

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Bishop Elias G. Galvan" <bishop@pnwumc.org>
Subject: Nuclear Posture Review
Date: Thu, 18 Apr 2002 10:16:07 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----
=_NextPart_000_00B8_01C1E6C2.109DB760"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Dear Bishop Galvan:

Knowing that the United Methodist Bishops have a deep concern for the abolition of nuclear weapons, I want to share with you two items on the Nuclear Posture Review, which the Pentagon released in January. The first is an article discussing how the Nuclear Posture Review is a flawed proposal. It will appear in the next issue Peace Leaf, the quarterly newsletter of Methodists United for Peace with Justice. The second is a letter on the subject to President Bush from representatives of 25 national religious organizations.

I am sending them as Word attachments. If that doesn't work for you, let me know and I'll paste it in as text of a e-mail message.

I hope that this material will be useful in the forthcoming meeting of the Council of Bishops. I urge you to speak your views on this issue.

Shalom,

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

1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org

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

Nuclear Posture Review

A Flawed Proposal

In January 2002 the U.S. Department of Defense sent to Congress a secret report on the results of its comprehensive Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). Mandated by Congress, the NPR lays out the direction for American nuclear forces for the next ten years and beyond. For the general public the Pentagon released only a bare outline of its recommendations. In March the Los Angeles Times got hold of the classified version and divulged greater details.

The fuller version reveals a set of policies that has some positive features but also contains serious flaws, some quite disturbing. The greatest flaw is the belief that nuclear weapons should remain forever. In contrast, the voices of religion say that possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons is immoral and that all nuclear weapons should be eliminated.

Reductions Insufficient

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

Deeper analysis, however, reveals that this reduction is not as significant as first appears. Previous arms control agreements, such as the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed by President Reagan, and START I, signed by President George H.W. Bush, provided for the destruction of delivery vehicles (missiles, bombers) taken out of service. In contrast, the Nuclear Posture Review reveals an intent to preserve the delivery vehicles and warheads for possible redeployment

This goes against the principle of irreversibility that the United States agreed to during the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Also, it will encourage Russia to keep in reserve warheads and delivery vehicles taken out of service. Because Russian security of nuclear weapons and fissile material is sometimes lax, this increases the risk that terrorist organizations could gain access.

A much wiser course would be to dismantle all downloaded warheads and their delivery systems. Moreover, reductions should be accomplished at a much faster pace and should go much deeper than now being considered by President Bush and Russian President Putin.

MAD Continues

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

Their words about moving away from MAD are contradicted by the level of the nuclear force to remain deployed and held in reserve. Administration officials explain that nuclear missiles will no longer be aimed at any particular target but will be available for whatever contingency might arise. But experts indicate that all of the contingencies specified in the NPR beyond Russia -- China and five non-nuclear states (see below) -- would require only a few hundred missiles to deal with if worse comes to worse. The only possible targets for the balance are in Russia.

As Secretary of State George Shultz under President Reagan observed, states design policy not on the basis of intention of other states but rather on their capabilities. Because Russia retains the capability of launching a massive attack on the United States, the U.S. must maintain a counter capability. This means that mutual assured destruction remains in effect between two nations now said to be friends.

The only way to end the MAD doctrine is to substantially reduce capability far below the numbers considered in the Nuclear Posture Review, perhaps to fewer than 200 or 100, and eventually to zero.

Expanded Role

As the United States built up its nuclear arsenal after World War II, the primary role for nuclear weapons was the deterrence of nuclear attack by another state possessing nuclear weapons. The second role until the Cold War ended was deterrence of a Soviet attack on Western Europe. Under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the United States made a commitment not to use nuclear weapons against any nation not possessing nuclear weapons or allied with a nuclear weapons state.

The Nuclear Posture Review of the Bush administration changes this. It indicates that nuclear strike capability should be available for various contingencies. It specifies: "North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Libya are among the countries that could be involved in immediate, potential, or unexpected contingencies." The NPR also indicates that nuclear weapons should be used to deter attack by biological and chemical weapons. It adds that nuclear weapons could be employed against targets

able to withstand non-nuclear attack, such as, deep underground bunkers and bio-weapon facilities.

When asked about this at a news conference, President Bush explained, "We've got all options on the table." This is a dangerous approach. The expanded role for nuclear weapons suggests greater legitimacy and encourages other nations to respond in kind. Moreover, it is immoral, for all options should not be on the table. Genocide is not a legitimate option. Slaughter of the innocent is not an acceptable option.

Testing and New Weapon Development

The desire to expand the role of nuclear weapons leads the Nuclear Posture Review to give consideration to return to nuclear weapon testing and development of new nuclear weapons. Although the NPT affirms President Bush's commitment to a moratorium on nuclear weapons testing, it calls for the Department of Energy to reduce the time it would take to resume testing from the current two to three years to one year or so. Comments by the Pentagon spokesperson at a press briefing on the NPR and statements by other officials suggest that the Administration is looking toward the end of the test moratorium within a few years.

