for contingency nuclear planning directed at nations such as Iran and Iraq.

Rumsfeld yesterday described the review as providing "requirements for deterrence in the 21st century." He insisted it was "not an operational planning document" and "says nothing about targeting any country with nuclear weapons."

Bush refused twice to respond to questions about whether he favored development of a new, low-yield nuclear weapon.

Instead he said he hoped the U.S. nuclear arsenal "is modern, upgraded and can work . . . to deter any attack on America. The reason one has a nuclear arsenal is to serve as a deterrence," he said.

4. "Nuclear Plan Changes Calculus Of Deterrence"

Christian Science Monitor - March 14, 2002 - By Ann Scott Tyson, Special correspondent of The Christian Science Monitor

WASHINGTON -- The Bush administration's controversial new policy blueprint for nuclear weapons raises fundamental questions about US security needs in the post-cold-war era:

Does the United States need a more elaborate nuclear deterrent? And will such a deterrent work against the "rogue" states and other unexpected threats?

To critics at home and abroad, the Defense Department document on nuclear contingencies, called the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), represents the worst unilateralist tendencies of the Bush presidency. A dramatic policy departure, it could lower the threshold for using nuclear weapons and marks a major setback to nonproliferation efforts worldwide, they charge.

Already, the emergence last weekend of details of the classified nuclear report has generated serious diplomatic fallout, with Russia and China - two of seven nations listed as potential targets - demanding explanations from Washington.

Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld yesterday defended the nuclear review as setting out "prudent requirements for the 21st century." After meetings with Russian Defense Minister Sergei Ivanov, he noted Russia's "formidable nuclear capabilities" but underscored that the two countries "are no longer adversaries." Russian leaders were briefed on the nuclear review in January.

The Pentagon and its supporters contend the US needs a new, more flexible, and rapid nuclear response capable of countering a multitude of emerging threats.

These threats include "rogue" states such as Iraq, Iran, Syria, North Korea, and Libya that already possess or are seeking chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. Then there are the unexpected new dangers. "We're focusing on how we will fight ... not who or when," said J.D. Crouch, the assistant secretary of defense for international security policy. "We expect to be surprised" and must deal with "a broad range of the potential capabilities that adversaries may array against us," he said in a briefing on the report earlier this year.

Administration officials stress that deterrence is the goal of the policy. They say the report, which is required by Congress, is not an operational plan for a nuclear attack. Instead, it aims to give the president a "range of options," including updated nuclear weapons, to respond to attacks by

conventional weapons or weapons of mass destruction against the US or allies including Israel, South Korea, and Taiwan.

These new nuclear weapons would be more precise, create less nuclear fallout, and be easier to target quickly, say military experts familiar with the report. Some would be designed to destroy specific targets, such as fortified underground bunkers used by dozens of countries. For example, low-yield, earth-penetrating weapons that detonate underground could destroy bunkers full of chemical or biological agents.

Still, nuclear and defense experts disagree over whether such new weapons would constitute an effective deterrent, especially against so-called rogue regimes.

Some say the US will boost the credibility of its deterrent by deploying smaller, more "fine-tuned" nuclear weapons that are easier to use in a wide variety of conflicts.

"Most of the nuclear options at our disposal now are so gross that their use is not credible," says Loren Thompson, a nuclear expert at the Lexington Institute, a defense think tank in Arlington, Va. "To deter, we must have options that the enemy believes we will use."

Such weapons will help dissuade attacks by not only dictators such as Iraqi's Saddam Hussein, but even terrorist leaders like Osama bin Laden, Thompson says.

"A large part of Osama bin Laden's calculus was that we were too soft to respond. They [Bush administration officials] want to at least create the impression that that is not the case," Thompson says.

Others, however, doubt whether an updated US nuclear arsenal can deter hostile, repressive leaders such as Saddam or North Korean dictator Kim Jong-Il. "The leaders in question are prepared to see their own people suffer, says Hans Binnendijk," a nuclear-weapons expert at the National Defense University. "So just holding their societies at risk may not be enough to deter, especially if they feel their regime is about to go under."

While the grim reality of mutually assured destruction (MAD) helped restrain the Soviet Union during the cold war, "deterrence is not nearly as assured" today, says Mr. Binnendijk.

Indeed, a more assertive US nuclear posture could backfire by lowering the threshold for using nuclear weapons and undermining nonproliferation efforts around the world, critics say.

While reducing the number of deployed warheads to between 1,700 and 2,200 within a decade, the policy calls for storing removed warheads as part of a reserve "responsive force" rather than destroying them.

5. "The Real Problems With Our Nuclear Posture"
New York Times - March 14, 2002 - Andrew F. Krepinevich OpEd

WASHINGTON — A mini-firestorm has erupted over the recommendations of a classified Pentagon review of the United States' nuclear forces. Critics charge that the Bush administration is bent on pursuing initiatives that will undermine the 57-year-old taboo on the use of the ultimate weapons of terror. But they misread this document, which was leaked last weekend.

In fact, what the administration has proposed in its Nuclear Posture Review is nothing less than the transformation of United States strategic forces to decrease the number of nuclear weapons in the American arsenal as well as to reduce the reliance placed on nuclear weapons in the event of crisis or conflict.

With the cold war over, the threat from Russia has declined dramatically, enabling the United States to cut its nuclear forces unilaterally. The administration would cut the number of operationally deployed warheads over the next decade by two-thirds — to between 1,700 and 2,200. Recent advances in precision-guided weapons, or "smart bombs," will also make it possible to substitute conventional weapons, in a limited way, for nuclear weapons, which may permit additional nuclear force reductions.

The review's other main recommendation places greater reliance on non-nuclear precision weapons and missile defenses to strengthen deterrence against attacks by weapons of mass destruction (chemical, biological and nuclear weapons) and for use against acts of aggression if deterrence fails. Ideally, American missile defenses would intercept enemy missiles armed with weapons of mass destruction. Any residual weapons of mass destruction would then be destroyed by non-nuclear precision attacks launched by the United States. The use of nuclear weapons — and the prospect of breaking that taboo — would be unnecessary. Under this scenario, nuclear weapons would remain weapons of last resort, as they are now.

Yet criticisms have been launched against the way these recommendations have been couched. Some find the review's discussion of potential military conflicts involving China, Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Russia and Syria — and the possibility of using a nuclear deterrent against these nations — to be provocative. But it has long been the Pentagon's task to prepare war plans for a range of plausible contingencies. Russia and China have sizable nuclear arsenals. The other five states are hostile toward America and its allies, have links to terrorist organizations, and are actively pursuing weapons of mass destruction. The United States needs to develop methods of deterrence against the use of chemical and biological weapons — weapons which we have forsaken.

Critics are also quick to suggest that the language of the review, because it raised the possibility of using nuclear weapons against nations wielding biological or chemical weapons, would violate the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty's "negative" security pledge. The United States has pledged not to use nuclear weapons against a state that neither possesses nuclear weapons nor is allied to a state possessing them.

The Clinton administration reaffirmed this promise. But the Clinton administration, like both Bush administrations, also maintained a position of calculated ambiguity as to whether it would actually use nuclear weapons in response to a chemical or biological attack, even if the aggressor did

not possess nuclear weapons. Before the Persian Gulf war, the first Bush administration left Saddam Hussein to wonder how the United States would respond to an Iraqi chemical or biological attack on American forces even though Iraq did not have nuclear capabilities.

Also drawing fire is the review's proposal to develop low-yield nuclear weapons, or "mini-nukes," for possible use in destroying hard or deeply buried targets, like underground bunkers used by rogue states in developing and storing weapons of mass destruction. Critics fear that since these smaller nuclear weapons would cause less damage, they would be more likely to be used.

But the Defense Department already has a nuclear weapon designed to penetrate bunkers. The review proposes to continue efforts to develop more effective penetrating weapons, since the deeper the penetration, the lower the yield required to destroy the target. But, more important, it recommends pursuing non-nuclear options for dealing with such targets, including "bunker-buster" precision weapons that would reduce reliance on mini-nukes altogether.

There is also concern about the Pentagon's plans to store, rather than destroy, a substantial number of the nuclear warheads removed from the active forces. But storage makes sense for two reasons. First, the Pentagon currently has no ability to produce new nuclear weapons, and the process for restarting production would take years. Second, dramatic cuts in the level of United States nuclear weapons would make it more likely that other states will aim to achieve parity with us. Even as we reduce our weapons, the ability to reconstitute much of our current force could be important in dissuading countries that aspire to nuclear superpower status from increasing their arsenals.

The administration's critics, however, are right on one central point. The review places far too much faith in missile defenses. Despite the efforts of nearly half a century, effective ballistic missile defenses remain a long-term goal, not a reality. While the administration should not abandon efforts to pursue promising missile defense technologies, it should be realistic about the role missile defenses can play.

Finally, despite the review's call to create a strategic, non-nuclear, precision-strike force, the administration's budget contains few major initiatives to enhance these capabilities. Instead, the budget invests heavily in highly problematic missile defenses, while precision-strike force weaponry, like stealth bombers, extended-range unmanned strike aircraft and long-range precision munitions, remain underfunded. The end result could be a strategic force that while deploying far fewer nuclear weapons, fails to provide strong non-nuclear alternatives against rogue nations.

Andrew F. Krepinevich is executive director of the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments.

6. "Nuts About Nukes"
Washington Post - March 14, 2002 - Mary McGrory column

It's one of two things. The nuclear posture review is either a harmless piece of paper serving up warmed-over Clinton doctrine, "a working document" leaked by some subversive showoff; or else it is a farewell to arms control and nonproliferation, the work of doomsday planners who have at last succeeded in selling their idea that nuclear weapons are no different from the conventional kind and equally useful in combat.

The Bush administration, led by Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and Secretary of State Colin Powell, is busy spinning its insignificance. Sen. Jack Reed (D-R.I.) asked Powell at a hearing if the new, smaller nukes envisioned by the review would require testing that would violate the moratorium on testing. Powell gave a sweeping assurance: He had called the Pentagon and was told it had no intention of abandoning the test ban.

Secretary Rumsfeld was having the novel experience of playing host to an official whose country found its name on the target list that is a feature of the review. Both he and Sergei Ivanov, Russia's defense minister, got around it by saying what great friends and partners the United States and the Kremlin have become since the end of the Cold War.

The Pentagon reviewers may seem to be activating the nuclear trigger by asserting that we will use nuclear weapons against any nation threatening biological or chemical warfare. Hitherto, nonnuclear states were exempt from U.S. nuclear attack, but the president says he has to have every possible option.

For some, the review offered a trip down memory lane. The advocacy of small nuclear weapons brought back memories of 1964, when Republican presidential contender Barry Goldwater traversed the country peddling tactical battlefield nukes no bigger than a fountain pen -- so small they could be clipped to a GI's shoulder tabs.

The public did not buy. It wasn't the size of the weapons, it was their radioactivity that concerned people. Goldwater was vaporized by Lyndon Johnson.

"It was bizarre then," says the Carnegie Endowment's nuclear sage, Joseph Cirincione, of Goldwater's crusade. "It's bizarre now."

"We are saying that nuclear weapons are no longer the weapon of last resort but weapons of first choice," he says. This is from an administration that has pledged a two-thirds reduction in strategic nuclear weapons but denies that development of small weapons will have any effect on nonnuclear countries that had refrained from going nuclear.

Cirincione's succinct summary of the meaning of the review: "It means that the nuclear nuts have seized control of the policy apparatus."

Most military men agree that battlefield nukes are not an option. Among them has been Colin Powell, who, in his autobiography, "My American Journey," wrote disparagingly of their utility. In 1958 he was assigned to guard a nuclear cannon. "We are not talking about dropping a few artillery shells at a crossing. No matter how small they were . . . we would be crossing a threshold. . . . Using nukes at this point would mean one of the most significant policy and military decisions since Hiroshima."

Powell has been assiduous in defending the administration against charges of extremism and unilateralism. Some think he swallows hard before fashioning his rationalizations, but a united front is more essential than ever, with the vice president making a tour to convince 11 nations that this is a prudent, painstaking country that could be trusted to run a tidy and effective effort in evicting Saddam Hussein from Iraq.

"Our heads are spinning," said Sen. Lincoln Chafee of Rhode Island, a moderate Republican who succeeded his father in the Senate. John Chafee was a champion of arms control. "This is a time when we should be befriending people, not threatening them. We need all the allies we can get."

Chafee said that the leaked news of another enterprise, the shadow government, was still confounding members. The Bush plan to collect bureaucrats from all over the government and send them underground for 90 days to ensure the continuity of government -- leaving Congress entirely out of the picture -- caused both hilarity and hurt feelings on the Hill.

Members are familiar with White House efforts to make the legislative branch feel irrelevant, but to insinuate nonexistence breaks new ground.

The short-lived Office of Strategic Influence caused consternation.

Although for some it represented progress of a sort -- the Pentagon never admitted it was lying all through the Vietnam War -- it caused fresh waves of derision in Europe.

The alacrity with which administration officials, beginning with the president, are insisting that the nuclear posture review represents no change is enough to convince you that the Office of Strategic Influence is alive and all too well.

7. "A Pretty Poor Posture For A Superpower"

Los Angeles Times - March 13, 2002 - Robert S. McNamara and Thomas Graham Jr. OpEd

During the Cold War, peace was supported by the doctrine of "mutual assured destruction," which simply meant that each side maintained second strike capability, thereby deterring nuclear war. The Antiballistic Missile Treaty and other treaties limiting the use of offensive nuclear forces were the underpinning of this doctrine. They were also the basis for ending the nuclear arms race.

Now, the Bush administration has moved to a new nuclear doctrine described by one commentator as "unilateral assured destruction."

Should the recently leaked Nuclear Posture Review, or NPR, become official policy, we can expect nuclear weapons to spread around the world. We will live in a far more dangerous world, and the United States will be much less secure.

According to reports describing the NPR, Russia is still a possible target, but potentially by offensive forces rather than second-strike nuclear forces. China also could be a target, with a "military confrontation over the status of Taiwan" a possible rationale for a nuclear strike.

The NPR goes even further. It explicitly lists Libya, Syria, Iraq, Iran and North Korea as potential targets for U.S. nuclear forces, putting aside the ambiguity employed in previous reports. One thing--perhaps the only thing--that these five states have in common, however, is that all are nonnuclear parties to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

For 30 years, this treaty has kept nuclear weapons from spreading all over the world, a development that would be devastating to U.S. security.

The problem is, however, that in 1978, to bolster the treaty, the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union formally pledged never to use nuclear weapons against nonnuclear countries that were parties to the treaty except in the case of an attack in alliance with a nuclear weapon state. (No exception was made for responding to chemical or biological attacks.)

This pledge, joined by France and China, was reiterated in 1995.

And in what could be the most reasonable request in the history of international relations, in exchange for agreeing to never acquire nuclear weapons, 182 nonnuclear nations asked that the five nuclear weapons states promise never to attack them with such weapons. This was done in April 1995 in connection with a U.N. Security Council resolution.

But the Pentagon plan undermines the credibility of that pledge, which underpins the nonproliferation treaty.

Further, the basic implication of the NPR--that the U.S. reserves the right to target any nation with nuclear weapons whenever it chooses to do so--is itself likely to increase the risk of the nuclear weapons proliferation. If a country believes it's falling out of favor with Washington, what is the first thing it is likely to do? A quote attributed to Indian Defense Minister George Fernandes provides some insight: "Before one challenges the United States, one must first acquire nuclear weapons."

Finally, the NPR also appears to set forth a 40-year plan for developing and acquiring new nuclear weapons. It reportedly calls for new air, sea and land launch platforms to be developed and deployed in 2020, 2030 and 2040, and it calls for new low-yield and variable-yield warheads that probably would require nuclear testing. Maintaining a permanent rationale for a robust U.S. nuclear arsenal and a resumption of nuclear testing flies in the face of vital U.S. commitments.

These matters are far too important for the administration to decide on its own. There must be a full public debate, in Congress, on the future of our nuclear deterrent and the nuclear nonproliferation regime.

Robert S. McNamara was secretary of Defense from 1961 to 1967. Thomas Graham Jr., the special representative of the president for arms control and disarmament during the Clinton administration, is president of the Lawyers Alliance for World Security and author of "Disarmament Sketches," due in May from the University of Washington Press.

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: Op-ed piece on nuclear posture review
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues,

There are lots of item on the Nuclear Posture Review this week. Among them is this excellent op-ed piece by Robert McNamara and Thomas Graham.

Howard

###

"A Pretty Poor Posture For A Superpower"

Los Angeles Times - March 13, 2002 - Robert S. McNamara and Thomas Graham
Jr. OpEd

During the Cold War, peace was supported by the doctrine of "mutual assured destruction," which simply meant that each side maintained second strike capability, thereby deterring nuclear war. The Antiballistic Missile Treaty and other treaties limiting the use of offensive nuclear forces were the underpinning of this doctrine. They were also the basis for ending the nuclear arms race.

Now, the Bush administration has moved to a new nuclear doctrine described by one commentator as "unilateral assured destruction."

Should the recently leaked Nuclear Posture Review, or NPR, become official policy, we can expect nuclear weapons to spread around the world. We will live in a far more dangerous world, and the United States will be much less secure.

According to reports describing the NPR, Russia is still a possible target, but potentially by offensive forces rather than second-strike nuclear forces. China also could be a target, with a "military confrontation over the status of Taiwan" a possible rationale for a nuclear strike.

The NPR goes even further. It explicitly lists Libya, Syria, Iraq, Iran and North Korea as potential targets for U.S. nuclear forces, putting aside the ambiguity employed in previous reports. One thing--perhaps the only thing--that these five states have in common, however, is that all are nonnuclear parties to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

For 30 years, this treaty has kept nuclear weapons from spreading all over the world, a development that would be devastating to U.S. security.

The problem is, however, that in 1978, to bolster the treaty, the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union formally pledged never to use nuclear

weapons against nonnuclear countries that were parties to the treaty except in the case of an attack in alliance with a nuclear weapon state. (No exception was made for responding to chemical or biological attacks.)

This pledge, joined by France and China, was reiterated in 1995.

And in what could be the most reasonable request in the history of international relations, in exchange for agreeing to never acquire nuclear weapons, 182 nonnuclear nations asked that the five nuclear weapons states promise never to attack them with such weapons. This was done in April 1995 in connection with a U.N. Security Council resolution.

But the Pentagon plan undermines the credibility of that pledge, which underpins the nonproliferation treaty.

Further, the basic implication of the NPR--that the U.S. reserves the right to target any nation with nuclear weapons whenever it chooses to do so--is itself likely to increase the risk of the nuclear weapons proliferation. If a country believes it's falling out of favor with Washington, what is the first thing it is likely to do? A quote attributed to Indian Defense Minister George Fernandes provides some insight: "Before one challenges the United States, one must first acquire nuclear weapons."

Finally, the NPR also appears to set forth a 40-year plan for developing and acquiring new nuclear weapons. It reportedly calls for new air, sea and land launch platforms to be developed and deployed in 2020, 2030 and 2040, and it calls for new low-yield and variable-yield warheads that probably would require nuclear testing. Maintaining a permanent rationale for a robust U.S. nuclear arsenal and a resumption of nuclear testing flies in the face of vital U.S. commitments.

These matters are far too important for the administration to decide on its own. There must be a full public debate, in Congress, on the future of our nuclear deterrent and the nuclear nonproliferation regime.

Robert S. McNamara was secretary of Defense from 1961 to 1967. Thomas Graham Jr., the special representative of the president for arms control and disarmament during the Clinton administration, is president of the Lawyers Alliance for World Security and author of "Disarmament Sketches," due in May from the University of Washington Press.

"A Pretty Poor Posture For A Superpower"

Los Angeles Times - March 13, 2002 - Robert S. McNamara and Thomas Graham
Jr. OpEd

During the Cold War, peace was supported by the doctrine of "mutual assured destruction," which simply meant that each side maintained second strike capability, thereby deterring nuclear war. The Antiballistic Missile Treaty and other treaties limiting the use of offensive nuclear forces were the underpinning of this doctrine. They were also the basis for ending the nuclear arms race.

Now, the Bush administration has moved to a new nuclear doctrine described by one commentator as "unilateral assured destruction."

Should the recently leaked Nuclear Posture Review, or NPR, become official policy, we can expect nuclear weapons to spread around the world. We will live in a far more dangerous world, and the United States will be much less secure.

According to reports describing the NPR, Russia is still a possible target, but potentially by offensive forces rather than second-strike nuclear forces. China also could be a target, with a "military confrontation over the status of Taiwan" a possible rationale for a nuclear strike.

The NPR goes even further. It explicitly lists Libya, Syria, Iraq, Iran and North Korea as potential targets for U.S. nuclear forces, putting aside the ambiguity employed in previous reports. One thing--perhaps the only thing--that these five states have in common, however, is that all are nonnuclear parties to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

For 30 years, this treaty has kept nuclear weapons from spreading all over the world, a development that would be devastating to U.S. security.

The problem is, however, that in 1978, to bolster the treaty, the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union formally pledged never to use nuclear weapons against nonnuclear countries that were parties to the treaty except in the case of an attack in alliance with a nuclear weapon state. (No exception was made for responding to chemical or biological attacks.)

This pledge, joined by France and China, was reiterated in 1995.

And in what could be the most reasonable request in the history of international relations, in exchange for agreeing to never acquire nuclear weapons, 182 nonnuclear nations asked that the five nuclear weapons states promise never to attack them with such weapons. This was done in April 1995 in connection with a U.N. Security Council resolution.

But the Pentagon plan undermines the credibility of that pledge, which

underpins the nonproliferation treaty.

Further, the basic implication of the NPR--that the U.S. reserves the right to target any nation with nuclear weapons whenever it chooses to do so--is itself likely to increase the risk of the nuclear weapons proliferation. If a country believes it's falling out of favor with Washington, what is the first thing it is likely to do? A quote attributed to Indian Defense Minister George Fernandes provides some insight: "Before one challenges the United States, one must first acquire nuclear weapons."

Finally, the NPR also appears to set forth a 40-year plan for developing and acquiring new nuclear weapons. It reportedly calls for new air, sea and land launch platforms to be developed and deployed in 2020, 2030 and 2040, and it calls for new low-yield and variable-yield warheads that probably would require nuclear testing. Maintaining a permanent rationale for a robust U.S. nuclear arsenal and a resumption of nuclear testing flies in the face of vital U.S. commitments.

These matters are far too important for the administration to decide on its own. There must be a full public debate, in Congress, on the future of our nuclear deterrent and the nuclear nonproliferation regime.

Robert S. McNamara was secretary of Defense from 1961 to 1967. Thomas Graham Jr., the special representative of the president for arms control and disarmament during the Clinton administration, is president of the Lawyers Alliance for World Security and author of "Disarmament Sketches," due in May from the University of Washington Press.

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0
Date: Thu, 14 Mar 2002 08:48:29 -0500
To: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: See the original: nuclear posture review on-line

Global Security.Org, headed by John Pike, has put excerpts of the classified Nuclear Posture Review on line:

<http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/policy/dod/npr.htm>

John Isaacs

To: "Myungsun Han" <mhan624@hotmail.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Questions about UMC Peace with Justice
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <F303tonOinRLrQCRDKY0000cb8a@hotmail.com>
References:

At 08:58 PM 3/12/02 -0500, you wrote:

>Hello from NJ. Hi! My name is Myungsun Han and I am a student of Drew
>Theological school. One of the assignments of that class is to research
>one of the caucuses in UMC that I am interested and to submitt 15 page long
>paper....

I would like to help you, but I'm not sure how timely I can be. Methodists United for Peace with Justice is mostly a one man operation now, myself as chair. I'm in the midst of helping the interfaith community respond to President Bush's Nuclear Posture Review. We don't have much on MUPJ history readily available, but I'll put together some material and mail it to you. Please provide a mailing address.

Shalom,
Howard Hallman

X-Originating-IP: [199.74.153.171]
From: "Dave Robinson" <paxchristiusanc@hotmail.com>
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: sign on
Date: Thu, 14 Mar 2002 09:09:22 -0500
X-OriginalArrivalTime: 14 Mar 2002 14:09:22.0602 (UTC) FILETIME=[D73670A0:01C1CB61]

HI Howard,

I am on the road but saw Tony's response to you. Please add Pax Christi USA,
me, and Bishop Walter Sullivan to the letter if its not too late.

peace,
dave

MSN Photos is the easiest way to share and print your photos:
<http://photos.msn.com/support/worldwide.aspx>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 6.0.1
Date: Thu, 14 Mar 2002 08:23:43 -0600
From: "Greg Laszakovits" <glaszakovits_gb@brethren.org>
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Letter to Bush on Nuclear Posture Review

Howard,
Sorry to be late in responding. Please sign me on.

Greg

Greg Davidson Laszakovits
Church of the Brethren Washington Office
337 North Carolina Avenue SE
Washington, DC 20003
202.546.3202

From: JohnEngl@aol.com
Date: Thu, 14 Mar 2002 11:29:30 EST
Subject: BUMC Communion Offerings.
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 6.0 for Windows US sub 10551

Howard,

As we discussed, I contacted Kris about the Communion Offerings. She has come up with the following numbers.

In 2001, the total communion offering was \$1,740.00. A total of \$119.26 was paid out for communion supplies..

So far in 2002 a total of \$344 has been given.

At the moment a total of \$7,028.56 is in the Communion Fund.

Regards,

John

To: interfaithnd, ograbc@aol.com, tlheath_churchwomen@yahoo.com, thart@episcopalchurch.org, rsider@speakeeasy.net

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

Subject: NPR letter sent to President Bush

Cc:

Bcc:

X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\iclt.191.doc;

In-Reply-To:

References:

Dear Colleagues,

(1) Our letter on Nuclear Posture Review went to President Bush today, March 15. I am sending you the final version with signers as a Word attachment. Thanks to all who signed it. If anyone who didn't sign, would like to add your name, let me know. We'll add it as we make use of the letter. If anyone wants to put the letter on your web site, please do.

(2) We will discuss this letter with Frank Miller of the National Security Council staff when we meet with him from 1:25 to 2:30 p.m., Friday, March 22 in Conference Room 2, Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE. Please plan to stay another 30 minutes until 3:00 so that we can discuss follow through activities. PLEASE RSVP.

(3) Global Security.Org, headed by John Pike, has put excerpts of the classified Nuclear Posture Review on line:
<http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/policy/dod/npr.htm>

(4) Release of the recommendations of the classified NPR has brought the nuclear issue to the forefront of public discussion. This is both a great opportunity and a sizable challenge to the faith community to respond vigorously. More on this next week.

Shalom,
Howard

From: HolRonFost@aol.com
Date: Fri, 15 Mar 2002 14:43:43 EST
Subject: Re: Peace with Justice Sunday
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 7.0 for Windows US sub 256

PWJ Sunday falls the first Sunday after Pentecost which this year makes it May 26th.

**Be God's,
Ron**

X-Originating-IP: [199.95.168.36]
From: "Myungsun Han" mhan624@hotmail.com
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Re: Questions about UMC Peace with Justice
Date: Thu, 14 Mar 2002 12:13:26 -0500
X-Original Arrival Time: 14 Mar 2002 17:13:26.0746 (UTC)
FILETIME=[8E0913A0:01C1CB7B]

Thank you for your responding.

My mailing address is

Myungsun Han

P.O.Box 802 CM 1957-Drew, Madison, NJ 07940

Thanks.

[Myungsun Han](#)

E-mail: mhan624@hotmail.com
Homepage: <http://cafe.godpeople.com/mhan624/>
>From: "Howard W. Hallman"
>To: "Myungsun Han"
>Subject: Re: Questions about UMC Peace with Justice
>Date: Thu, 14 Mar 2002 11:26:48 -0500
>
>At 08:58 PM 3/12/02 -0500, you wrote:
>> Hello from NJ. Hi! My name is Myungsun Han and I am a student of Drew
>>Theological school. One of the assignments of that class is to research
>>one of the caucuses in UMC that I am interested and to submitt 15 page long
>>paper....
>
>I would like to help you, but I'm not sure how timely I can be. Methodists
>United for Peace with Justice is mostly a one man operation now, myself as
>chair. I'm in the midst of helping the interfaith community respond to
>President Bush's Nuclear Posture Review. We don't have much on MUPJ
>history readily available, but I'll put together some material and mail it
>to you. Please provide a mailing address.
>
>Shalom,

>Howard Hallman
>
>
>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.

Get your FREE download of MSN Explorer at <http://explorer.msn.com>.

X-Originating-IP: [156.40.64.92]
From: "Kelly Diamond" kgdime@hotmail.com
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Re: Sessions on the Social Principles
Date: Thu, 14 Mar 2002 11:39:14 -0800
X-OriginalArrivalTime: 14 Mar 2002 19:39:14.0793 (UTC)
FILETIME=[EC471D90:01C1CB8F]

Good idea to add cloning & stem cell research. Yes, I'll send it in to Kris for the Messenger. Thanks, Kelly

>From: "Howard W. Hallman"
>To: "Kelly Diamond"
>Subject: Re: Sessions on the Social Principles
>Date: Wed, 13 Mar 2002 15:45:24 -0500
>
>Kelly,
>
>I can't think of a way to tie into the "open" series. I'm satisfied with
>"Christians Grapple with Social Issues", but I'll accept whatever you
>decided upon.
>
>Your paragraph for the Messenger is fine, except I would add "cloning, stem
>cell research" because of the current controversy.
>
>Are you going to get it in the Messenger?
>
>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-Originating-IP: [207.220.160.91]
From: "Christopher Wong" pla8341@hotmail.com
To: Janice.Vera@CliffordChance.com, dancryer@aol.com, douglas.cotts@att.net, linne@prodigy.net, nosborn@attglobal.net, MLPCC@CUNYVM.CUNY.EDU, darcole@hotmail.com, jelsunny@aol.com
Cc: revchurch@aol.com, jcarlssonb@aol.com, mriley@uua.org, rcavenaugh@uua.org, egbertL4pj@yahoo.com, mupj@igc.org
Subject: Re: Nuclear Posture Review
Date: Sat, 16 Mar 2002 01:20:32 -0500
X-OriginalArrivalTime: 16 Mar 2002 06:20:33.0581 (UTC)
FILETIME=[ADD5F5D0:01C1CCB2]

Some helpful web sites for further information of NPR

<http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/qdr2001.pdf> (The DoD web site for the document "Quadrennial Defense

Review Report" in PDF format. You need Acrobat Reader to open the document)

<http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jan2002/g020109-D-6570C.html> (The Briefing Slides)

<http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jan2002/d20020109npr.pdf> (The disclosed cover letter to the Congress)

<http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/pol/arms/stories/review.htm> (The news briefing from Crouch, the assistant secretary of Defense for International Security Policy on NPR , Jan 29,2002)

<http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/policy/dod/npr.htm> (The detail of the NPR report from Global Security)

Some commentary

<http://www.fas.org/> (Federation of American Scientists)

<http://www.cdi.org/nuclear/> (Center for Defense Information)

[http://www.csis.org/burke\(mb/USnprOV011002.pdf](http://www.csis.org/burke(mb/USnprOV011002.pdf) (Center for Strategic and International Studies)

<http://www.ucsusa.org/index.html> (Union of Concerned Scientists)

http://www.fpif.org/commentary/0012nuclear_body.html (World Policy Institute)

http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2000_11/Nolan.asp (Arms Control Association)

<http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/02.01/020110kriegerposturereview.htm> (Nuclear Age Peace Foundation)

<http://www.peace-action.org/> (Peace Action)

Get your FREE download of MSN Explorer at <http://explorer.msn.com>.

From: JohnEngl@aol.com
Date: Sat, 16 Mar 2002 12:57:01 EST
Subject: Communion Offering.
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 6.0 for Windows US sub 10551

Howard,

I will put a copy of the data I got from Kris in Dwight Smith's Outreach box tomorrow morning, Sunday.

Regards,

John

From: JFNORTH@aol.com
Date: Sun, 17 Mar 2002 21:10:31 EST
Subject: Fwd: NAMI URGENT ACTION ALERT--CALL IMMEDIATELY
To: mupj@igc.apc.org X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Mac sub 28 Return-Path: Received: from rly-xc04.mx.aol.com (rly-xc04.mail.aol.com [172.20.105.137]) by air-xc02.mail.aol.com (v83.45) with ESMTP id MAILINXC22-0315131738; Fri, 15 Mar 2002 13:17:38 -0500 Received: from smtp-a.capu.net (smtp-a.capu.net [64.50.133.50]) by rly-xc04.mx.aol.com (v83.45) with ESMTP id MAILRELAYINXC48-0315131723; Fri, 15 Mar 2002 13:17:23 -0500 Received: from leah (cd-190-163.ra30.dc.capu.net [64.50.190.163]) by smtp-a.capu.net (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id NAA29419; Fri, 15 Mar 2002 13:14:57 -0500
From: "NAMI Office" To: Cc: "Esther Kaleko-Kravitz"
Subject: NAMI URGENT ACTION ALERT--CALL IMMEDIATELY
Date: Fri, 15 Mar 2002 13:17:47 -0500
Message-ID: MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="----=_NextPart_000_0007_01C1CC23.CD089D20"
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
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 V6.00.2600.0000

**EXTREMELY URGENT ACTION ALERT--CALLS REQUIRED IMMEDIATELY!!!!!!
SAVE LIVES--CALL LEGISLATORS TO SUPPORT NAMI MD TREATMENT BILL
SB645/HB923**

We just found out that the Senate Educ., Health and Environmental Affairs Committee will be voting THIS AFTERNOON OR EVENING on the NAMI MD Treatment Bill to change the involuntary evaluation and hospital treatment standards for people with serioius mental illness. (The House Committee will vote within the next 10 days, but it could be as early as Monday.)

PLEASE CALL THE 2 COMMITTEE CHAIRS **IMMEDIATELY** AND URGE SUPPORT FOR Senate bill 645 or House Bill 923. (SB 645/ HB/923)

Sen. Clarence Blount, Chairman, Educ, Health & Environmental Affairs Committee:
301-858-3697 or 410-841-3697 or 1-800-492-7122, ext 3697
Urge him to support SB 645 (Give your name and address)

Delegate John Hurson, Chairman House Environmental Matters Committee
301- 858-3534 or 410-841-3534 or 1-800-492-7122, ext. 3534
Urge him to support HB 923 (Give your name and address)

If any of your legislators are on the committees voting on the bill (see below), call their office also and urge them to vote for HB 923 (Delegates) or SB 645 (Senators). Give them your name and address. If you do not know your state legislative district, you can find out by calling your county Board of Elections and giving them your address.

Mont. Co. Senator on Education, Health & Environmental Affairs Committee:
Brian E. Frosh (D. 16) Montgomery County. (301) 858-3124 (uncommitted)

Mont. Co. Delegates on House Environmental Matters Committee:
Del. Joan Stern (Dist. 39): 301-858-3037 (uncommitted-urge support)
Leon G. Billings (D. 18) Mont. Co.(301) 858-3028 (co-sponsor-urge continued support)
Del. Barbara Frush (D 21) 301-858-3114 (cosponsor-urge continued support)
Tod D. Sher (D. 14A)- 301-858-3052 (Our Lead Sponsor-thank him)

BACKGROUND:

Suicide, suffering, homelessness and incarceration. These are the consequences of not treating serious mental illness, such as schizophrenia, bi-polar disorder, and major depression. Current Maryland law requires a person to be dangerous before they can be involuntarily evaluated or hospitalized. This is often too late to prevent tragic consequences for those who do not understand they need hospitalization.

How NAMI Md's Treatment Law Would Help: Enabling Timely Hospital Treatment

- A. Timely petition for physician evaluation: The danger criteria is changed from "clear and imminent" to a standard of reasonable expectation of danger in the foreseeable future.
 - B. "Gravely Disabled" is an added criteria for involuntary evaluation petition, hospital admission, and treatment. This applies to those who need inpatient treatment, but are not able to make an informed decision and whose condition puts them in danger of serious bodily harm or psychiatric deterioration.
 - C. Significant damage to substantial property is added as a criteria for involuntary procedures. This is to prevent harm & avoid criminal charges.
- In all cases involuntary hospitalization is permitted only if the person has a mental illness, there is no less restrictive form of intervention consistent with the person's welfare and safety and if they are unable or unwilling to be admitted voluntary.

To: dosmith@juno.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Communion offering
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dwight,

Here is information on the communion offering that I received from John English. My understanding is that this money is for the pastor's discretionary use for special needs in the Bethesda community, including response to drop-ins. If the balance is in excess of what he needs from month to month, we may want to consider whether some of it should be transferred to Bethesda Care rather than sitting idle. Also, my understanding is that it is not supposed to be used for communion supplies. They are funded elsewhere.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Howard,

As we discussed, I contacted Kris about the Communion Offerings. She has come up with the following numbers.

In 2001, the total communion offering was \$1,740.00. A total of \$119.26 was paid out for communion supplies.

So far in 2002 a total of \$344 has been given.

At the moment a total of \$7,028.56 is in the Communion Fund.

Regards,

John

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

Dwight,

Here is information on the communion offering that I received from John English. My understanding is that this money is for the pastor's discretionary use for special needs in the Bethesda community, including response to drop-ins. If the balance is in excess of what he needs from month to month, we may want to consider whether some of it should be transferred to Bethesda Care rather than sitting idle. Also, my understanding is that it is not supposed to be used for communion supplies. They are funded elsewhere.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Howard,

As we discussed, I contacted Kris about the Communion Offerings. She has come up with the following numbers.

In 2001, the total communion offering was \$1,740.00. A total of \$119.26 was paid out for communion supplies.

So far in 2002 a total of \$344 has been given.

At the moment a total of \$7,028.56 is in the Communion Fund.

Regards,

John

To: tlh_churchwomen@yahoo.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Nuclear posture review
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\iclt.191.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues,

- (1) Our letter on Nuclear Posture Review went to President Bush today, March 15. I am sending you the final version with signers as a Word attachment. Thanks to all who signed it. If anyone who didn't sign, would like to add your name, let me know. We'll add it as we make use of the letter. If anyone wants to put the letter on your web site, please do.
- (2) We will discuss this letter with Frank Miller of the National Security Council staff when we meet with him from 1:25 to 2:30 p.m., Friday, March 22 in Conference Room 2, Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE. Please plan to stay another 30 minutes until 3:00 so that we can discuss follow through activities. PLEASE RSVP.
- (3) Global Security.Org, headed by John Pike, has put excerpts of the classified Nuclear Posture Review on line: <http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/policy/dod/npr.htm>
- (4) Release of the recommendations of the classified NPR has brought the nuclear issue to the forefront of public discussion. This is both a great opportunity and a sizable challenge to the faith community to respond vigorously. More on this next week.

Shalom,
Howard

To: oped@washpost.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: "Nuclear Weapons: A Moral Issue"
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\icnd.133.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Op-Ed Editor:

Your Op-Ed page has recently had interesting discussion of the United States nuclear posture. Missing, though, is consideration of the morality of nuclear weapons. To overcome this lack I am submitting an op-ed piece entitled, "Nuclear Weapons: A Moral Issue." I am sending it as text below and as a Word attachment.

I am submitting this piece exclusively to the Post. However, please let me know if you do want to use it so that I can submit it elsewhere.

Sincerely yours,
Howard W. Hallman

###

Nuclear Weapons: A Moral Issue by Howard W. Hallman

The leak of the classified Nuclear Posture Review has brought about much-needed discussion of U.S. nuclear policy. As we engaged in this debate, we should realize that nuclear weapons are not merely a factor in foreign and military policy. At the very heart of the matter, the possession, use and threatened use of nuclear weapons is a moral issue.

Religious bodies have long recognized the immorality of nuclear weapons. In 1983 the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches unequivocally declared "that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds." Speaking for the Holy See, Archbishop Renato Martino in October 1997 told the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified." Religious denominations in the United States have made similar statements.

Yet, the Pentagon planners who produced the Nuclear Posture Review foresee the United States possessing nuclear weapons far into the future. To be sure the planned reduction of U.S. strategic nuclear weapons to 1,700 to 2,000 warheads, along with similar Russian reduction, is a step in the right direction. But even when this level is finally reached in 2012, both nations will still have enough deployed warheads to destroy one another several times over. These weapons will remain on high alert according to the Pentagon plan. In practice the cold war doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD) will still be in effect even though President Bush, Secretary Rumsfeld, and Secretary Powell have said it is obsolete.