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

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

A Faith Response

Because of such concerns, representatives of 25 national religious organizations have urged President Bush to send the Nuclear Posture Review back to the drawing boards. They propose that 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.

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-weapon state not allied with a nuclear-weapon state. We are greatly disturbed that your administration wants to expand rather than contract the role of nuclear weapons in the 21st century.

(6) Testing. Our concern is reinforced by the approach to nuclear testing revealed in the Nuclear Posture Review. While we welcome reaffirmation of your commitment to a moratorium on nuclear weapons testing, we are bothered by the NPR's call for the Department of Energy to reduce the time it would take to resume testing. This 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

Washington Office, Church Women
United

James Matlack, Director
Washington Office
American Friends Service Committee

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

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

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

Greg Davidson Laszakovits
Church of the Brethren Washington
Office

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

Tiffany Heath, Legislative Officer

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

Brenda Girton-Mitchell

Director, Washington Office

National Council of the Churches of
Christ in the USA

Kathy Thornton, RSM

National Coordinator, NETWORK:

A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby

(more)

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

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

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

Rev. James Winkler, General Secretary
United Methodist General Board
of Church and Society

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

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Donald C. Whitmore" <3rdM@gte.net>,
"Schuyler Rhodes" <srhodes@igc.org>,
"Bruce K. Edwards" <b3ruce@socket.net>,
"Sherman W. Harris" <visionaires@hotmail.com>,
"James & Char Hipkins" <debate44646@yahoo.com>,
"Phillip H. Miller" <millerph@att.net>
Subject: New board members nominated
Date: Thu, 18 Apr 2002 13:04:46 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

To: Board of Directors

Recently I attended the annual retreat of the United Methodist Conference Peace with Justice Coordinators. While there I recruited three new members for our Board of Directors. They are:
James Hudson from the Virginia Conference, Rev. Phil Wilson from the Western Pennsylvania Conference, and Joyce Georgieff from the California-Pacific Conference. James Hudson used to represent the South Georgia Conference but moved to Alexandria, VA a couple of years ago and immediately got involved. Phil Wilson is a retired minister in the Pittsburgh area, which is the site of the 2004 General Conference. Joyce Georgieff continues the tradition of a strong peace with justice program in Cal-Pac, previously coordinated by Maggie Fertschneider and Cliff Churn, both of whom served on our board.

I nominate them for board membership and ask you to reply whether you favor their election, yes or no.

I would like to have a board meeting in Washington, D.C. in the fall, probably October. This summer I will be in touch about possible dates.

In my latest endeavor with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament I am in the process of setting up a web site called www.zero-nukes.org. It will contain or provide linkages to statements related to nuclear disarmament from religious organizations and civil-sector organizations. Most important of all it will provide an opportunity for military professionals, scientists, other experts, and ordinary citizens to lay out scenarios for the elimination of nuclear weapons, the zero option. It should be operational in May.

Meanwhile we are opposing many elements of President Bush's Nuclear Posture Review. Jim Hipkins is working on an issue of PeaceLeaf on this subject.

We're still needed!

Shalom,
Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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.

Status: U

Return-Path: <3RDM@gte.net>

Received: from out006.verizon.net ([206.46.170.106])

by nils.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 16YipEFE3N13pm0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 18 Apr 2002 16:21:50 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from gte.net ([67.250.32.253]) by out006.verizon.net

(InterMail vM.5.01.04.05 201-253-122-122-105-20011231) with ESMTTP
id <20020418202015.FULX27046.out006.verizon.net@gte.net>

for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 18 Apr 2002 15:20:15 -0500

Message-ID: <3CBF2A84.9BE26B40@gte.net>

Date: Thu, 18 Apr 2002 13:20:20 -0700

From: Don Whitmore <3RDM@gte.net>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7C-CCK-MCD {C-UDP; EBM-APPLE} (Macintosh; I; PPC)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Subject: Re: New board members nominated

References: <000901c1e6fb\$4067aa80\$a362f7a5@default>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854"; x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear Howard: Yes, I favor election of the three new board members. Take care,
Don Whitmore

"Howard W. Hallman" wrote:

> To: Board of Directors

>

> Recently I attended the annual retreat of the United Methodist Conference

> Peace with Justice Coordinators. While there I recruited three new members

> for our Board of Directors. They are:

> James Hudson from the Virginia Conference, Rev. Phil Wilson from the Western

> Pennsylvania Conference, and Joyce Georgieff from the California-Pacific

> Conference. James Hudson used to represent the South Georgia Conference

> but moved to Alexandria, VA a couple of years ago and immediately got

> involved. Phil Wilson is a retired minister in the Pittsburgh area, which

> is the site of the 2004 General Conference. Joyce Georgieff continues the

> tradition of a strong peace with justice program in Cal-Pac, previously

> coordinated by Maggie Fertschneider and Cliff Churn, both of whom served on

> our board.