Worse yet the Pentagon plan expands the role of nuclear weapons in the 21st century. Going beyond the cold war policy of using nuclear weapons to deter nuclear weapon states from attacking the United States and its allies, the Nuclear Posture Review specifies that nuclear weapons should be available for dealing with North Korea, Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Libya and for use in retaliation against biological and chemical weapons. President Bush justifies this by saying, "We've got all options on the table."

We should pause and ask ourselves, what kind of people are we? Do we really want our personal security to be

based upon willingness to annihilate another people? Do we hate Saddam Hussein so much that we are willing to wipe out Baghdad to eliminate him? Is it right for us to hold the Iraqi people hostage? Or North Koreans, Iranians, Syrians, Libyans?

No, it isn't. Instead we should state forthrightly that all options are not available to a moral nation. Genocide is not a legitimate option. Slaughter of the innocent is not an acceptable option. That's what nuclear weapons do. They ravage environment. Used in massive numbers nuclear weapons threaten life on Earth. That's why the United Methodist bishops entitled their 1986 pastoral letter on the nuclear crisis, In Defense of Creation.

Accordingly, representatives of two dozen national religious organizations have urged President Bush to send the Nuclear Posture Review back to the drawing boards. There it should be reconfigured to incorporate nuclear disarmament components and specify a declining role for nuclear weapons in U.S. foreign and military policy.

An excellent disarmament agenda is available from the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). It encompasses a number of practical steps, such as: reduction in operational status of nuclear weapons system; continued moratorium on nuclear-weapon-test explosions; entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; irreversible reductions of strategic offensive weapons and also tactical nuclear weapons; increased transparency; engagement of all nuclear-weapon states in the process of achieving the total elimination of their nuclear weapons.

For some, this may sound too idealistic and impractical. It isn't. Numerous admirals and generals in their retirement have told us that nuclear weapons have no military utility. In June 2000 eighteen of them joined 21 top religious leaders in a statement, issued at the Washington National Cathedral, saying that "the long-term reliance on nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger in their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They added, "National security imperatives and ethical demands have converged to bring us to the necessity of outlawing and prohibiting nuclear weapons worldwide."

This is moral response for a moral nation. This is the correct nuclear posture for the United States.

-30-

Howard W. Hallman is chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice. He also serves as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Office phone: 301 896-0013
Home phone: 301 897-3668

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0

Date: Mon, 18 Mar 2002 09:37:20 -0500

To: jdi@clw.org

From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>

Subject: Nuclear-related issues: 7 items

1. "Senators Insist On Role In Nuclear Arms Deals" - N.Y. Times
2. "Nuclear Arsenal Upgrade Planned" - USA Today
3. "Nuclear Arms Scientists May Lack 'Sense Of Mission'" - USA Today
4. "Bush Finds That Ambiguity Is Part Of Nuclear Deterrence" - N.Y. Times
5. "Russia 'Satisfied' On U.S. Nuclear Plan" - Int. Herald Tribune
6. "China Bluntly Rebukes U.S. Over Nuclear Policy Review" - Reuters
7. "Nuclear Preemption" - Hoagland column

=====

1. "Senators Insist On Role In Nuclear Arms Deals"

New York Times - March 17, 2002 - By Thom Shanker

WASHINGTON, March 16 -- The ranking Democratic and Republican members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have written to the Bush administration demanding that any nuclear arms reductions with Russia be submitted to the Senate as a formal treaty, according to copy of their letter obtained today.

Senators Joseph R. Biden Jr., Democrat of Delaware, and Jesse Helms, Republican of North Carolina, said an agreement on "significant obligations by the United states regarding deployed U.S. strategic nuclear warheads" would "constitute a treaty subject to the advice and consent of the Senate."

Their letter to Secretary of State Colin L. Powell was dated March 15, two days after President Bush expressed optimism that a deal on nuclear arms cuts would be ready for his meeting in May with President Vladimir V. Putin.

During a White House news conference, Mr. Bush clearly moved from reluctance to enthusiasm about signing a formal agreement with his Russian counterpart. But he left unclear exactly what format that agreement would take, and he has never committed to its being a treaty.

Thus, the Biden-Helms letter portends possible tensions between the White House and Congress over how -- even whether -- to make permanent and irreversible any reductions in American and Russian strategic nuclear arsenals.

At his Wednesday news conference, Mr. Bush said he agreed with Mr. Putin "that there needs to be a document that outlives both of us," adding, "And what form that comes in we will discuss." Secretary Powell said much the same thing in an appearance before the Foreign Relations Committee last month.

The Bush administration came into office warning that it would seek to modify and even abandon treaties it viewed as no longer in the national interest, and already has given the required legal notification that it will withdraw from the Antiballistic Missile Treaty to proceed with testing and deploying missile defenses.

Late Friday night, a prototype missile defense interceptor struck a mock warhead high over the Pacific Ocean in the fourth success out of six tests of the system, Pentagon officials said. Some arms control advocates voiced skepticism about the artificial conditions in the test, saying that the "kill vehicle" is told when the target will be launched, what it looks like and where it is headed. But the Pentagon described the test as "a major step."

On the question of nuclear arms reductions, Mr. Bush has moved almost month-by-month since his meeting with Mr. Putin in December, from indicating that a handshake alone would be sufficient to seal the deal, to his current position of agreeing to some sort of legally binding agreement.

While Mr. Biden and Mr. Helms are at opposite ends of the spectrum on many issues, their letter made clear that they are in full accord that the Senate's prerogative on treaties under the Constitution must be respected.

"With the exception of the SALT I agreement, every significant arms control agreement during the past three decades has been transmitted to the Senate pursuant to the Treaty Clause of the Constitution," the letter says. "Mr. Secretary, we see no reason whatsoever to alter this practice."

A State Department spokeswoman said there would be no comment today on the Biden-Helms letter. Mr. Bush has pledged to reduce America's 6,000-warhead nuclear arsenal to between 1,700 and 2,200 warheads over 10 years, and Mr. Putin has committed to as few as 1,500.

Recent descriptions of the Bush administration's review of the nation's nuclear posture worried arms-control advocates because the Pentagon plans to keep a significant number of warheads in storage even after they are removed from missiles and bombers. The Pentagon says those warheads are a hedge against unexpected threats, while advocates of arms control agreements say keeping such a substantial number of warheads in reserve calls into question the permanence of the cuts.

"The Helms and Biden letter is a very welcome message because it could lead the way to a more permanent reduction of U.S. and Russian forces," said Daryl G. Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control Association. "The key outstanding issue remains the content of the agreement, which should in our view produce verifiable and irreversible reductions."

He said a formal treaty "provides both sides with clearer and more durable commitments," adding, "Given the magnitude of this subject, such clarity is essential -- rather than leaving open the door to possible renewed nuclear tension."

Senate committee aides said that a president had three ways to formalize legally binding agreements.

One is a commitment under the president's sole executive authority, and does not come before the Congress. One is a legislative-executive agreement, which is submitted to both houses of Congress and requires a majority vote. The third is the two-thirds vote of advice and consent from the Senate on treaties.

Mr. Biden and Mr. Helms, in their letter, stressed their desire to "work closely with the Executive Branch on this matter," but said an arms control agreement with Russia must be submitted to the Senate.

2. "Nuclear Arsenal Upgrade Planned"

USA Today - March 18, 2002 - By Jonathan Weisman, USA Today

WASHINGTON — Energy Department scientists will begin work next month on a new bunker-busting nuclear weapon that could mark the most significant advance in the U.S. nuclear arsenal in a decade.

Research into a weapon that could penetrate deeply buried structures, such as those designed to make nuclear, chemical or biological weapons, is a key part of President Bush's push to rejuvenate the U.S. nuclear weapons program.

The research project marks a shift from designing weapons of mass annihilation to smaller arms that the administration says would better deter "rogue" states but critics say could make nuclear war more plausible.

Documents from the Energy Department, which oversees nuclear weapons, say Bush also plans to:

Reassemble design teams at the nation's nuclear weapons labs, which disbanded the teams in 1992 after the first President Bush had agreed to a nuclear test moratorium.

Shorten from years to months the lead time it would take to resume nuclear testing.

Ramp up spending on manufacturing sites to build nuclear weapons and components.

"The need is clear for a revitalized nuclear weapons complex," the Pentagon's new review of nuclear strategy says. News organizations have obtained portions of the classified Nuclear Posture Review. Researchers at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California and Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico will determine whether an advanced earth-penetrating nuclear weapon can be built. It would be assembled from existing warheads and components and placed in a 5,000-pound shell.

Everet Beckner, the National Nuclear Security Administration's deputy administrator for defense programs, says the program starts small: There likely will be fewer than a dozen designers at each lab, the "bunker-buster" study will cost \$40 million to \$50 million over two to three years, and Energy officials will seek congressional approval before designing a weapon.

Bush's father canceled the last major weapons research program, a short-range attack missile warhead, in 1991. He halted all new weapons research in 1992.

President Clinton shifted the nuclear weapons program from research,

testing and production to dismantling warheads and ensuring the safety and reliability of older weapons without testing.

The U.S. arsenal has had one type of nuclear "bunker buster" since 1997. Scientists took an existing bomb and refitted it with a hardened nose cone and new tail fins. The aim of the new weapon is to go deeper into the ground to cause less surface damage.

3. "Nuclear Arms Scientists May Lack 'Sense Of Mission'" USA Today -March 18, 2002 - By Jonathan Weisman, USA Today

WASHINGTON — The Bush administration's push to rebuild the nation's nuclear weapons research and production program is about more than developing new weapons to confront a new enemy.

It's also about training a new generation of scientists to replace an aging cadre of Cold Warriors who are heading toward retirement and taking the USA's nuclear weapons knowledge with them.

Administration officials and nuclear weapons scientists say a decade of neglect at the nation's three nuclear weapons labs has hurt morale, encouraged weapons experts to leave and crippled efforts to recruit a new generation of nuclear scientists.

"Nobody wants to work here," complains Tom Thomson, a senior weapons designer at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California. "There's no sense of mission," he says.

Only by challenging scientists to design and build new nuclear weapons will the labs regain their intellectual edge, they say.

Next month, nuclear weapons design teams will work on a weapon that could explode deep underground and cause minimal damage at the surface. Targets could include bunkers built to make nuclear or chemical weapons.

In assembling the design teams, the administration wants U.S. scientists to "think more broadly" about today's threats, "the present stockpile and whether it's properly configured," says Everett Beckner, deputy director of the Energy Department's National Nuclear Security Administration.

Critics of Bush's push to develop a new generation of nuclear weapons say they are outraged that the administration would risk a new nuclear arms race just to create more challenging work for scientists — especially when their job is to design a weapon that has a greater chance of being used.

"Getting nuclear weapons untangled from old Cold War doctrines and putting them on the shelf for use is a huge departure from the past," says Robert Alvarez, an Energy Department official in the Clinton administration.

Bush administration critics also say nuclear weapons lost their diplomatic and military utility with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the labs should shrink along with their mission.

The point of successive international arms control accords has been to halt the arms race, not only in numbers of nuclear weapons but in their quality, arms control advocates say. By resuming nuclear weapons research, Bush is violating the spirit of those accords, the critics say.

President Clinton addressed the issue of intellectual atrophy in the 1990s with a multibillion-dollar effort to ensure the safety and reliability of the remaining nuclear arsenal without testing.

His administration funded a raft of new science projects, from the largest laser in the world at Lawrence Livermore to pricey new non-nuclear explosives facilities at Los Alamos National Laboratory. Scientists also began supercomputing initiatives to create three-dimensional modeling of nuclear explosions and the effects of age on nuclear weapons.

But instead of providing intellectual challenges to a new generation of scientists, the program only slowed the exodus from the labs, administration officials and nuclear scientists say. "To keep people thinking at the front edge of their intellectual interests, it's important that they not be constrained to think only in terms of what's out there, already built," Beckner says.

Morale was dealt another blow by the Wen Ho Lee scandal, in which a Taiwanese-American who worked at Los Alamos was charged with spying for China. He was released after nine months in prison, when the government's case against the scientist collapsed.

Before the first President Bush declared a nuclear testing moratorium and an end to new nuclear weapons design in 1992, scientists were proposing a variety of exotic models. High-altitude radio frequency warheads would knock out an enemy's electrical grid. Directed-energy weapons would channel a nuclear blast in one direction. Low-yield "mini-nukes" would produce smaller nuclear explosions and pose a more credible deterrent to foes who do not believe the United States would ever detonate a large nuclear weapon capable of wiping out a city.

Such ideas are beginning to resurface. Two years ago, Stephen Younger, the head of nuclear weapons work at Los Alamos, wrote, "It is often, but not universally, thought that nuclear weapons would be used only ... when the nation is in the gravest danger." Younger added, "This may not be true in the future."

Younger, now director of the Pentagon agency charged with defending the nation from nuclear, chemical and biological attacks, extolled the virtues of the "mini-nuke" in his 2000 paper. He wrote that the benefit of a less powerful weapon is that casualties "may be reduced, an important factor in attacks near urban areas." Paul Robinson, director of Sandia National Laboratories in New Mexico, and Younger argue for a new "bunker buster" that can hit deeply buried targets with minimal deaths.

Some scientists don't believe that could work. Even a "mini-nuke" would have to burrow down 230 feet to fully contain the blast, says Robert Nelson, a physicist at Princeton University. That, he says, is physically impossible.

If it could not reach that level, even the force of a "mini-nuke" would be devastating, Nelson says. The giant daisy cutter bombs used sparingly in Afghanistan have 15,000 pounds of explosives. A 1-kiloton "mini-nuke" would explode with the equivalent force of 2 million pounds of explosives.

Even so, the administration is ready to try. John Gordon, undersecretary of Energy for nuclear security, told a Senate panel last month that the United States must adapt its nuclear force to deter "rogue states" bent on making nuclear, chemical or biological arms. Gordon said the goal is to be able to produce new nuclear weapons.

The 2003 Energy Department budget request boosts nuclear stockpile work 18% from this year to \$1.2 billion. Funding to rebuild the nuclear weapons production complex already shot up from \$9 million in 2001 to \$197 million this year, and Bush wants the level to reach \$243 million in 2003.

The development of new warheads could also add pressure on the United States to resume nuclear testing. Clinton signed an international test ban treaty, but it has not been ratified by the Senate and Bush does not support it. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld has expressed doubts that the safety and reliability of the existing nuclear arsenal can be ensured without an occasional explosive test.

Thomson says building a new weapon without testing it would be like designing a new car but never turning the ignition switch to see if it works.

The Nuclear Posture Review, the classified administration report that advocates new weapons research, calls for the Energy Department to reduce the time it would take to conduct a test from two years to several months. "While the United States is making every effort to maintain the stockpile without additional nuclear testing, this may not be possible for the indefinite future," it concludes.

4. "Bush Finds That Ambiguity Is Part Of Nuclear Deterrence"

New York Times - March 18, 2002 - By David E. Sanger

News Analysis

WASHINGTON, March 17 — President Bush and Vice President Dick Cheney have rarely missed an opportunity in recent weeks to warn that they will do whatever it takes to keep Saddam Hussein, or any other hostile power, from obtaining nuclear or biological weapons.

But the White House suddenly grew nervous after the leak of a Pentagon report suggesting one possible strategy for stopping them — a quick strike with a low-yield nuclear weapon designed to burrow deep into the earth and wipe out underground sites where such weapons are produced or stored.

Allies and nuclear strategists began asking a question not heard in Washington for decades: would the president ever consider a pre-emptive nuclear strike?

The answers have ranged from "not likely" to "no comment."

Secretary of State Colin L. Powell insisted several times that there had been no change in nuclear policy. The White House spokesman took the unusual step of quoting statements by two of former President Bill Clinton's defense secretaries warning potential rivals that they would face an overwhelming and devastating response if they threatened nuclear or biological attack.

In interviews, President Bush's top aides noted that despite the president's aggressive language about Iraq and the "axis of evil," he had never said that he would consider using specially designed nuclear weapons in a pre-emptive strike.

"We do not have a declared policy of pre-emption," a senior administration official said on Friday. "We have a strategy of deterrence."

At the same time, this official added, it is important to develop deep-burrowing nuclear weapons in order to "hold at risk" any nation's hardened, underground nuclear or biological weapons and laboratories. The new American weapons are needed, the official said, to make sure there is no safe place to develop nuclear and biological weapons, and to discourage countries from even trying.

Yet ambiguity is everything in nuclear deterrence.

Taken together, Mr. Bush's language, his advisers' statements and the Nuclear Posture Review suggest that Mr. Bush sees some advantage in keeping the world guessing about how the United States would respond to evidence that a country or a terrorist group was hiding weapons of mass destruction deep underground.

So the administration reached for phrases that left some strategic wiggle room, to sow reassurance at home and doubt in Iran, Iraq and North Korea.

Mr. Bush will not discuss it, naturally, and he said last week that "the nuclear review is not new," suggesting that the Clinton administration was headed in the same direction. Then, muddying the waters, he added, "We've got all options on the table, because we want to make it very clear to nations that you will not threaten the United States or use weapons of mass destruction against us or our allies."

China and North Korea, among other nations, say they believe the policy is both new and aggressive, with Beijing accusing Washington this weekend of trying to commit "nuclear blackmail."

This is not the first time the Chinese or the North Koreans have tried to figure out what an American president thinks about the unthinkable.

Harry S. Truman unleashed atomic weapons on Hiroshima and Nagasaki and never looked back, but he also refused Gen. Douglas MacArthur's request to use them in the Korean War. John F. Kennedy had to face the prospect in the Cuban missile crisis, and newly revealed tapes indicate that Richard M. Nixon urged his secretary of state to think about the use of nuclear weapons in Vietnam, though it seemed more like a passing rant than a

serious discussion.

But the strategic calculations that went on in the past are different from those under way in the Bush White House because deterring superpowers is very different from deterring a Saddam Hussein.

It is widely accepted that nuclear weapons are virtually useless in a war on terrorism or on rogue states, and in the case of America's nuclear arsenal that is particularly true. As the Nuclear Posture Review notes, the American arsenal is overwhelmingly based on cold-war thinking, when deterrence meant convincing rivals that the United States possessed the ability to wipe out their cities and missile silos. Mr. Bush has said that approach is outdated and has embraced deep cuts in America's traditional nuclear arsenal.

But terrorists do not have cities, and Iraq and Iran do not have silos.

So the discussion under way in Washington focuses on what amounts to a specialty use of a nuclear weapon: harnessing a nuclear blast to dig deep underground and cause a seismic wave that would collapse an underground nuclear site. The idea would be to keep nuclear fallout to a minimum.

So far the United States has only one earth-penetrating nuclear weapon that might get at underground sites, the B61 Mod 11 gravity bomb. The nuclear study, on which Mr. Bush was "extensively briefed," his aides say, warned that this weapon "cannot survive penetration into many types of terrain in which hardened underground facilities are located."

A study is under way to figure out how that weapon could be modified to get the job done, with more blast and less radiation, though that might take a decade. Still, the discussion has prompted questions that the White House wants to quash, while leaving Mr. Hussein wondering.

"The danger of this way of thinking," said one former Clinton administration nuclear strategist, "is that it treats a nuclear weapon as just one instrument you have available."

"Of course, no president would use it if he could get the job done with a conventional weapon," the former official said. "But what if the C.I.A. director walks into the Oval Office one day and says, 'Mr. President, we know where there are nuclear and biological weapons deep down in Tora Bora, but the only way to get at them is with a nuclear weapon'?"

Secretary Powell, eager to calm the diplomatic waters, made a point of restating American policy, saying that the United States would not use a nuclear weapon pre-emptively against a state that had promised not to build nuclear weapons of its own. That policy was meant to encourage countries to join the nonproliferation treaty. Administration officials say Secretary Powell was absolutely right. But then, preserving ambiguity, they note that the policy might not apply to a country that signed the treaty but then built nuclear weapons anyway — Iraq, for example.

=====

5. "Russia 'Satisfied' On U.S. Nuclear Plan"

International Herald Tribune - March 16-17, 2002 - AP, Reuters

Defense minister accepts Washington's explanation of document

Compiled by Our Staff From Dispatches AP, Reuters

MOSCOW--Although differences remain on some arms-control issues, Russia is satisfied with U.S. explanations about a contingency plan that could allow nuclear strikes against Russia and six other nations, Russia's defense minister said Friday after talks in Washington.

But officials from Iran and North Korea - also on the list of potential targets - hit back angrily.

U.S. officials provided Russia with explanations "that satisfy us," Defense Minister Sergei Ivanov said in Shannon, Ireland, on his way back from the United States, according to the ITAR-Tass and Interfax news agencies.

The leak of a classified Pentagon nuclear planning document had threatened to overshadow Ivanov's visit. News reports last weekend about the Nuclear Posture Review listed as potential targets Russia and China, both nuclear powers, as well as Iran, Syria, Iraq, North Korea and Libya.

Russian officials, whose country has enjoyed warmer relations with Washington in recent months because of Moscow's support for the U.S.-led campaign in Afghanistan, have questioned why the plan lumps Russia together with some of Washington's fiercest foes, such as Iraq and North Korea.

But in his talks with Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Secretary of State Colin Powell, Ivanov steered clear of any public signs of irritation.

"Being a defense minister, I understand well that the Defense Ministry of any country must plan any kind of developments," Ivanov said Friday.

Ivanov's talks with U.S. officials focused on working out a deal on nuclear arms cuts that both sides hope to secure in time for President George W. Bush's visit to Russia in May.

Ivanov said experts would pursue discussions next week in Geneva on outstanding issues, mainly U.S. proposals to store rather than destroy warheads taken out of service.

Moscow sees the summit as a consolidation of President Vladimir Putin's pro-Western foreign policy, underpinned by his backing for the U.S.-led anti-terrorism coalition. "At the moment a certain window of opportunity in our relations has been opened, or at least a small window, for a considerable improvement," Putin was quoted as saying. "It is vital to make use of this at once. Otherwise it might close."

Bush agreed last December to reduce U.S. arsenals of long-range nuclear warheads by two-thirds to between 1,700 and 2,200. Putin said Russia could go as low as 1,500.

In Greece, President Mohammed Khatami of Iran said Friday that the U.S.

planning document was a threat to "all humanity."

"The powers that threaten other peoples with nuclear weapons threaten not just these peoples but all humanity," Khatami said after a meeting with Archbishop Christodoulos of the Greek Orthodox Church.

For a third straight day, North Korea's Stalinist regime accused the U.S. government of planning a nuclear war on the Korean Peninsula and claimed that it had the ability to retaliate.

"If the U.S. inflicts a nuclear holocaust upon the DPRK, the former's mainland will not be safe either," said Rodong Sinmun, the official newspaper of the North's ruling Workers' Party.

6. "China Bluntly Rebukes U.S. Over Nuclear Policy Review"

New York Times - March 17, 2002 - By Reuters

BEIJING, March 16 -- Using its strongest language against the United States in months, China accused Washington today of "nuclear blackmail."

The state television said that Vice Foreign Minister Li Zhaoxing called in Ambassador Clark T. Randt Jr. to deliver "solemn representations" on a Pentagon nuclear policy review that contains contingency planning for a possible nuclear confrontation with China, among other countries.

"China wants to make it very clear that China will never yield to foreign threats, including nuclear blackmail," the television report quoted Mr. Li as telling Mr. Randt. "The days when China could be bullied are gone forever."

Threats would "simply increase the determination of the Chinese people to safeguard their sovereignty," he added.

Mr. Li also accused Washington of encouraging independence activists in Taiwan, which Beijing regards as a rebel province, by allowing Taiwan's defense minister, Tang Yiau-ming, to visit the United States and to meet senior officials.

Beijing typically issues angry protests when a senior Taiwan official is allowed into the United States.

But China was particularly upset by Mr. Tang's talks with Deputy Defense Secretary Paul D. Wolfowitz, the highest-level documented defense talks between the United States and Taiwan in at least 22 years.

China's Foreign Ministry said that Mr. Tang's visit, and his meeting with Mr. Wolfowitz at a private conference in Florida, jeopardized a recent warming in Chinese-American ties.

The talks focused on American arms sales to Taiwan and were seen by some analysts as an effort to counter China's growing military power.

On Wednesday, an official Chinese newspaper accused Washington of using the policy review as a pretext to resume nuclear tests and develop new nuclear

arms to extend its military dominance in the world.

But Mr. Li's language was the strongest China has used against the United States in many months and stood out sharply against the background of improved ties since Beijing backed the American war on terror.

Mr. Li accused Washington of breaching three joint communiqus, which paved the way for a normalization of ties, by offering Taiwan advanced weapons. "The United States must abandon the idea of Taiwan as an unsinkable aircraft carrier," he was quoted as saying.

"Taiwan has been a burden on the U.S. shoulders for more than half a century," he added. "We don't see any good in the U.S. continuing to shoulder that burden. It will simply drop a stone on its own toes."

In the three communiqus, Washington recognized Chinese sovereignty over Taiwan, promised to reduce arms sales to the island gradually and agreed to maintain unofficial links to Taiwan.

President Bush reaffirmed that recognition of Chinese sovereignty during a visit to Beijing last month, but he also said Washington would honor its commitment to protect Taiwan in the face of attack or provocation.

Last year, Mr. Bush said he would do "whatever it took" to help Taiwan repel any Chinese invasion.

=====

7. "Nuclear Preemption"

Washington Post - March 17, 2002 - Jim Hoagland column

Nuclear weapons have posed the heaviest burden of leadership for every American president since Harry Truman. There can be no more awesome responsibility than having to think about the circumstances under which a nation or perhaps even the world would be destroyed on your command, as George W. Bush has just been reminded.

The classified version of this administration's first important statement to itself about nuclear weapons found its way into the Los Angeles Times last weekend. The disclosure provoked outcries of alarm from anti-nuclear activists and a determined effort by officials to minimize or dismiss the document.

Don't buy the smoke screen. The nuclear posture review written at Donald Rumsfeld's Pentagon is a revealing statement. This planning document helps establish an ethos of nuclear strategy that will inevitably influence what and how the president thinks about atomic weapons.

Ronald Reagan was horrified by his first detailed briefing on American nuclear strategy, according to a famous story told by his aides. Reagan was so revolted by the doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD) and its balance of terror that he demanded an alternative: a strategic defensive shield against Soviet nuclear attack. The idea collapsed along with the Soviet Union.

Reagan's emotional response to the ultimate weapon resembled the nuclear antipathy expressed by Jimmy Carter and Bill Clinton during their presidencies. A calculated, highly pragmatic approach seems to characterize the Presidents Bush, father and son.

I found candidate George W. Bush's campaign discussions of nuclear strategy to be careful to businesslike. In his initial exposure to the grim details of how much destructive power he would have at his fingertips, Bush posed a deceptively workaday question: Why do we need so many nuclear weapons now that the Soviet Union has disappeared?

The Soviet attack on Europe that U.S. nuclear weapons were to deter had lost all plausibility in Bush's mind. He prodded discussions about unilateral reductions in the U.S. arsenal that would save money and perhaps contribute to better relations with Russia. His version of missile defense is far more tentative and far less ideological than was Reagan's Star Wars notion. When the Russians insisted on a legally binding document to cover strategic arms reductions, Bush went along.

So there was little theology or Strangelovian analysis in Bush's original contemplation of nuclear strategy. Then came Sept. 11 and the war in Afghanistan. Those events have significantly darkened this administration's nuclear ethos. Any weapons that can be used to preempt worst-case scenarios are being looked at in a new light.

This is one of the three important indirect revelations of the nuclear posture review: It suggests that deterrence is a meaningless concept for suicidal terrorists like Mohamed Atta and probably for Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda. That may be true for Iraq's Saddam Hussein or North Korea's Kim Jong Il as well. The review makes clear a turn by the Bush team to a strategy of preemption, including by nuclear weapons if necessary, to prevent these rulers from passing on weapons of mass destruction (WMD) to terror networks. This represents a devaluation of deterrence by the Bush administration.

Second, the authors of the defense paper document the administration's deepening skepticism about the effectiveness of traditional U.S. and international nonproliferation policies and arms control treaties.

Thinking they were talking in private, the planners list seven countries as candidates to glow in the dark permanently if they get out of line: Russia and China, because of the size of their arsenals and the uncertainty of their political futures; Iraq, Iran and North Korea, performing "axis of evil" encores here because they support U.S.-targeted terrorists and have or seek WMD; Libya and Syria, not previously spotlighted but secret makers and stockpilers of chemical weapons.

Finally, like most bureaucratic exercises, the paper works backward from a desired conclusion. The goal is a resumption of nuclear testing. The authors sing the praises of new mini-nuclear weapons and radioactive bunker-busters that, alas, cannot be developed if the United States continues the voluntary moratorium on testing being observed by the world's established nuclear powers.

That, for me, is the least convincing part of the exercise. The losses from

going first and thereby encouraging China or France to test new nuclear devices outweigh the gains that a resumption of U.S. testing now would bring. And it would do nothing to lessen Bush's Toxic Texan image abroad.

The administration is right in insisting that this is the beginning, not the end, of an important internal discussion. But it is being intellectually dishonest in disowning the shaping power of what has already been written and which must now be weighed by the president.

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

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0
Date: Mon, 18 Mar 2002 14:58:34 -0500
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: 3 Nobel Laureates Criticize Bush Nuclear Posture Review

For immediate release:
Monday, March 18, 2002

Contact: Steve LaMontagne (202) 543-4100 x.100
John Isaacs (202) 543-4100 x.131

3 Nobel Laureates Criticize Bush Nuclear Posture Review

Washington, D.C. . . Three Nobel Laureates, including atomic pioneer Hans Bethe, today released a statement condemning the Bush Administration's Nuclear Posture Review.

The three experts declared: "The Nuclear Posture Review signals an unfortunate reversal of longstanding policy, ending the taboo against nuclear weapons by including them in the full range of weapons to be used against countries with which the U.S. has major disagreements."

They continued: "The Bush administration may be embracing what every previous President has rejected and could provoke a dangerous escalation of the nuclear arms race at a time when nuclear weapons should be eliminated."

The three signers are:

Hans A. Bethe, one of the original Manhattan Project scientists and a 1967 Nobel Laureate in Physics;

Dudley Herschbach, 1986 Nobel Laureate in Chemistry; and

John C. Polanyi, also a 1986 Nobel Laureate in Chemistry.

The statement was issued by Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation (formerly Council for a Livable World Education Fund), which was founded in 1982. Council for a Livable World, its sister organization, was founded 20 years earlier by nuclear physicist Leo Szilard, who led the scientific community's efforts to end the nuclear arms race.

The entire statement follows:

Statement by the Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation on the Bush Administration's Nuclear Posture Review

For 56 years, the world has avoided the use of nuclear weapons despite many grave crises. While nuclear options were presented to Presidents Truman (Korean conflict), Eisenhower (Vietnam war) and others, all Presidents have rejected the option as too dangerous to the planet and humanity. Ronald Reagan said, "A nuclear war can not be won and must never be fought."

However, the Bush administration may be embracing what every previous President has rejected and could provoke a dangerous escalation of the nuclear arms race at a time when nuclear weapons should be eliminated.

The Pentagon has undertaken a Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) that broadens the role of nuclear weapons beyond their cold war function of deterring a Soviet attack. According to the NPR, U.S. nuclear weapons will now target seven countries. Russia, China, Libya, Syria, Iraq, Iran and North Korea. Situations in which the weapons could be used include a war in the Middle East between Israel and Iraq; military conflict between China and Taiwan; North Korean invasion of South Korea; or responding to what are vaguely referred to as "surprising military developments." Understanding of the danger inherent in nuclear weapons has clearly been lost.

Since Hiroshima, nuclear weapons have been viewed as weapons of last resort, posing a threat of such magnitude that they served as a deterrent. While a single nuclear bomb could reduce an entire city to rubble, eight countries have produced some 50,000 nuclear weapons-enough to destroy the planet several times over. A nuclear exchange between India and Pakistan could eradicate one sixth of humanity. The taboo against using these terrible weapons has therefore remained strong despite countless military and political conflicts.

The United States, the only country ever to use nuclear weapons, has maintained an enormous nuclear force for the single purpose of deterring a nuclear attack and has drawn a firm line between the use of conventional weapons and nuclear bombs. Official U.S. policy states that nuclear weapons will be used only against countries that possess such weapons or ally themselves with a nuclear power.

Since the end of the Cold War, the United States has undertaken to reduce and de-emphasize its nuclear forces while greatly improving its conventional weapons capabilities. Today no other nation can match the United States in overall military spending - the anticipated fiscal 2003 military budget of \$400 billion is more than the combined defense expenditures of every other country in the world. This superiority in non-nuclear weapons has led some former hard-liners such as Paul Nitze to recommend abolition of nuclear weapons.

The Nuclear Posture Review signals an unfortunate reversal of longstanding policy, ending the taboo against nuclear weapons by including them in the full range of weapons to be used against countries with which the U.S. has major disagreements.

The plan also calls for development of new types of nuclear weapons that can be used against hardened or deeply buried targets. However, developing "usable" nuclear weapons with perceived military value will encourage other states to pursue similar capabilities. Moreover, even the use of "small" nuclear weapons will invite other states to retaliate against the U.S. with larger and more devastating nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons.

The NPR undermines the 1970 Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which 187 countries have signed and that commits the five major nuclear weapon states (the U.S., Russia, China, France, and the UK) to eventual nuclear

disarmament. Instead, the Pentagon plan signals a new nuclear build-up that will undercut U.S. diplomatic efforts focused on stopping the proliferation of nuclear weapons to terrorists or hostile states. The few countries already developing nuclear weapons will become more determined to do so. Countries that have agreed not to develop nuclear weapons under the NPT, already distressed by a growing trend of U.S. unilateralism, may abandon the treaty in the face of a U.S. buildup.

If the NPR is made policy, it will undermine U.S. security by encouraging other states to pursue nuclear weapons, and thereby increase the likelihood that nuclear weapons will actually be used.

Hans A. Bethe Cornell University 1967 Nobel Laureate in Physics

Dudley Herschbach Harvard University 1986 Nobel Laureate in Chemistry

John C. Polanyi University of Toronto 1986 Nobel Laureate in Chemistry

John Isaacs
Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation
110 Maryland Avenue, NE - Room 201
Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 543-4100 x.131
www.clw.org

From: "J. Matlack" <jmatlack@erols.com>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: MEETING WITH FRANK MILLER OF NSC
Date: Mon, 18 Mar 2002 19:19:37 -0500
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2919.6600
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

Dear Howard,

I plan to attend the session with Miller.

JIM MATLACK --- AFSC

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0

Date: Tue, 19 Mar 2002 08:39:27 -0500

To: jdi@clw.org

From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>

Subject: Nuclear-related issues: 2 items

1. "Russia May Accept U.S. Arms Plan" - AP
2. "Think Anew About US Nukes" - Scoblic OpEd

1. "Russia May Accept U.S. Arms Plan"

Moscow Times - March 19, 2002 - By The Associated Press

NEW YORK -- Russia could agree to a new nuclear arms pact that would allow the United States to store some decommissioned weapons for possible future use instead of destroying them, Defense Minister Sergei Ivanov said.

Ivanov's comments on NBC's "Meet the Press" on Sunday suggested a softening of the Kremlin position on what Russia officials have called the main sticking point in progress toward a deal on nuclear arms cuts that both sides hope to secure in time for U.S. President George W. Bush's visit to Russia in May.

In the interview, conducted in Washington last week after he met with Bush and Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, Ivanov said that a portion of the weapons decommissioned under the pact could be stored and that the details are "negotiable."

"But the devil is in the details: how much, how long and how quickly it might go back to operational and ... jeopardize strategic stability," he said.

Ivanov was upbeat about his U.S. trip, praising Bush as a "visionary man" and suggesting Bush and Putin are pursuing closer ties despite opposition from some within their own countries.

Bush "understands that the times of the Cold War are definitely over, and that both leaders should be bold and imaginative enough to try to maybe overpower the bureaucracy of both countries, which sometimes has its own vested interest."

Turning to Iraq, Ivanov said Russia believes Saddam Hussein's regime may be developing weapons of mass destruction but that no action beyond existing UN sanctions should be taken unless that is proven. "We calculate that there might be a problem in Iraq with weapons of mass destruction," he said. "That's why we support strongly the idea that a huge team of international monitors should go to Iraq ... investigate whatever they wish [and] finally have a clear answer, yes or no."

Asked if Moscow would support military action against Saddam, Ivanov said only that the United States has not informed Russia of such a decision.

But he said, "The problem is not with Saddam Hussein. The problem is with

weapons of mass destruction."

2. "Think Anew About US Nukes"

Christian Science Monitor - March 19, 2002 - J. Peter Scoblic OpEd

WASHINGTON - Details of the Pentagon's classified Nuclear Posture Review, leaked out last week, provoked a swift reaction from some analysts, who said the Bush administration had lowered the threshold for using nuclear weapons, and an equally swift reply from the White House, which said that it had in fact reduced US dependence on nuclear weapons.

Both claims are wrong. The administration's review contains almost nothing new – it merely reaffirms the centrality of nuclear weapons in US security policy – and that is the problem.

The review lists seven countries – China, Russia, Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, and Syria – against which the United States must be prepared to use nuclear weapons. It calls for the US to monitor relevant targets in those countries, and it even specifies several scenarios in which the use of nuclear weapons might be necessary, such as a North Korean invasion of the South.

Critics leaped on these portions of the report as evidence that the Bush administration is broadening the circumstances under which the US would use nuclear weapons. But, in truth, the US has long prepared for a wide variety of scenarios in which nuclear weapons might play a role, so as not to be caught without options in the middle of a crisis. The threat from "rogue states" was addressed in the last Nuclear Posture Review, conducted in 1994, and it is not surprising or upsetting that it is addressed in this one.

Nor is it surprising that certain nonnuclear states, such as Libya and Syria, were included in the review. Although the US has pledged not to use nuclear weapons against states that don't have them, it has qualified that promise by saying that it might not apply to states that attack the US with chemical or biological weapons. All the nonnuclear states listed in the review are believed to be pursuing such weapons.

In short, contrary to fierce criticism from analysts, the Bush administration does not appear to have lowered the bar for the use of nuclear weapons.

But the administration's claim that it has reduced nuclear dangers by exorcising the "balance of terror" that characterized cold-war relations with Russia is equally inaccurate. The proof is the numbers contained in the review, which calls for keeping 1,700-2,200 of the 6,000 strategic warheads currently deployed.

While that reduction may seem dramatic, Presidents Bill Clinton and Boris Yeltsin agreed to pursue similar cuts in 1997, and the Bush reductions will actually take place more slowly than if the START II treaty were allowed to take effect. Worse, instead of dismantling the weapons removed from service, Bush plans to keep several thousand in a reserve that would allow the US to redeploy 2,400 warheads in less than three years.

More important is what those numbers say about US nuclear-use policy. Because nuclear weapons are so destructive, the US needs only a few hundred to deter a nuclear attack; the 192 warheads on a single, fully loaded US Trident submarine, for example, could kill 50 million people if aimed at Russian cities. The United States needs 1,700-2,200 warheads only if it is planning to wage a nuclear war with Russia and destroy its nuclear weapons on the ground – a posture it maintained during the cold war to defend against a Soviet invasion of Europe or a surprise nuclear attack.

Today, that posture is inappropriate because Russia is no longer an enemy. But oddly, the only targets that could necessitate the 1,700-2,200 warheads called for in the Nuclear Posture Review are the 1,500 nuclear weapons that Russia is expected to keep. No other military contingency – even a nuclear conflict with China – requires more than a few hundred warheads. In other words, the "new" US nuclear posture is still based on the ability to fight a nuclear war with Russia.

THAT is the real problem with the Nuclear Posture Review: It reaffirms the cold-war nuclear status quo. By calling for a large nuclear reserve force, "ground-penetrating" nuclear warheads, and a revitalization of the US nuclear weapons infrastructure, the Bush administration is institutionalizing a strong reliance on nuclear weapons for the indefinite future.

Some analysts are concerned that the review is a step toward a policy that sanctions the use of nuclear weapons as legitimate weapons of war. That would be a horrific mistake that would encourage proliferation and irreparably harm US security.

The US would be far better served by adopting a genuinely new nuclear posture, one that maintains nuclear weapons only to deter a nuclear attack. Given the awesome power of US conventional forces, we do not need nuclear weapons for any other purpose, even to deter a chemical or biological attack.

The diplomatic advantage of that stance would be dramatic and could be leveraged to secure the international cooperation needed to prevent terrorists and rogue states from acquiring weapons of mass destruction – a true post-cold war, post-Sept. 11 priority.

J. Peter Scoblic is editor of Arms Control Today.

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

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0
Date: Tue, 19 Mar 2002 09:17:15 -0500
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Biden-Helms letter on a nuclear reductions treaty

March 15, 2002

The Honorable Colin L. Powell
Secretary of State
Washington, DC 20520

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Your February 5 testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations indicates that the Administration has decided to negotiate a legally-binding agreement with the Russian Federation on further strategic arms reductions. Various subsequent reports left the same impression.

Clearly, any such agreement would most likely include significant obligations by the United States regarding deployed U.S. strategic nuclear warheads. We are therefore convinced that such an agreement would constitute a treaty subject to the advice and consent of the Senate.

With the exception of the SALT I agreement, every significant arms control agreement during the past three decades has been transmitted to the Senate pursuant to the Treaty Clause of the Constitution. Mr. Secretary, we see no reason whatsoever to alter this practice, especially since it clearly appears that a legally binding bilateral agreement with Russia would in all likelihood incorporate (or continue) certain aspects of the START I Treaty.

Indeed, the question of Senate prerogative regarding international arms control agreements has been previously addressed by the Senate. In Declaration (5) of the START I Treaty resolution of ratification, the Senate stated its intent to consider for approval all international agreements obligating the United States to reduce or limit its military power in a significant manner, pursuant to the treaty power set forth in Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

Mr. Secretary, it is therefore clear that no Constitutional alternative exists to transmittal of the concluded agreement to the Senate for its advice and consent.

We will, of course, work closely with the Executive Branch on this matter, and we respectfully expect close consultation with the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations as negotiations with Russia proceed.

Sincerely,

Jesse Helms

Joseph R. Biden, Jr.

Ranking Member

Chairman

To: "Stacie Robinson" <srobinson@clw.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Religious leaders letter to Bush on NPR
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\iclt.191.doc;
In-Reply-To: <031a01c1cec8\$d6094f80\$461a6a3f@clw.org>
References:

Stacie,

Would you please forward the following e-message and attachment to your "post-Coalition" e-list? It relates to a letter sent by religious to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review.

Thanks,
Howard

###

Dear Colleagues:

I would like to share with you a letter from representatives of 23 national religious organizations to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review. We raise six concerns:

slow pace of strategic weapons reduction, keeping large numbers of warheads in reserve, continuation of MAD, lack of de-alerting, expanded role for nuclear weapons, and testing issues. We ask Bush to send the Nuclear Posture Review back to the drawing boards to correct these deficiencies and incorporate nuclear disarmament objectives.

I am sending the letter as a Word attachment. If you want as text in an e-message, please let me know.

Shalom,
Howard

###

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

Kathy,

Here is information on the web site -- www.zero-nukes.org -- that I told you about. The sponsors to date are listed. I would welcome FCNL as a sponsor and your representative on the steering committee. I have previously sent Joe and David information.

I will appreciate your suggestions for a possible web site designer.

Howard

###

An Interfaith Web Site: www.zero-nukes.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 \(see Attachment 1\)](#)

[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 be 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.
- 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: Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fcnl.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Proposed web site
Date: Tue, 19 Mar 2002 12:31:52 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Howard,
In asking my intern, she told me that another of our intern's boyfriend does web design. I would suggest you talk with her. Her name is Tia Anderson <tia@fcnl.org> I have never met her boyfriend, but he is here in Washington, so this may be your easiest way to get an estimate.
I'll look at what you sent me and comment later. I just wanted to get you this information.

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, March 19, 2002 10:48 AM
To: kathy@fcnl.org
Subject: Proposed web site

Kathy,

Here is information on the web site -- www.zero-nukes.org -- that I told you about. The sponsors to date are listed. I would welcome FCNL as a sponsor and your representative on the steering committee. I have previously sent Joe and David information.

I will appreciate your suggestions for a possible web site designer.

Howard

###

An Interfaith Web Site: www.zero-nukes.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 (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.

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.

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.]

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

Tia,

Here is the outline of our proposed web site. Have Ed call me if he is interested in offering a proposal for its design.

Howard

###

An Interfaith Web Site: www.zero-nukes.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 (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.

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.

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: marie_kayser@yahoo.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Web site design
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Marie,

Here is the prospectus of the web site -- www.zero-nukes.org -- which we want to create. It will be a project of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, and will be sponsored by denominational offices. We are in the process of raising some funds to pay for the web site design.

Let me know if you are interested in offering us a proposal for this task. If so, then we can get together to talk about it further.

Shalom,
Howard

###

An Interfaith Web Site: www.zero-nukes.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 \(see Attachment 1\)](#)
[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 be 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.
- 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.]

Date: Tue, 19 Mar 2002 12:16:12 -0800 (PST)
From: Marie Kayser
Subject: Re: Web site design To: "Howard W. Hallman"

Hi,

Just a quick note to let you know that I received your email and will respond no later than Thursday afternoon. If you need something sooner, please let me know.

For additional information about myself, please go to
<http://www.twotonedeyes.com/mariekayser.html>

Thank you and I will talk to you soon,
Marie

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

Marie,

Here is the prospectus of the web site -- www.zero-nukes.org -- which we want to create. It will be a project of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, and will be sponsored by denominational offices. We are in the process of raising some funds to pay for the web site design.

Let me know if you are interested in offering us a proposal for this task. If so, then we can get together to talk about it further.

Shalom,
Howard

###

An Interfaith Web Site: www.zero-nukes.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 L[Yahoo! Sports](#) - live college hoops coverage

Date: Tue, 19 Mar 2002 13:00:04 -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: 2002 NPT PrepCom: 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 articles 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

British Nuclear Policy and the NPT: Room For Improvement

By Mark Bromley
March 18, 2002

Since the NPT's entry into force in 1970, the United Kingdom has been one of the most active supporters of the treaty. In July 2000 the UN under-secretary general for disarmament affairs, Jayantha Dhanapala, praised Britain's "leadership, and its determination to ensure that the noble words of the NPT and the Final Document of its last Review Conference are translated into concrete deeds."ⁱ In February, Foreign Secretary Jack Straw reaffirmed the government's commitment to the NPT and cited arms control as one of the "outstanding successes of international policy for over 50 years".ⁱⁱ

The United Kingdom values the NPT and is committed to the treaty's long-term health, but the government is also intent on retaining its nuclear capability for the indefinite future, and will strongly resist any further reductions to its "minimum possible" nuclear arsenal. Britain's progressive stance masks this essential contradiction at the heart of UK policy, one that was made clear in the immediate aftermath of the 2000 NPT review conference. While Peter Hain, minister of state at the Foreign Office, proclaimed that the 2000 NPT final document contained the "most explicit pledge ever made by the Nuclear Weapons States to work for complete global nuclear disarmament,"ⁱⁱⁱ Defense Secretary Geoff Hoon caustically noted, "I think realistically it is unlikely to lead to action tomorrow, next

week or next month".^{iv}

The UK government's position offers the potential for both conflict and progress. This can best be seen when evaluating Britain's progress on parts of the 13-step programme of action to advance nuclear arms control and disarmament that was agreed at the 2000 NPT review conference.

Increased transparency by the nuclear weapon states...

Britain is considerably more open with details of its nuclear arsenal than the other nuclear powers; for example, it published details of its nuclear arsenal and fissile material holdings in 1998. However, government efforts to restrict parliamentary scrutiny of its nuclear policy have increased in recent years. Following the 1997 elections, the UK government abandoned the system of annual inquiries on 'Progress of the Trident Programme' and the annual Statements on the Defence Estimates in favour of a range of documents that collectively contain less information on nuclear policy than the previous statements.

In addition, the fact that Britain is not party to any arms reduction treaties means that all cuts to its nuclear arsenal have been unilateral, unverified and potentially reversible. While the government has been open about the general size of its nuclear arsenal, it remains wary of stating exact force levels. The British nuclear arsenal is based on a stockpile of "less than 200 operationally available warheads,"^v but these figures are not open to independent assessment.

While Britain has led the way in many areas of transparency, there is still more that the government could do. With major changes now taking place in US nuclear policy, and deliberation at Aldermaston about the future of the British nuclear force, regular and detailed government reporting to Parliament, together with effective parliamentary scrutiny, should be restored.

Engagement... of all the nuclear-weapon states in the process leading to the total elimination of their nuclear weapons.

The UK Government strongly resists any further reductions to its existing nuclear arsenal. The UK Trident system represents "the minimum necessary to provide for our security for the foreseeable future and very much smaller than those of the major nuclear powers. Considerable further reductions in the latter would be needed before further British reductions could become feasible".^{vi}

Both Russia and the United States have committed to nuclear arsenal reductions over the next ten years. At present the two countries are engaged in detailed negotiations regarding how to verify and implement these reductions. As possibly the most progressive of the five nuclear powers in the field of arms control, the UK government is uniquely placed to take a decisive role in widening and institutionalising this process. One way to further this process would be for Britain to support President Putin's proposal for talks among the five nuclear weapon states on nuclear disarmament. This offer was made most recently in

July 2001, but so far the only nuclear power to express any interest has been France.

An unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon states to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament to which all States Parties are committed under Article VI.

Britain's commitment to retaining the Trident system will inevitably clash with its commitment to accomplish the total elimination of its nuclear arsenal. This was demonstrated most recently by Britain's decision in February to participate in Washington's sub-critical nuclear testing programme. The test did not violate the CTBT, but experts note that the data gathered could be used not only to ensure the safety and reliability of the existing nuclear stockpile, but also to develop new warhead designs.^{vii}

The British government has acknowledged that it has received briefings on the scope and outcome of US sub-critical experiments since 1995; however, February's test marked the first time that UK personnel participated in a test. The increased level of UK involvement in the US testing programme is also reflected by the number of British personnel visiting the Nevada Test Site, which has risen from nine people in 1999, to 40 in 2001.^{viii}

Britain's increased involvement in the US sub-critical testing programme raises questions about its support for the most central of the 13 steps. One way to allay these fears would be for the prime minister to reaffirm Britain's commitment to the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons. A statement from Tony Blair regarding Britain's continued commitment to nuclear disarmament would go a long way to allaying the fears of non-nuclear weapon states and greatly strengthen the NPT.

Regular reports... by all States parties on the implementation of Article VI and paragraph 4 (c) of the 1995 Decision on 'Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament'...

While the Programme of Action provides nuclear weapons states with a set of goals, its major failing is the lack of a concrete timetable against which to measure the progress of individual states. Britain has played an important role in the nuclear non-proliferation regime since the treaty's inception and negotiation in the 1960s. Since 1997, the UK has used NPT PrepComs as an opportunity to report on its progress in the field of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament.

Terrorist threats, alleged stolen nuclear material, and a more belligerent US nuclear policy all cast an atmosphere of tension and uncertainty as the 2002 NPT PrepCom approaches. With the treaty under threat from these global security issues, the UK government should take the initiative to strengthen the agreement by outlining its own programme of action to implement the 2000 NPT nuclear disarmament plan. Such a programme of action would be a timely response to increased public awareness of the risks posed by proliferation, and would provide a valuable example to other NPT States Parties about the importance of

addressing security and disarmament challenges.

Conclusion

As the 2005 NPT review conference approaches there is a danger that contradictions at the heart of UK government policy may weaken its commitment towards the NPT. The twin pressures of an increasingly unilateralist US arms control agenda and the need to begin considering a replacement for Trident will make it harder for Britain to mask this difference and continue to exert a positive influence on arms control efforts.

In order to avert this possibility and allay these fears, the government must take strong action to reaffirm its commitment to the NPT, thus paving the way for progress over the next four years to implement the treaty's commitments on moving towards disarmament.

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 briefing: Is the United States Living Up to Its Disarmament Commitments?

ⁱ 'Eliminating Nuclear Arsenals: The NPT Pledge And What It Means (Text of a speech, reproduced with kind permission of Under-Secretary-General Dhanapala, delivered to the UK All-Party Group on Global Security and Non-Proliferation, house of Commons, London, July 3, 2000)', Jayantha Dhanapala, *Disarmament Diplomacy*, June 2000.

ⁱⁱ Speech given by the foreign secretary, Jack Straw, at King's College, London, 6 February 2002
<http://www.fco.gov.uk/news/speechtext.asp?5869>

ⁱⁱⁱ Official Report, 8 June 2000, col. 306w.

^{iv} "Nuclear pledge 'only first step'", BBC News Online, 21 May, 2000
http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/uk/newsid_757000/757845.stm

^v Strategic Defence Review, The Stationery Office, Cm 3999, July 1998, para 64.

^{vi} "Ambitions for Britain - The Labour Party Election Manifesto 2001"

^{vii} "Does the U.S. Science-Based Stockpile Stewardship Program Pose a Proliferation Threat?", Natural Resources Defense Council, 1998 <http://www.nrdc.org/nuclear/athreat.asp>

^{viii} "Britain to Participate in US Nuclear Test", BASIC Press Release, 14 February 2002

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0

Date: Wed, 20 Mar 2002 08:49:43 -0500

To: jdi@clw.org

From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>

Subject: Nuclear policy review: 5 reactions

1. "Bush's nuclear plan could make U.S. less safe, not more" - Sabo OpEd
2. "The Nuclear Posture: What's Wrong with this Picture?" - B. Frank statement
3. "US Nuclear Plan Signals a Policy Revolution" - Wales OpEd
4. "Time to address details of nuclear arms treaty" - Inderfurth and Graham OpEd
5. "Stepped Up Nuclear Policy Not In U.S.' Best Interest" - Atlanta Journal editorial

=====

1. "Bush's nuclear plan could make U.S. less safe, not more"
Minneapolis Star Tribune - March 17, 2002 - Martin Olav Sabo OpEd

Since the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, most reasonable people accept the premise that nuclear weapons should only be used as a deterrent.

However, President Bush has reportedly charged the Pentagon with developing new scenarios to use nuclear weapons.

Despite significant progress in curbing the threat they pose to world peace, the president wants to take us backward by elevating nuclear weapons in U.S. defense policy. His plan will endanger our national security, rather than increase it, if it results in a resumption of nuclear testing worldwide or furthers the spread of nuclear weapons.

Emerging details of Bush's Nuclear Posture Review betray a dangerous fascination with nuclear war-fighting, reminiscent of Dr. Strangelove. New nuclear weapons to destroy underground targets will be studied -- even though conventional weapons are on the drawing board to do the same thing. Giving nuclear capabilities to many conventional weapons being developed is also envisioned. Rather than downsize our nuclear weapons infrastructure, Bush actually wants to reinvigorate it by upgrading existing weapon systems, building new facilities, and producing new plutonium triggers.

"But wait a minute, Sabo," you might say. "Doesn't the president want to reduce the number of U.S. nuclear warheads?" No, at least not to any significant degree. While the president has promised to reduce the number of deployed nuclear warheads from 6,000 down to between 1,700 and 2,200, most of these warheads will not be destroyed. Instead, they will be kept in reserve as part of a "responsive force" that could easily be redeployed. Surge production capacity will also be retained, making possible a rapid increase in our nuclear arsenal.

The president's plans mock his commitment to the U.S. ban on underground nuclear testing, especially since he continues to oppose Senate

ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) and refuses to rule out future nuclear tests. Indeed, the Nuclear Posture Review recommends reducing the time it would take to begin a new round of nuclear tests. The president's nuclear weapons policy will actually harm our national security if it leads Russia and China to restart their own testing programs and end their participation in the CTBT and the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT).

Bush's nuclear obsessions undermine the NPT, the centerpiece of international efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons, which has succeeded in confining the problem to a handful of rogue states such as Iran, Iraq and North Korea. While the president has sought to strengthen the International Atomic Energy Agency, the institution responsible for monitoring NPT compliance, a good argument can be made that his nuclear plans run counter to our own NPT obligations. How can we persuade the international community to join us in reigning in other states' nuclear weapons programs when ours is being rejuvenated?

By planning to use nuclear weapons for war fighting rather than deterrence, Bush may actually encourage other states to acquire them in order to deter U.S. action. In recklessly adding to the list of states that might feel threatened by our nuclear weapons, he may be risking confrontations that could otherwise be avoided by effective diplomacy.

The president should reconsider his nuclear policies. They will not win the war against terrorism or make our country more secure. Instead they could make the world a more dangerous place.

-- Martin Olav Sabo, D-Minn., represents the Fifth Congressional District and serves on the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense.

=====

2. "The Nuclear Posture: What's Wrong with this Picture?" Congressional Record - March 12, 2002 - Statement by Rep. Barney Frank

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, this new nuclear posture paper that the Bush administration has presented itself, from the Pentagon to the President, looks like an entry in a contest as to how many things can we find wrong with this picture.

To begin, most shockingly, it proposes to reduce the barrier that has long existed against the use of nuclear weapons. It proposes that we consider using nuclear weapons against nonnuclear nations. It proposes using nuclear weapons in a variety of ways previously uncontemplated, or at least not advocated in our policy.

There are several things, of course, wrong with that. In the first place, any American policy of trying to discourage other countries to develop nuclear weapons could not be more seriously undermined by anything we do. The town drunk is not going to be very credible preaching temperance, and having America threaten a more promiscuous use of nuclear weapons makes no sense whatsoever. If, in fact, the policy were to be carried out, it would, of course, add greatly to the billions that would be

spent in development of these newer weapons to be used in new situations, further straining our ability to meet important domestic needs. It could very well mean a violation of the proposal of the nuclear test ban treaty and of our, up until now, policy of not testing.

Reducing the psychological, physical, strategic barrier to the use of nuclear weapons is a very, very poor policy; but there is a silver lining. As with the proposal to have the Pentagon lie to us and others, as with the proposal to use military tribunals in place of the American domestic courts, as the Attorney General once suggested, we are now being told, well, never mind.

The Pentagon has developed a very interesting approach and the Bush administration with it. This is the third time we have seen very, very extreme proposals which when they encounter resistance we are told we should not have paid a great deal of attention to.

I am unpersuaded that the proposals were not meant in the first place. I am pleased in the face of the very wide and very thoughtful criticism that these proposals have brought forth the administration backs down; but we cannot be sure that they have totally disappeared and of all of the proposals this suggestion, more than a suggestion, this policy review urging more use of nuclear weapons in more situations against more countries is really quite frightening.

The President has justly commanded virtually unanimous support in the United States in his defense of America against terrorism. It cannot be in our interests for him to raise serious questions about his judgment in other strategic areas.

It is important that this policy not simply be characterized as a mere option but, in fact, repudiated thoroughly. There cannot be continuing suggestion, even more than a suggestion, that the United States contemplates this sort of use of nuclear weapons. Its impact on our alliances will be corrosive. It will have a negative, rather than a positive, effect on our ability to persuade even those countries to which we are opposed to respond in sensible ways.

The President's effort to work out some kind of role with Russia is undermined by this and particularly by the suggestion when he says he is going to take some nuclear weapons down, he simply means putting them in another place. This clearly undermines our efforts to reach agreement with China, with Russia and with a whole range of other countries; and it is a very embarrassing episode for the United States. I am pleased that the administration now appears to be backtracking, but it is important that we make sure that this one does not rise again.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this is the last time the Pentagon is going to play this game of putting forward something that is so demoralizing that it has to be withdrawn. We would be much better if these kinds of grave errors were not made in the first place.

3. "US Nuclear Plan Signals a Policy Revolution"

The Bush administration contends that the review – which was leaked to the press – is merely contingency planning of the sort any responsible state would undertake. But, in fact, it represents a profound break with the past —and a vision for a new world in which nuclear use is “thinkable.”

Heres' how:

== It offers a new role for nuclear weapons

While the policy review would reduce the overall number of nuclear weapons, it expands the conditions under which they could be used. In the past, these weapons were used solely to deter -- or to attack when our survival, or that of our allies, was at stake. But this plan assigns an elaborate war-fighting role to nuclear weapons.

The plan directs the military to prepare to use nuclear weapons in response to chemical or biological attack; against hardened targets able to withstand conventional bombardment; or in the event “of surprising military developments”—an almost inevitable occurrence in the midst of ongoing conflict.

This final contingency is a novel and open invitation to integrate nuclear forces into battlefield plans.

The document reflects a firm belief that deterrence is no longer relevant to the threats we face. In one chilling phrase, “nuclear attack options...would complement other military capabilities,” the review blurs the distinction between weapons of last resort and conventional weaponry, reversing a long-held tradition.

For 50 years, successive Presidents have sought to differentiate between nuclear and other arms, in recognition of the devastating effects of nuclear bombs. President Truman went so far as to place our nuclear arsenal under the jurisdiction of the Atomic Energy Commission, rather than the Pentagon.

The Energy Department—which absorbed the Atomic Energy Commission-- remains the steward of U.S. nuclear forces. And, with the concurrence of the military, presidents had gradually reduced our nuclear reliance, by assigning these weapons a limited role. By offering a variety of options for nuclear use, this Nuclear Posture Review suggests a reversal of that trend.

==New weapons for new roles

The document calls for the development of weapons that could be employed in the type of preemptive attack the Pentagon envisions. New, earth-penetrating weapons could be used to destroy hardened bunkers of the sort used by Iraq and perhaps North Korea. And, improved guidance systems would be developed to assure greater precision in a surgical strike. The Pentagon even contemplates having Special Operations forces gather on-the-ground intelligence to be used in orchestrating a combined nuclear

and conventional assault.

==Testing needed to develop new weapons

The Nuclear Posture review would require a resumption of nuclear weapons testing in order to develop new arms. Resuming testing would break a six year-long moratorium, encouraging others, like China, to follow suit.

The moratorium was meant to pave the way for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which was signed by the US but never ratified. It was one of many arms control agreements initially championed by the United States but rejected by this President as relics of a previous age. Their purpose was to control the spread of weapons of mass destruction.

Such treaties were also part of a larger push by arms control advocates to stop proliferation by stigmatizing nuclear devices as both militarily useless and morally repugnant. Pentagon plans would take us in the opposite direction, increasing their perceived value as weapons of war.

==Signals that non-nuclear nations could be attacked

The Nuclear Posture Review identifies several non-nuclear and near-nuclear countries that might be the object of a preemptive attack, including Iran, Iraq, Libya, Syria and North Korea. It thereby removes the promise of the 1968 Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty that nuclear weapons would never be used against non-nuclear states, unless those nations were acting in concert with a nuclear power

The plan not only removes that disincentive those states had for pursuing a nuclear capability, it creates a compelling argument for them to rapidly “go nuclear” in their scramble deter us from using the bomb.

While the Nuclear Posture Review may be a contingency plan from the Pentagon’s perspective, non-nuclear countries may feel they’ve been put on notice that we are willing to attack them. They may conclude they have no choice but to join the nuclear club.

==Calls for mingling conventional and nuclear arms

The plan calls for a “new Triad” comprised of more flexible offensive nuclear arms, increasingly advanced conventional weapons and anti-ballistic missile systems to defend against retaliation. By trying to create a useable mix of offensive and defensive weapons, the Pentagon is signaling that it believes it can launch a preemptive strike without fear that our nuclear foes would retain the capacity to respond.

Throughout the nuclear age, we have known that if either side has the ability to attack without fear of retaliation, the advantage goes to whichever strikes first. Once the United States has this combination of offensive and defensive weaponry – along with a doctrine for their use -- nations may put weapons on hair trigger alert, disperse them widely in battlefield conditions, and loosen controls so they can act quickly and nimbly.

This raises the risk of unintended or unauthorized nuclear launch, something we and other responsible powers have always worked to avoid.

Ironically, the Pentagon developed this ground-breaking plan because of concerns about renegade states and non-state actors who play by their own rules. The fear is that they will be unconstrained by traditional calculations of cost and benefit, and therefore cannot be deterred.

Yet that is the picture of America that this planning document paints — a picture of a power that makes its own rules, sheds its treaty obligations, and is immune to the logic of assured destruction. When combined with the pledge to project power any place, anywhere and to use that power to topple regimes, an image emerges of pax Americana -- a world in which we impose our own peace, in our own way, and on our own terms.

From the perspective of those who make and carry out policy, the appeal of this approach is evident. It frees them from the constraints of collaborative decision-making and expands their options greatly. But can we function in this fashion without raising the danger we hope to avert?

In recent years, many policy makers have argued that we should engage renegade states that concern us—that we should embed them in international regimes, hold them to international standards of behavior, and require that they play by the rules. In other words, we should persuade them to be more like us. This document, combined with the President's pronouncements, may give the false impression that we have chosen instead to be more like them.

Whether the policy choices made are consistent with both our interests and our values as a nation are questions only an educated public can answer.

In a democracy, we count on one another to be informed, to challenge, to teach, and to choose wisely. Our security depends on it.

Jane Wales is the former Associate Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy and Senior Director of the National Security Council. She is now President and CEO of the World Affairs Council of Northern California.

4. "Time to address details of nuclear arms treaty"
Baltimore Sun - March 15, 2002 - Karl F. Inderfurth and Thomas Graham Jr. OpEd

WASHINGTON -- Questions are being raised about whether the Pentagon's secret "nuclear posture review" seeks major changes in U.S. nuclear doctrine to include more scenarios in which nuclear weapons might be used and the development of new nuclear arms.

The Bush administration will need to address these concerns as fully as possible to put the Pentagon report "in context and in perspective," as Secretary of State Colin Powell has said.

More positively, the document reportedly acknowledges that further changes in the U.S. nuclear posture toward Russia are now possible because of vastly improved relations with Moscow.

This is certainly in line with the stated intentions of Presidents Bush and Vladimir Putin to make major reductions in U.S. and Russian long-range nuclear arms.

Unfortunately, the high-level meeting in February between U.S. and Russian officials did not yield much progress in nailing down a formal agreement on reductions.

With the next summit between the two leaders in May, both sides will have to redouble their efforts if Mr. Bush's goal of eliminating "Cold War relics" is to be realized.

The possibility of achieving major nuclear arms reductions got a boost during the visit this week of Russian Defense Minister Sergei Ivanov. Mr. Bush said he now agreed with Mr. Putin that the United States and Russia should sign a legally binding agreement. "There needs to be a document that outlives both of us," he said.

Mr. Bush had suggested earlier that trust and a handshake would do. Mr. Putin wanted it in writing.

Now the task is to turn from form to content.

Consideration of what to include in a new agreement between the United States and Russia should start with successful elements from earlier strategic arms agreements.

The carefully negotiated verification and monitoring provisions in the START I treaty did an excellent job of ensuring the successful implementation of the pact in December.

That treaty, which required both sides to eliminate thousands of long-range nuclear weapons and reach a common ceiling of no more than 6,000, was accomplished under the eyes of U.S. and Russian monitoring teams. START I worked because each side had confidence the other was complying with its provisions.

The START II provision that banned multiple warhead missiles (or MIRVs) is another element that must be considered. Unfortunately, START II will probably never be ratified. And deploying MIRVs on its new ICBM may be attractive to Russia in the context of U.S. national missile defense.

Provisions for dealing with warheads that will be removed from operational deployment and the fissile material from dismantled warheads, a topic not dealt with in earlier agreements, must also be on the table. This issue will be especially important in coming years because nearly 10,000 warheads will be made surplus when the promised cuts are fully implemented.

Mr. Putin stated that any agreement "must have a legally binding, irreversible and verifiable character." The Bush administration has been vague regarding what will happen with warheads removed from the active force, with Assistant Secretary of Defense J.D. Crouch stating "Some weapons will move off and stay in the responsive capability ... others will be earmarked for destruction ... and others will remain in the inactive stockpile."

This fuzzy language has raised questions about Mr. Bush's declared intention to reduce the U.S. strategic nuclear force to between 1,700 and 2,200 warheads.

There are also other issues that have not been dealt with in earlier agreements but pose a clear threat to the United States and Russia. The

fate of excess tactical nuclear weapons tops the list.

In 1991 and 1992, a set of agreed parallel, presidential nuclear initiatives resulted in the withdrawal and reduction of many of these weapons. It marked a significant step forward. But these initiatives were unilateral. There were no formal agreements or any understandings on verification and monitoring. Today, the United States has about 1,670 tactical nuclear weapons, but we have no clue of the Russian total. Estimates range as high as 20,000. More conservative estimates are in the range of 4,000 to 5,000.

These small tactical weapons are just the ones terrorists or "rogue" states would most like to acquire, as a recent Time report about the possibility of an attack against New York underscored. The time has come to deal with tactical nuclear weapons to ensure they do not fall into the wrong hands.

A legally binding agreement on reducing offensive nuclear weapons -- one that would include strong provisions to verify and monitor these reductions -- would complete one important step in creating the new strategic framework called for by Mr. Bush and Mr. Putin.

Karl F. Inderfurth is senior adviser to the Nuclear Threat Reduction Campaign and professor at the Elliott School of International Affairs at George Washington University. Thomas Graham Jr., former special representative of the president for arms control, is president of the Lawyers Alliance for World Security.

=====

5. "SteppedUp Nuclear Policy Not In U.S.' Best Interest" Atlanta Journal and Constitution editorial - March 19, 2002

The issue for now is Iraq. Saddam Hussein's record of aggression makes it imperative that the United States and its allies prevent him from acquiring nuclear weapons.

In the long run, though, Iraq is just a symptom of a problem that is much larger and much more daunting. Fifty years ago, just two nations had nuclear weapons, the United States and the Soviet Union. Today the capability is within the grasp of almost any nation that cares to try. The most recent addition to the nuclear club, Pakistan, is a fairly large country of 140 million people. But it has an economy similar in size to that of Arkansas; its citizens earn an average of \$470 a year.

If Pakistan can get the bomb, the world has changed. So policy must change, too.

Unfortunately, while the Bush administration has focused intently on the shortterm challenge in Iraq, its approach to longerterm nuclear policies threatens to make the situation more difficult to control. It lowers, rather than raises, the threshold for the possible use of nuclear weapons.

That's dangerous.

Late last year, the Pentagon submitted a special report, called a "Nuclear

"Posture Review," to Congress. The report is supposed to be a topsecret reassessment of the nation's nuclearweapons policies, including potential targets and the type of weapons needed to meet defense requirements.

Some new provisions in the review, while controversial overseas, are probably wise. For example, the document explicitly envisions the possibility that the United States could use nuclear weapons in retaliation against countries that attack us with other weapons of mass destruction, such as chemical or biological weapons.

It has long been clear that the United States would use nuclear weapons to counter a nuclear attack. By adding chemical or biological weapons to that list, we ensure that any potential foe thinks hard before attacking us with those means.

"We think it best for any potential adversary to have uncertainty in his calculus," Secretary of State Colin Powell said. That's exactly right.

Unfortunately, the report also advocates development and deployment of a new generation of smaller nuclear weapons for use in a conventional battlefield. The new "mininukes" would be designed to burrow deep underground before exploding, thus making them effective against underground bunkers and command centers.

From a soldier's point of view, the appeal of such weapons is obvious. They have a difficult task the destruction of enemy bunkers and in nuclear weapons, they have a tool for accomplishing it.

But civilian leaders have a larger obligation. If we contemplate using nuclear weapons in conventional war, other nations will feel free to do the same. And while our "mininukes" would be smaller and less destructive, it's hard to base a moral argument on the proposition that a 10kiloton nuke is acceptable while a 2megaton weapon is not.

Ever since World War II, the United States has advocated policies that make the use of nuclear weapons unthinkable in all but the most extreme cases. The new generation of weapons advocated by the Pentagon would abandon that policy and make the world a more dangerous place.

Saner heads must intervene.

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: March 22 meeting with Frank Miller; reply requested
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues:

This is a reminder of the March 22 meeting with Frank Miller from the National Security Council to discuss the Nuclear Posture Review. It will take place this Friday afternoon in Conference Room 2, Methodist Building, 120 Maryland Avenue, NW from 1:25 to 2:30 p.m, plus an additional half-hour by ourselves to discuss follow through.

We need a good attendance for this important meeting. PLEASE REPLY NOW to let me know whether you are coming. Your reply will save me from making follow up calls.

Shalom,
Howard

From: Sam Garman <sam@fcnl.org>
To: "mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>
Cc: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>
Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] March 22 meeting with Frank Miller; reply requested
Date: Wed, 20 Mar 2002 09:21:28 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

I think you can count on David Culp and me being there.

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

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2002 9:21 AM
To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com
Subject: [interfaithnd] March 22 meeting with Frank Miller; reply requested

Dear Colleagues:

This is a reminder of the March 22 meeting with Frank Miller from the National Security Council to discuss the Nuclear Posture Review. It will take place this Friday afternoon in Conference Room 2, Methodist Building, 120 Maryland Avenue, NW from 1:25 to 2:30 p.m, plus an additional half-hour by ourselves to discuss follow through.

We need a good attendance for this important meeting. PLEASE REPLY NOW to let me know whether you are coming. Your reply will save me from making follow up calls.

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

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

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 5.5.6.1
Date: Wed, 20 Mar 2002 09:34:05 -0500
From: "Catherine Gordon" <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] March 22 meeting with Frank Miller; reply
requested

I will be there.

Regards,
Catherine

Catherine Gordon
Associate for International Issues
Washington Office, Presbyterian Church (USA)
www.pcusa.org/washington
tel - 202 543 126
fax - 202 543 7755

>>> "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> 03/20/02 09:21AM >>>

Dear Colleagues:

This is a reminder of the March 22 meeting with Frank Miller from the National Security Council to discuss the Nuclear Posture Review. It will take place this Friday afternoon in Conference Room 2, Methodist Building,
120 Maryland Avenue, NW from 1:25 to 2:30 p.m, plus an additional half-hour
by ourselves to discuss follow through.

We need a good attendance for this important meeting. PLEASE REPLY NOW to let me know whether you are coming. Your reply will save me from making follow up calls.

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

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

From: "Charlotte V. Davenport, csjp" <csjp@igc.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] March 22 meeting with Frank Miller; reply requested
Date: Wed, 20 Mar 2002 09:50:22 -0500
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200
Importance: Normal

Dear Frank,
I am not able to attend because of a previous commitment. I hope you get a good turnout.
Charlotte Davenport, csjp
Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2002 9:21 AM
To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com
Subject: [interfaithnd] March 22 meeting with Frank Miller; reply requested

Dear Colleagues:

This is a reminder of the March 22 meeting with Frank Miller from the National Security Council to discuss the Nuclear Posture Review. It will take place this Friday afternoon in Conference Room 2, Methodist Building, 120 Maryland Avenue, NW from 1:25 to 2:30 p.m, plus an additional half-hour by ourselves to discuss follow through.

We need a good attendance for this important meeting. PLEASE REPLY NOW to let me know whether you are coming. Your reply will save me from making follow up calls.

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

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

Reply-To: <lisaw@ncccusa.org>
From: "Lisa Wright" <nccwsdc@bellatlantic.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Cc: "Heather Nolen" <heathern@ncccusa.org>
Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] March 22 meeting with Frank Miller; reply requested
Date: Wed, 20 Mar 2002 09:59:53 -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 -

Unfortunately I already have previously scheduled meetings that will run from 10-3pm. I'll check with Heather, but I'm not sure of her schedule either.

Thanks.

Lisa

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2002 9:21 AM
To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com
Subject: [interfaithnd] March 22 meeting with Frank Miller; reply requested

Dear Colleagues:

This is a reminder of the March 22 meeting with Frank Miller from the National Security Council to discuss the Nuclear Posture Review. It will take place this Friday afternoon in Conference Room 2, Methodist Building,
120 Maryland Avenue, NW from 1:25 to 2:30 p.m, plus an additional half-hour by ourselves to discuss follow through.

We need a good attendance for this important meeting. PLEASE REPLY NOW to let me know whether you are coming. Your reply will save me from making follow up calls.

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 the [Yahoo! Terms of Service](#).

Date: Wed, 20 Mar 2002 10:28:53 -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] March 22 meeting with Frank Miller; reply requested

Howard -- I am pretty sure I will be able to be there -- Carol Blythe

From: Marsusab@aol.com
Date: Wed, 20 Mar 2002 11:48:05 EST
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] March 22 meeting with Frank Miller; reply requested
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 7.0 for Windows US sub 121

Howard:

I have other meetings that day and won't be able to attend.

Regarding the Web site: Sorry to keep missing your calls. I've been out or overseas a lot in the last weeks. Let's talk soon about this. Maybe later today, after 4:00 pm?

Mark

Mark B. Brown
[Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs](#)
Division for Church in Society
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Washington, DC

tel. 202-626-7932

From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman " <mupj@igc.org>
Cc: Sam Garman <sam@fcnl.org>
Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] March 22 meeting with Frank Miller; reply requested
Date: Wed, 20 Mar 2002 10:28:09 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Yes, Sam and I will be there. Joe will be out of town.

David

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

From: Sam Garman
Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2002 9:21 am
To: 'mupj@igc.org'
Cc: David Culp
Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] March 22 meeting with Frank Miller; reply requested

I think you can count on David Culp and me being there.

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

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2002 9:21 AM
To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com
Subject: [interfaithnd] March 22 meeting with Frank Miller; reply requested

Dear Colleagues:

This is a reminder of the March 22 meeting with Frank Miller from the National Security Council to discuss the Nuclear Posture Review. It will take place this Friday afternoon in Conference Room 2, Methodist Building, 120 Maryland Avenue, NW from 1:25 to 2:30 p.m, plus an additional half-hour by ourselves to discuss follow through.

We need a good attendance for this important meeting. PLEASE REPLY NOW to let me know whether you are coming. Your reply will save me from making follow up calls.

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

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

From: CarolCWalker@aol.com
Date: Wed, 20 Mar 2002 11:06:21 EST
Subject: Fwd: General Board of Church and Society Statement on the Middle East
To: akimpact@mosquito.net, art.monzingo@austin.rr.com, beverly@fumcaustin.org,
cawindrum@yahoo.com, Cbbias@aol.com, DGilliam@upumc.org,
genec@texas.net, Hawkins1@absbc.org, mimi@fumcaustin.org,
msmcmnary@worldnet.att.net, mspivey@austin.rr.com, mupj@igc.org,
Nabhankins@aol.com, NHuff10060@aol.com, rlgdavis@satx.rr.com,
rogers33@swbell.net, rrash@rcsp.com, Rrpmyers@aol.com, sid@tumc.org,
sue@melgerhel.com, VFindeisen@aol.com, WWale@aol.com,
lloyd.doggett@mail.house.gov
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Mac sub 28

This is from the General Board of Church and Society, United Methodist Church. The Peace With Justice program which I served as PWJ Educator was through the GBCS.

I will also forward some other articles - I've been out of touch for a couple of weeks.

Blessed be, Carol Walker

Return-Path: <BAbeywickrama@UMC-GBCS.ORG>

Received: from rly-xb01.mx.aol.com (rly-xb01.mail.aol.com [172.20.105.102]) by air-xb05.mail.aol.com (v83.45) with ESMTP id MAILINXB54-0318150756; Mon, 18 Mar 2002 15:07:56 -0500

Received: from church2.UMC-GBCS.ORG ([66.95.90.3]) by rly-xb01.mx.aol.com (v83.45) with ESMTP id MAILRELAYINXB13-0318150241; Mon, 18 Mar 2002 15:02:41 -0500

Received: by church2.umc-gbcs.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <F3TRHXDX>; Mon, 18 Mar 2002 14:57:41 -0500

Message-ID: <619BD1E95646D311B69D0008C79FE32D8572E1@church2.umc-gbcs.org>

From: Bernadette Abeywickrama <BAbeywickrama@UMC-GBCS.ORG>

To: "carolcw@com" <carolcw@com>

Subject: General Board of Church and Society Statement on the Middle East

Date: Mon, 18 Mar 2002 14:57:39 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

carolcw@comGENERAL BOARD OF CHURCH AND SOCIETY

STATEMENT ON THE MIDDLE EAST

Eighteen months of escalating violence in the Holy Land prompted leaders of churches in Jerusalem to address Palestinians and Israelis with these words: "There is a time for killing, a time for healing; a time for knocking down, a time for building; ...a time for throwing stones away, a time for gathering them; ...a time for war, a time for peace." (Ecclesiastes 3:3-8)
Now is the time for peace.

With the patriarchs and heads of churches in the Holy Land, we are dismayed by the "spiral of violence directly affecting the lives of people." With them we are "saddened to see more widows, orphans, and mourning fathers and mothers on both sides" and ask "Is this the future that we all want for our children?" (Jerusalem, March 9, 2002)

Palestinian and Israeli children have a right to live securely and at peace in the land where Christ blessed the children and proclaimed peace. Each day terror tears at the hearts of Palestinian and Israeli children. One third of those who have died as a result of the recent violence are children. Terror and violence must end so that children can sleep safely in their own beds, go to school freely and without fear, and receive medical attention when needed. In the spirit of the One who said, "Inasmuch as -you have done it to one of the least of these...," we speak on behalf I of children caught between bombs and bullets in a dispute over land.

The state of Israel has a recognized claim to the land it inhabited prior to June 1967, but currently illegally occupies the Gaza Strip and the West Bank (including East Jerusalem), territories to create a viable, contiguous Palestinian state. The United Methodist Church has called for the implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions #242, #338, #194, #267, #465 and #681 as first steps in settling the issues of borders and security, Jerusalem, refugees' right of return and compensation, Israeli settlements, water resources, and release of political prisoners and detainees.

Israel will find peace and security through ending the illegal occupation of Palestinian and Arab territories. Palestinian security and peace and economic stability will be found behind secure borders in a civil and democratic society. Within both Israel and Palestine, courageous leaders are at work to achieve these ends. They need our support and prayers.

Within the Holy Land, the peace of Christ is realized in the lives of individuals who seek to shield children from terror through play and creative education, who bring conflict resolution skills to broken relationships, who teach the Bible and train tour guides to walk where Jesus walked, who teach in church-related schools, who pray in churches, and who every day live incredible lives of non-violent direct action in the middle of a war-torn land. These persons want and need our prayers. They want us to tell their story so that it does not get lost in attention-grabbing violent headlines.

Therefore the General Board of Church and Society of The United Methodist Church affirms the recent action of the United States in advancing and supporting the United Nations Security Council resolution that envisions "a region where two States, Israel and Palestine, live side by side within secure and recognized borders."

We also encourage continued United States and United Nations efforts towards a cease-fire and the resumption of peace negotiations.

Since United States' aid has been used by Israel to prolong the illegal occupation of Palestinian land, we call for that aid to be formally monitored so that its use complies with United States law, prohibiting its use in situations where it does not comply. Furthermore, we renew the United Methodist General Conference call, "to deduct annually from any Israeli loan guarantees an amount equal to all Israeli settlement spending every year, including spending for settlements in and around Jerusalem (Book

of Resolutions 2000, #293, pp. 731-732).

"We request that the U.S. government reevaluate the entire structure of aid to the Middle East." We also ask for consideration of "economic support for the efforts of nongovernmental organizations, including religious institutions, human rights groups, labor unions, and professional groups" (Book of Resolutions 2000, #295, pp. 733-734).

We insist "that the United States Government immediately release the remaining portion of humanitarian aid it promised to the Palestinian people in 1993, and encourage other nations to do the same" (Book of Resolutions 2000, #295, pp. 733-734).

We urge the United States and all other member states of the United Nations to make clear Israel's obligation to end the occupation and to abide by United Nations Resolutions #242 and #338 and all other relevant resolutions (Book of Resolutions 2000, #305,p.761).

We call for the creation of an independent Palestinian state as soon as possible.

We urge the United Nations to send an international peacekeeping force, and encourage regional and intergovernmental bodies, such as the European Union, to send human rights monitors to the region.

We call upon all entities that serve as mediators in this conflict to seek the recognition and implementation of international human rights and humanitarian laws, for the sake of humanity and not primarily for any one's own national interests.

We endorse the World Council of Churches' Ecumenical Accompaniment Program in Palestine and Israel and encourage United Methodists to participate in and support the program as a faithful response to Christ's call to be peacemakers.

We encourage United Methodists to sign the Churches for Middle East Peace [CMEP] document "A Christian Call for Peace" and to become more informed about how they can help to end the suffering of people in Palestine and Israel through prayer, education, advocacy and personal and spiritual involvement.

Finally we ask you, in the name of the Living God, whom we worship, and in the name of Christ, the Prince of Peace, our Savior, to raise your voices with the Spirit's cry for justice, peace, and reconciliation for all the peoples of the world. Our prayers and actions for peace are urgently needed now.

General Board of Church and Society of the United Methodist Church
Spring Meeting, March 13-17, 2002
Herndon, Virginia, USA

Only the General Conference speaks for the entire denomination. The General Board of Church and Society is the international public policy and social action agency of The United Methodist Church.

To: kristen.kulinowski@mail.house.gov
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: A letter on Nuclear Posture Review
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\iclt.191.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Ms. Kulinowski:

I am sending you via text below and also by a Word attachment a letter from representatives of 23 national religious to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review. It was developed by the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair.

I requested that you share this letter with Representative Markey and others who may be interested. Perhaps Mr. Markey would be willing to put it in the Congressional Record or send it to all members of the House.

We have six concerns about the Nuclear Posture Review that Pentagon planners have produced. (1) that strategic reductions will take too long to complete, (2) that keeping a large supply of warheads and delivery vehicles in reserve will encourage Russia to do likewise, with risk that they could fall into the hand of terrorists, (3) that in actuality the cold war doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD) remains in effect, (4) that the Nuclear Posture Review does not provide for taking warheads off hair-trigger alert, as President Bush advocated during the presidential campaign, (5) that the NPR expands the role of nuclear weapons, including the targeting of such non-nuclear states as North Korea, Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Libya, and (6) that the NPR reveals plans to develop new warheads and delivery vehicles and prepare for nuclear testing.

For these reasons we have asked President Bush to send the Nuclear Posture Review back to the drawing board for revisions that would eliminate the MAD doctrine and encompass nuclear disarmament objectives in keeping with U.S. obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

As the House Armed Services Committee examines the U.S. nuclear posture, we hope that they will invite top religious leaders to offer the views of the faith community on this important public policy. We would be willing to help line up a bishop or two for such an occasion, or somebody like Bob Edgar, general secretary of the National Council of Churches and a former U.S. representative from Pennsylvania.

Please call me at 301 896-0013 if you want to discuss this further.

Shalom,
Howard Hallman

###

March 15, 2002

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

Re: Nuclear Posture Review

Dear Mr. President:

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.

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 a statement issued at the Washington National Cathedral 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."

From this perspective we are discouraged by what Pentagon planners have produced in the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). We have several concerns we would like to share with you.

(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. 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 hundreds of targets in Russia, as they now do under the single integrated operational plan (SIOP). Thus, in actuality 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 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 biological or chemical weapons. In contrast, previous U.S. policy specified 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.

(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 goes 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 appears to be 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 NPT Review Conference. 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,

Jeanette Holt, Associate Director
Alliance of Baptists

James Matlack, Director
Washington Office
American Friends Service Committee

Rev. Ken Sehested, Executive Director
Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America

Greg Davidson Laszakovits
Church of the Brethren Washington Office

Tiffany Heath, Legislative Officer
Washington Office, Church Women United

Lonnie Turner, Representative to the Diplomatic/Business Community
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship

Rev. Mark B. Brown
Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs
Division for Church in Society
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Rev. Joel J. Heim, Ph.D., Moderator
Disciples Peace Fellowship

Ronald J. Sider, President
Evangelicals for Social Action.

Joe Volk, Executive Secretary
Friends Committee on National Legislation

Murray Polner, Chair
Jewish Peace Fellowship

Bro. Steven P. O'Neil, SM
Office of Justice & Peace
Marianists, New York Province

Rev. J. Daryl Byler, Director
Washington Office
Mennonite Central Committee, U.S.

Rev. Kathryn J. Johnson, Executive Director
Methodist Federation for Social Action

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

Kathy Thornton, RSM
National Coordinator, NETWORK:
A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby

Bishop Walter Sullivan, President
Dave Robinson, National Coordinator
Pax Christi USA

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

Andrew Greenblatt, Coordinator
Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities

Duane Shank, Issues and Policy Adviser
Sojourners

Ann Rutan, csjp, President
Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace

Pat Conover, Legislative Director
United Church of Christ
Justice and Witness Ministries

Meg Riley, Director
Washington Office for Faith in Action
Unitarian Universalist Association

This letter was facilitated by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, 1500 16th

Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036 Phone/fax: 301 896-0013 E-mail: mupj@igc.org

To: "Ellen Barfield" <uuawo@aol.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Sign-on letters
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\iclt.165.doc; A:\iclt.166.doc; C:\My Documents\iclt.191.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Ellen,

I am sending the two sign-on letters as Word attachments. Let me know if you have any difficulty in receiving them.

Howard

From: Michael Weiner mweiner@rac.org
To: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] March 22 meeting with Frank Miller; reply requested
Date: Wed, 20 Mar 2002 13:21:48 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Howard,

I will be there. Unfortunately, no one else from the RAC can make it. I will, however, have a check for you for the website project.

Thanks,
Michael

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [<mailto:mupj@igc.org>]
Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2002 9:21 AM
To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com
Subject: [interfaithnd] March 22 meeting with Frank Miller; reply requested

Dear Colleagues:

This is a reminder of the March 22 meeting with Frank Miller from the National Security Council to discuss the Nuclear Posture Review. It will take place this Friday afternoon in Conference Room 2, Methodist Building, 120 Maryland Avenue, NW from 1:25 to 2:30 p.m, plus an additional half-hour by ourselves to discuss follow through.

We need a good attendance for this important meeting. PLEASE REPLY NOW to let me know whether you are coming. Your reply will save me from making follow up calls.

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

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

Date: Wed, 20 Mar 2002 13:41:44 -0800 (PST)
From: Marie Kayser
Subject: Re: Web site design
To: "Howard W. Hallman"

Hi,

Attached is my proposal to design and develop the web site for <http://www.zero-nukes.org>

Thanks for your interest and I hope we can work together,

Marie Kayser

Do You Yahoo!?

[Yahoo! Movies](#) - coverage of the 74th Academy Awards® Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\zero nuke web site proposal.doc"

Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
Web Site PROPOSAL

SUBMITTED BY:
MARIE KAYSER
1413 F STREET NE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002
(202) 396-2666

Organization:	Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
Project Title:	Web Site for : www.zero-nukes.org
Contact:	Howard W. Hallman, Chair Methodist United for Peace with Justice 1500 16 th Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20036 Phone/Fax: (301) 896-0013 e-mail: mupj@igc.org
Site Address:	www.zero-nukes.org
Major Goals of Project:	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.
Hosting:	To be determined
Anticipated Graphics Work:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Do you know what type of graphics to use: theme, colors?▪ Do you already have a logo to use for the web site?▪ Do you already have pictures or illustrations you would like to use on the web site?
Web Designer will use the following technology to develop the web site :	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Macromedia Dreamweaver.▪ Adobe Photoshop▪ Adobe ImageReady▪ Adobe Illustrator▪ HTML, JavaScript and CGI script for interactive page.
Web site designs you like – please provide URL:	
Looking to Procure, When?	
Our Responsibilities:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Provide overall web site design.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Web site development and production. ▪ Fix bugs & problems in codes.
Web Site Pages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Home page (Mission Statement and Introduction) ▪ Sponsors ▪ Contact Information ▪ Global Nuclear Arsenal (Basic information and related links) ▪ Nuclear Disarmament (Statements from religious bodies and leaders, link to civil sector reports) ▪ Civil-Sector Reports (Nuclear disarmament) ▪ Zero Nuclear Weapon Proposals ▪ Zero Alert Proposal ▪ Nuclear Posture Review ▪ Feedback from Users (Interactive Page) ▪ Site Index
Cost	<p>Cost of Main Page (Home Page) - \$175.00 Cost of Sub Page(s) - \$80 Cost of Interactive Page (Forms) - \$100.00 No charge for using your own photos/images.</p> <p>Price includes 2 samples of the Homepage, "Under Construction" Page, and upload to site.</p> <p>Payment Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A \$250 nonrefundable deposit is required to start work. • 50% of the balance is due after 50% of the Web pages are completed. • Full payment (minus deposit) is due after final approval of entire Web site. • Web pages are sent to you or uploaded by us after final payment is received.

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5.2
Date: Wed, 20 Mar 2002 17:21:42 -0500
From: "Gerard Powers" <GPowers@usccb.org>
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: [interfaithnd] March 22 meeting with Frank Miller; reply
requested -Reply

I plan to attend. Thanks for organizing it.

From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>
To: 'Mary Lord' <MLord@afsc.org>, Baltazar Pinguel <BPinguel@afsc.org>
Subject: RE: Proposal for a web site
Date: Wed, 20 Mar 2002 17:34:08 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Mary and Bal --

I think it's a great idea. Howard Hallman talked to me earlier about it.
FCNL may join later, but I have too many irons in the fire right now. The
last thing I need is another committee.

Go for it!

David

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

From: Mary Lord [mailto:MLord@afsc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2002 1:11 pm
To: Baltazar Pinguel
Cc: 'david@fcnl.org'
Subject: RE: Proposal for a web site

Bal,

I would check in with David Culp at FCNL and see how they plan to respond.
I have met Howard but don't know him well. My memory is that FCNL is the
only faith-based group doing substantial work in Washington on nuclear
weapons. I expect they would like to have company but don't know if that
means the kind of website Howard describes would be helpful. In general
I'd be inclined to be supportive.

Mary

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

From: Baltazar Pinguel
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2002 12:15 PM
To: Mary Lord
Subject: FW: Proposal for a web site

Hi Mary,

Please advise how we can proceed with this web site project.

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2002 11:36 AM
To: jmatlack@erols.com; bpinguel@afsc.org; joe@fcnl.org; david@fcnl.com;
kathy@fcnl.com
Subject: Proposal for a web site

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 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

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.]

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

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

Reply-To: <kenanddavida@starpower.net>
From: "Ken Giles & Davida Perry" <kenanddavida@starpower.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] March 22 meeting with Frank Miller; reply requested
Date: Wed, 20 Mar 2002 19:53:32 -0500
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook, Build 10.0.2616
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400
Importance: Normal

Sorry, but I can't be there.
...Ken Giles, JPF

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2002 9:21 AM
To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com
Subject: [interfaithnd] March 22 meeting with Frank Miller; reply
requested

Dear Colleagues:

This is a reminder of the March 22 meeting with Frank Miller from the National Security Council to discuss the Nuclear Posture Review. It will take place this Friday afternoon in Conference Room 2, Methodist Building, 120 Maryland Avenue, NW from 1:25 to 2:30 p.m, plus an additional half-hour by ourselves to discuss follow through.

We need a good attendance for this important meeting. PLEASE REPLY NOW to let me know whether you are coming. Your reply will save me from making follow up calls.

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

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

Date: Wed, 20 Mar 2002 20:23:44 -0500
From: "Gaillard T. Hunt" <gthunt@mdo.net>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.75 [en]C-CCK-MCD NSCPCD475 (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] March 22 meeting with Frank Miller; reply requested

Sorry, I won't be able to make it.

GT Hunt
301-530-2807

"Howard W. Hallman" wrote:

> Dear Colleagues:
>
> This is a reminder of the March 22 meeting with Frank Miller from the
> National Security Council to discuss the Nuclear Posture Review. It will
> take place this Friday afternoon in Conference Room 2, Methodist Building,
> 120 Maryland Avenue, NW from 1:25 to 2:30 p.m, plus an additional half-hour
> by ourselves to discuss follow through.
>
> We need a good attendance for this important meeting. PLEASE REPLY NOW to
> let me know whether you are coming. Your reply will save me from making
> follow up calls.
>
> 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
>
>
>
> Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>

From: "ANTHONY VENTO" <tvpcusa1@prodigy.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] March 22 meeting with Frank Miller; reply requested
Date: Thu, 21 Mar 2002 12:43:22 -0500
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700
X-Mimeole: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Hi Howard,
I will join you tomorrow.
Thanks for arranging this!
Peace be with 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: <interfaithnd@yahooroups.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 20, 2002 9:21 AM
Subject: [interfaithnd] March 22 meeting with Frank Miller; reply requested

> Dear Colleagues:

>
> This is a reminder of the March 22 meeting with Frank Miller from the
> National Security Council to discuss the Nuclear Posture Review. It will
> take place this Friday afternoon in Conference Room 2, Methodist Building,
> 120 Maryland Avenue, NW from 1:25 to 2:30 p.m, plus an additional
half-hour

> by ourselves to discuss follow through.

>
> We need a good attendance for this important meeting. PLEASE REPLY NOW to
> let me know whether you are coming. Your reply will save me from making
follow up calls.

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

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

Date: Fri, 22 Mar 2002 09:24:29 -0800

Subject: nukes

From: Kent/Kathy Barton <kentkathyb@earthlink.net>

To: Howard Heiner <heiner@jeffnet.org>,

"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>,

Janet Horman <JHorman@UMC-GBCS.ORG>

You've probably seen these, but I thought Wand provided some very resourceful sites and wanted to pass them on FYI just in case you had missed some of these.

Kathy Campbell-Barton

PLANNING TO USE NUCLEAR WEAPONS

>

>U.S. Works Up Plan for Using Nuclear Arms

>By PAUL RICHTER, L.A. Times, March 9, 2002

><http://latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-030902bombs.story>

>

>Excerpt: 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...The secret report...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."

>

>- - - - -

>

>NPR excerpts: www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/policy/dod/npr.htm

>

>* * * * *

>

>WAND DENOUNCES PLAN FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS USE

>Reckless Nuclear Policy Threatens US Security, Invites Spread of
>Nuclear Arms, 3/15/02 Press Release. For text: membership@wand.org

>

>Excerpt: "It is stunning that in a time of unprecedented nuclear dangers
>the administration would embrace a policy that makes the use of nuclear
>weapons more likely," said Susan Shaer, WAND executive director. "After
>decades of pressuring other countries to disarm or forgo developing nuclear
>weapons, the U.S. is now legitimizing their use. Remarkably, this includes
>using them in conflicts where the U.S. is not directly involved, such as
>between North and South Korea or Iraq and Israel."

>

>WAND calls on the United States to take deliberate and immediate
>steps to reduce nuclear dangers by:

- >1) abandoning the nuclear targeting plans laid out in the Nuclear Posture
> Review and declaring a policy of no first use of nuclear weapons;
- >2) removing its weapons from hair-trigger alert;
- >3) forgoing any new production of weapons-usable material;
- >4) urgently disposing of any existing weapons-usable material as waste;

>5) supporting nonproliferation efforts, such as the so-called "Nunn-Lugar"
> programs to dismantle and secure nuclear weapons and material in
> Russia.
>
>* * * * *
>
>LEARN MORE. The following articles offer excellent background
>for understanding the significance of Bush administration policy as
>set forth in the NPR, as well as alternatives to that policy.
>
>To receive one or more of these articles, use the link provided or
>email membership@wand.org. Please specify which article(s)
>you wish to receive.
>
>1. PUBLIC SHOULD GO BALLISTIC OVER NUKE PLAN
> Ellen Goodman, March 12, 2002
> www.postwritersgroup.com/archives/good0312.htm
>
>2. NUTS ABOUT NUKE'S
> By Mary McGrory, Thursday, March 14, 2002
> www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A24156-2002Mar13.html
>
>3. WE'VE GOT A CHANCE TO SAY NO
> Molly Ivins, 3/14/02
> www.dfw.com/mld/starttelegram/news/columnists/molly_ivins/2855915.htm
>
>4. AMERICA AS NUCLEAR ROGUE
> New York Times lead editorial -- March 12, 2002
>
>5. BUSH'S NUCLEAR PLAN: DR. STRANGELOVE REVISITED
> The Arms Trade Resource Center -- March 14, 2002 Update
>
>6. SEVEN MINUTES TO NUCLEAR MIDNIGHT
> The Arms Trade Resource Center -- March 14, 2002 Update
>
>7. LA TIMES Opinion. Secret Plan Outlines the Unthinkable
> William M. Arkin, 3/10/02
> <http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/la-op-arkinmar10.story>
>
>8. A PRETTY POOR POSTURE FOR A SUPERPOWER
> Robert S. McNamara and Thomas Graham Jr, 3/13/02
> Los Angeles Times
>
>9. WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION
> NPR resources, including unclassified government documents &
> congressional testimony, newspaper article links, and relevant
> WSLF publications. Go to: <http://www.wslfweb.org/nukes/npr.htm>
>
>

Date: Fri, 22 Mar 2002 13:34:53 -0600
Subject: Your Story Has Been Reviewed
From: storyXchange.com@server1.dataroad.net
Priority: Normal
Subject: Your Story Has Been Reviewed

Howard:

We just wanted to send you a brief message to let you know that a Story Buyer registered under the category of "Producer", has just reviewed the detailed synopsis of your Screenplay entitled Lead, Kindly Light.

The Story Buyer may, or may not, request this material. But, out of respect to the buyers, we do not release their names unless they actually request the material. However, it is nice to know that your material is making it into the hands of qualified Story Buyers.

We wish you success with this story!

Your Friends at storyXchange.

Date: Fri, 22 Mar 2002 13:36:18 -0600
Subject: Your Story Has Been Requested
From: storyXchange.com@server1.dataroad.net
Priority: Urgent
Subject: Your Story Has Been Requested

Howard:

Ellen Feig at Green/Epstein/Bacino has asked to review a copy of your Screenplay entitled "Lead, Kindly Light". This buyer is registered under the category of: Producer

We recommend you submit this material as soon as possible - you never know when a story buyer's needs may change.

To send this buyer your material, simply follow these easy steps:

1) CLICK ON THE LINK BELOW. This will take you to an area of the storyXchange web site that only you can access. There you will find a professional "Submission Letter" and "Submission Release Agreement" prepared specifically for this request. (If your email program has problems with hypertext links, just "copy" and "paste" the link in the Address entry box of your browser.)

2) Once you have the Submission Letter displayed, CLICK THE "PRINT" BUTTON ON YOUR BROWSER. This will print a copy of the Submission Letter on your printer. Repeat this process for the "Submission Release Agreement".

All buyers require this legal document when a submission does not originate from an agent or an attorney.

3) SIGN THE SUBMISSION LETTER AND THE SUBMISSION RELEASE AGREEMENT. Then attach both to a clean COPY of your material and forward it to the address of the requesting buyer.
(Do NOT send your original material.)

It is proper etiquette to give the buyer ample time to review your work. DO NOT badger them with phone calls. That is the fastest way to provoke a quick "pass" on your material. Be patient. Your work will be read in due time. If the buyer is interested, he/she will contact you.

If you would like to communicate with this buyer prior to submitting your material, we recommend you do so by email. This buyer's email address is: FeigThemom@aol.com

Good luck with your submission, and please let us know what happens.

Your Friends at storyXchange.

(Click below to go to your personal "Submission Letter")

<http://www.storyxchange.com/cgi-bin/start/entry.html?id=471>

Date: Sun, 24 Mar 2002 13:53:45 -0800 (PST)
From: Egbert Lawrence <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>
Subject: Reply from Larry Egbert re: [interfaithnd] NPR letter sent to President Bush
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Cc: Meg Riley <UUAWO@aol.com>

Howard,

Good letter. Thanks for sending us a copy. I am forwarding it on to Meg Riley for our Unitarian Universalist files.

Sorry I missed the meeting last Friday but was working in Chapel Hill with Doctors Without Borders.

PEACE! Larry

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

> Dear Colleagues,

>
> (1) Our letter on Nuclear Posture Review went to
> President Bush today,
> March 15. I am sending you the final version.
Thanks to all who signed it. If anyone
> who didn't sign, would
> like to add your name, let me know. We'll add it
> as we make use of the
> letter. If anyone wants to put the letter on your
> web site, please do.

>
> (2) We will discuss this letter with Frank Miller of
> the National Security
> Council staff when we meet with him from 1:25 to
> 2:30 p.m., Friday, March
> 22 in Conference Room 2, Methodist Building, 100
> Maryland Avenue, NE.
> Please plan to stay another 30 minutes until 3:00 so
> that we can discuss
> follow through activities. PLEASE RSVP.

>
> 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.

March 15, 2002

The Honorable George W. Bush

The White House

Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President: Re: Nuclear Posture Review

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.

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 a statement issued at the Washington National Cathedral 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."

From this perspective we are discouraged by what Pentagon planners have produced in the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). We have several concerns we would like to share with you.

(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.

The Honorable George W. Bush

March 15, 2002

Page two.

(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 hundreds of targets in Russia, as they now do under the single integrated operational plan (SIOP). Thus, in actuality 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 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 biological or chemical weapons. In contrast, previous U.S. policy specified 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.

(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 goes 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 appears to be 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

The Honorable George W. Bush

March 15, 2002

Page three.

departure, we call your attention to the practical steps contained in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference. 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,

Jeanette Holt, Associate Director

Alliance of Baptists

James Matlack, Director

Washington Office

American Friends Service Committee

Rev. Ken Sehested, Executive Director, Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America

Greg Davidson Laszakovits

Church of the Brethren Washington Office

Tiffany Heath, Legislative Officer

Washington Office, Church Women United

Lonnie Turner, Representative to the Diplomatic/Business Community

Cooperative Baptist Fellowship

Rev. Mark B. Brown

Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs

Division for Church in Society

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Rev. Joel J. Heim, Ph.D., Moderator Disciples Peace Fellowship

Ronald J. Sider, President

Evangelicals for Social Action.

Joe Volk, Executive Secretary

Friends Committee on National Legislation

Murray Polner, Chair

Jewish Peace Fellowship

Bro. Steven P. O'Neil, SM

Office of Justice & Peace

Marianists, New York Province

Rev. J. Daryl Byler, Director

Washington Office

Mennonite Central Committee, U.S.

Rev. Kathryn J. Johnson, Executive Director

Methodist Federation for Social Action

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Kathy Thornton, RSM

National Coordinator, NETWORK:

A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby

Bishop Walter Sullivan, President

Dave Robinson, National Coordinator

Pax Christi USA

Rev. Elenora Giddings Ivory

Director, Washington Office

Presbyterian Church (USA) (more)

Andrew Greenblatt, Coordinator

Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities

Duane Shank, Issues and Policy Adviser

Sojourners

Ann Rutan, csjp, President

Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace

Pat Conover, Legislative Director

United Church of Christ

Justice and Witness Ministries

Meg Riley, Director

Washington Office for Faith in Action

Unitarian Universalist Association

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Movies - coverage of the 74th Academy Awards®

<http://movies.yahoo.com/>

Date: Mon, 25 Mar 2002 07:44:30 -0800 (PST)

From: edwin knuth <edwinknuth@yahoo.com>

Subject: zero nukes website

To: mupj@igc.org

Hello Howard,

My name is Ed Knuth. I was given your email address by Tia Anderson at FCNL. I would be very interested in working on your project.

I am an experienced web site creator. I work for peoplink.org, an ngo working to bring the web and ecommerce to artists in developing countries. For Peoplink I created their new website at <http://www.catgen.com/peoplink> and contributed to the website for a project called CatGen located at <http://www.catgen.com>.

I am experienced in creating interactive content using perl and multimedia using flash. I am also comfortable putting together relational database driven websites using SQL.

I am looking forward to hearing from you. You can reach my by email or call me at home. My number is 301-588-3286.

Thank you very much,
Edwin Knuth

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Movies - coverage of the 74th Academy Awards®

<http://movies.yahoo.com/>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 5.5.6.1
Date: Mon, 25 Mar 2002 10:44:25 -0500
From: "Catherine Gordon" <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Sign-on letters

Howard,

Do you have copies of the sign-on letters the IFCND has done in the past year? If so, could you email them over?

Regards,
Catherine

Catherine Gordon
Associate for International Issues
Washington Office, Presbyterian Church (USA)
110 Maryland Ave. Suite 104
Washington, DC 20002
www.pcusa.org/washington
tel - 202 543 126
fax - 202 543 7755

Date: Mon, 25 Mar 2002 14:34:45 -0800 (PST)
From: Marie Kayser
Subject: Re: Web site design To: "Howard W. Hallman"

Hi Howard,

I like your idea. Please resend the attachment - it wasn't attached to the email.

I offer web training at 19.50 per hour. I use a web authoring tool which makes it easy for my clients to take over the website. I can give you a free copy of dreamweaver once we finish the site.

Regards,
Marie

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

Marie,

My error. I must have told you that the Methodist Building is 200 Maryland Avenue, NE, but it's really 100. I waited there a half hour, then thought in the back of my mind that recently I had written or said 200 Maryland. I stopped by the VFW Building around 2:35, and the receptionist said you had been there. Sorry I missed you.

Rather than scheduling another meeting, maybe we could have a telephone conversation to focus more precisely on what I am looking for. Then we could meet after that.

I've thought through more thoroughly the pages I want. An outline is sent as a Word attachment. The Home Page needs the sponsors displayed prominently and the mission statement. The page on "Arsenals and Treaties" would basically be linkage to a couple of web sites, or three or four. "Religious Statements" would have a considerable number plus linkages to denominational sites. "Civil Sector Statements" are likely to be synopses with linkages to fuller reports.

The heart of the site consists of "How to Get to Zero" and "Feedback:Your Comments." We are likely to start with a relatively small number of scenarios and build from there. Feedback will grow as the site gets going and is known. We will need help in particular on this process.

I want users to be able to copy statements without a lot of excessive site information on the left column, as many sites have. For example, on a

religious leaders' appeal to President Bush to de-alert nuclear weapons, I prefer the approach of <http://www.loga.org/NuclearDealerting.htm> to http://www.fcnl.org/issues/arm/sup/nuclear_weapons_religlders.htm. I have roughed out a way of doing this, which I am sending as a Word attachment, but you probably would have a better design.

As part of your contract, can you train me on how to make entries once the pages are established? And they keep you in to [Yahoo! Movies](#) - coverage of the 74th Academy Awards®

To: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Web site design
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\web outline.01.doc; A:\page heading.01.doc;
In-Reply-To: <20020325223445.57354.qmail@web13902.mail.yahoo.com>
References: <3.0.3.32.20020325171902.00695564@pop2.igc.org>

Here are the attachments again. If they don't come through I can send the page outline as a paste on, but not the sample page.

Howard

To: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Home page
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\home page.01.doc;
In-Reply-To: <20020326131651.54731.qmail@web13902.mail.yahoo.com>
References: <3.0.3.32.20020325174547.00697604@pop2.igc.org>

Marie,

I continue to work out my ideas for the web site. Attached is an idea for the home page that displays the sponsors prominently. This is important because their sponsorship gives the site its legitimacy. You, of course, are the design expert and will have your own ideas if we retain your services.

I'll give you a call this afternoon to discuss this matter.

Howard

Date: Tue, 26 Mar 2002 05:16:51 -0800 (PST)
From: Marie Kayser
Subject: Re: Web site design
To: "Howard W. Hallman"

Good morning. I got the attachment and will take a look at it.

Thanks,
Marie

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

Here are the attachments again. If they don't come through I can send the page outline as a paste on, but not the sample page.

Howard > ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword name=web outline.01.doc; x-mac-type=42494E41; x-mac-creator=4D535744 > ATTACHMENT part 3 application/msword name=page heading.01.doc; x-mac-type=42494E41; x-mac-creator=4D535744

Marie

Do You Yahoo!?

[Yahoo! Movies](#) - coverage of the 74th Academy Awards®

To: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Other web sites
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <20020326164139.20076.qmail@web13908.mail.yahoo.com>
References: <3.0.3.32.20020326112840.00692740@pop2.igc.org>

Marie,

As I said on the phone, I would like www.zero-nukes.org to be light and airy and user friendly. Here are some web sites with features I like.

www.abolition2000.org -- masthead with sunflower as symbol; nice shade of blue; sub-pages listed at the top; sub-pages with statements, etc. printable.

www.loga.org -- nice feel to it, pleasant colors; a letter on de-alerting, for example, comes through without a lot of extras, such as site contents on the side.

www.afsc.org -- menu on left is over colored lines; maybe our sponsor list could be treated that way.

www.fourthfreedom.org -- like the use of symbols on masthead with menu at top; however, I don't like the linkage information on the right side of statements when I print them.

www.nrdc.org -- like the looks of the masthead with logo on left, trees on right. In Ukraine after a missile site was destroyed, they planted sunflowers. Maybe a background of a field of sunflowers would work, but would want to touch base with Abolition 2000, which uses the sunflower as its symbol (though others have claimed it, too). Maybe children playing in a field of sunflowers.

As I think about it, I like light blue and blue gray as light, cool colors. The darker colors don't appeal to me. I like blue better than green.

These are my thoughts for now.

I look forward to receiving your proposal and for meeting with you at 2:00 p.m., Thursday, April 4 at your house.

Shalom,
Howard

Date: Tue, 26 Mar 2002 08:41:39 -0800 (PST)
From: Marie Kayser
Subject: Re: Home page
To: "Howard W. Hallman"

Hi,

I think that will work fine for the homepage, however, we need to display the links to the subpages prominently. We can show the links on top of the page and have the rest of the homepage mirror your suggestion.

My philosophy for a good website design balances information (text) with visual art. Do you have any thoughts of how you would like the website to look in terms of pictures, illustration, colors? Do you need a logo for the website?

To narrow down your ideas for a good web site, can you identify 3 of your favorite web sites which you find very user friendly, well designed and visually pleasing (not boring to the readers).

Thanks,
Marie

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

Marie,

I continue to work out my ideas for the web site. Attached is an idea for the home page that displays the sponsors prominently. This is important because their sponsorship gives the site its legitimacy. You, of course, are the design expert and will have your own ideas if we retain your services.

I'll give you a call this afternoon to discuss this matter.

Howard

> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword name=home page.01.doc; x-mac-type=42494E41;
x-mac-creator=4D535744

Marie

Do You Yahoo!?

[Yahoo! Movies](#) - coverage of the 74th Academy Awards®

From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Cc: Joe Volk <joe@fcnl.org>, Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fcnl.org>
Subject: RE: Zero-nukes web site
Date: Tue, 26 Mar 2002 17:49:50 -0500
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Howard --

Kathy is out of town. I will be out Thursday and Friday.

The three of us will sit down next week and get back to you next week.

Thanks for all your hard work,

David

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, March 26, 2002 5:47 pm
To: joe@fcnl.org; kathy@fcnl.org; david@fcnl.org
Subject: Zero-nukes web site

Dear Joe, Kathy, and David,

We are progressing in setting up the web site, www.zero-nukes.org. So far, seven denominational offices have agreed to be sponsors (see attachment). Decision is pending with several others. We hope that FCNL will join them.

Obligation of a sponsor is to be identified as such on the web site and to have a representative serve on the steering committee. The latter will function primarily by e-mail to offer advice to me as moderator and to provide oversight. Some sponsors are making a financial contribution (\$100 to \$300, except for a \$5,000 grant from the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society), though this is not mandatory.

I am talking with a web designer. This has led me to rough out a draft of a home page and develop an outline of other pages. Both are sent as a Word attachment.

I would like to have the web site functional by the end of April. Whether or not FCNL becomes a sponsor, there will be place on the web site for your policy statements and for linkage to your site.

Please respond by e-mail whether you will become a sponsor, or call me at 301 896-0013 if you want to discuss it further.

Shalom,
Howard

To: dave@paxchristiusa.org, tony@paxchristiusa.org, tvpcusal@prodigy.net
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: A new web site
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\home page.01.doc; A:\web outline.01.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Dave and Tony,

During the past couple of months I have been developing an idea for a web site, www.zero-nukes.org, to serve as an information exchange for developing ideas on how to reach zero nuclear weapons. This will be a project of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament with sponsorship primarily by denominational offices.

I have first approached the U.S. Catholic Conference, but Jerry Powers says that this is the kind of coalition that they cannot officially join. As an interfaith project, we need Catholic participation. Therefore, I invite Pax Christi, USA to become a sponsor. (And don't feel slighted that I asked USCC first!) So far seven denominational offices have agreed to become sponsors (see attachment), and several more are pending.

Obligation of a sponsor is to be identified as such on the web site and to have a representative serve on the steering committee. The latter will function primarily by e-mail to offer advice to me as moderator and to provide oversight. Some sponsors are making a financial contribution (\$100 to \$300, except for a \$5,000 grant from the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society), though this is not mandatory.

I am talking with a web designer. This has led me to rough out a draft of a home page and develop an outline of other pages. Both are sent as a Word attachment.

I would like to have the web site functional by the end of April. Whether or not Pax Christi, USA becomes a sponsor, there will be place on the web site for your policy statements and for linkage to your site.

Please respond by e-mail whether you will become a sponsor, or call me at 301 896-0013 if you want to discuss it further.

Shalom,
Howard

To: marsusab@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Zero-nukes web site
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\home page.01.doc; A:\web outline.01.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Mark,

We are progressing in setting up the web site, www.zero-nukes.org. So far, seven denominational offices have agreed to be sponsors (see attachment). Decision is pending with several others. We hope that the Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs will join them.

Obligation of a sponsor is to be identified as such on the web site and to have a representative serve on the steering committee. The latter will function primarily by e-mail to offer advice to me as moderator and to provide oversight. Some sponsors are making a financial contribution (\$100 to \$300, except for a \$5,000 grant from the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society), though this is not mandatory.

I am talking with a web designer. This has led me to rough out a draft of a home page and develop an outline of other pages. Both are sent as a Word attachment.

I would like to have the web site functional by the end of April. Whether or not the Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs becomes a sponsor, there will be place on the web site for your policy statements and for linkage to your site.

Please respond by e-mail whether you will become a sponsor, or call me at 301 896-0013 if you want to discuss it further.

Shalom,
Howard

To: joe@fcnl.org, kathy@fcnl.org, david@fcnl.org

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

Subject: Zero-nukes web site

Cc:

Bcc:

X-Attachments: A:\home page.01.doc; A:\web outline.01.doc;

In-Reply-To:

References:

Dear Joe, Kathy, and David,

We are progressing in setting up the web site, www.zero-nukes.org. So far, seven denominational offices have agreed to be sponsors (see attachment). Decision is pending with several others. We hope that FCNL will join them.

Obligation of a sponsor is to be identified as such on the web site and to have a representative serve on the steering committee. The latter will function primarily by e-mail to offer advice to me as moderator and to provide oversight. Some sponsors are making a financial contribution (\$100 to \$300, except for a \$5,000 grant from the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society), though this is not mandatory.

I am talking with a web designer. This has led me to rough out a draft of a home page and develop an outline of other pages. Both are sent as a Word attachment.

I would like to have the web site functional by the end of April. Whether or not FCNL becomes a sponsor, there will be place on the web site for your policy statements and for linkage to your site.

Please respond by e-mail whether you will become a sponsor, or call me at 301 896-0013 if you want to discuss it further.

Shalom,
Howard

To: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Web site design
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\web outline.01.doc; A:\page heading.01.doc;
In-Reply-To: <20020320214144.77722.qmail@web13902.mail.yahoo.com>
References: <3.0.3.32.20020319150013.006919fc@pop2.igc.org>

Marie,

My error. I must have told you that the Methodist Building is 200 Maryland Avenue, NE, but it's really 100. I waited there a half hour, then thought in the back of my mind that recently I had written or said 200 Maryland. I stopped by the VFW Building around 2:35, and the receptionist said you had been there. Sorry I missed you.

Rather than scheduling another meeting, maybe we could have a telephone conversation to focus more precisely on what I am looking for. Then we could meet after that.

I've thought through more thoroughly the pages I want. An outline is sent as a Word attachment. The Home Page needs the sponsors displayed prominently and the mission statement. The page on "Arsenals and Treaties" would basically be linkage to a couple of web sites, or three or four. "Religious Statements" would have a considerable number plus linkages to denominational sites. "Civil Sector Statements" are likely to be synopses with linkages to fuller reports.

The heart of the site consists of "How to Get to Zero" and "Feedback:Your Comments." We are likely to start with a relatively small number of scenarios and build from there. Feedback will grow as the site gets going and is known. We will need help in particular on this process.

I want users to be able to copy statements without a lot of excessive site information on the left column, as many sites have. For example, on a religious leaders' appeal to President Bush to de-alert nuclear weapons, I prefer the approach of <http://www.loga.org/NuclearDealerting.htm> to http://www.fcnl.org/issues/arm/sup/nuclear_weapons_religders.htm. I have roughed out a way of doing this, which I am sending as a Word attachment, but you probably would have a better design.

As part of your contract, can you train me on how to make entries once the pages are established? And they keep you involved as an advisor? What would your fee be for this service?

This is enough agenda for a telephone conversation. I'll be available much of Tuesday and Wednesday if you want to call me at 301 896-0013. We can then schedule a meeting if necessary and talk more specifically about the details of a contract for service.

With best regards,
Howard