>

> I nominate them for board membership and ask you to reply whether you favor

> their election, yes or no.

>

> I would like to have a board meeting in Washington, D.C. in the fall,

> probably October. This summer I will be in touch about possible dates.

>

> In my latest endeavor with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

> I am in the process of setting up a web site called www.zero-nukes.org. It

> will contain or provide linkages to statements related to nuclear

> disarmament from religious organizations and civil-sector organizations.

> Most important of all it will provide an opportunity for military

> professionals, scientists, other experts, and ordinary citizens to lay out

> scenarios for the elimination of nuclear weapons, the zero option. It
> should be operational in May.
>
> Meanwhile we are opposing many elements of President Bush's Nuclear Posture
> Review. Jim Hipkins is working on an issue of PeaceLeaf on this subject.
>
> We're still needed!
>
> Shalom,
> Howard
>
> Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
> 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.

Status: U

Return-Path: <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Received: from web13904.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.67])

by payne.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 16YybXmj3Nl3p40
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 19 Apr 2002 09:12:45 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020419131246.36687.qmail@web13904.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [172.153.65.38] by web13904.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Fri, 19 Apr 2002 06:12:46 PDT

Date: Fri, 19 Apr 2002 06:12:46 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: Banner design

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

In-Reply-To: <001d01c1e4a9\$9c2a2c20\$3461f7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-1462969027-1019221966=:35245"

--0-1462969027-1019221966=:35245

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Hi Howard,

Please give me your feedback on the 3rd draft. I did not enhance the illustration for the web so the picture looks a little bit unfocused. I just want to know what you think of the overall look, the dumptruck, missile, truck, etc.
<http://www.twotonedeyes.com/zero-nukes>

Thanks,

Marie

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

Although you have a more realistic missile in your second design of our banner, I like the first design much better. Among other factors the dark green of design two is too dark for my taste.

I prefer the way you present the site name and our name on the first version because it is more contained and doesn't sprawl across the page. "A Project of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament" in three lines is better than two. I'm undecided on the white space over half of "zero-nukes", but it does tie into the base of the distance mountains.

I prefer the sunflowers of the first version. I'm satisfied with that part of the banner

The problem with the first version is that it doesn't adequately convey that the truck is hauling a nuclear weapon away from a deployment site. Would you be able to using something like the missile of version two? Previously I have suggested a hole being filled by a bulldozer, but you haven't offered me that. (If you are looking for clip art, there are a couple of earthmovers on Microsoft Clip Gallery No. 3 under "industry"). Also, the ground under the truck needs redrawing so that it doesn't look like a river.

I would still like the tractor to be pulling a harrow (a series of disks) or a plow (with a row of blades).

Because the banner is our image I want to get it right. Thanks for your

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <jhorman@umc-gbcs.org>
Subject: Several matters
Date: Fri, 19 Apr 2002 16:33:47 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Dear Janet,

It was a great retreat at Camp Highwood. Your hard work paid rich dividends. Thanks for doing it.

Do you have a roster with addresses, phone numbers for those who attended? Or better yet for the entire network of peace with justice coordinators? If so, I would like to have one.

Do I need to do something to obtain the \$5,000 peace with justice grant that the GBCS granted for work on the web site? We are getting underway and could use the money.

In case you missed it in piled up e-mail, I would like to obtain an entry for the web site for the United Methodist Church. This could include an introductory paragraph that mentions how many United Methodists and local churches there are in the U.S., something about the structure with the General Conference and Council of Bishops. Then I would like to have for posting on the web site the principal policy statements of the UMC on nuclear disarmament, such as the bishops' 1996 pastoral letter, "In Defense of Creation" (not the whole report), the General Conference resolution "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence" and the resolution "The United Methodist Church and Peace" through section I - Disarmament. There may be others you would want to include. We will have a linkage with the GBCS.

I'm willing to help get the UMC stuff in order, but I would prefer that the input come primarily from the official agency.

Thanks in advance,
Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <ken@bpfna.org>
Subject: A new web site
Date: Fri, 19 Apr 2002 16:34:44 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Dear Ken,

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is creating a web site called www.zero-nukes.org. It will contain statements from religious organizations on nuclear disarmament and also from the civil sector. There will be a section for which we will ask military leaders and civilian experts to offer scenarios for eliminating all nuclear weapons. There will be opportunity for response and dialogue.

I need some help in locating Baptist policy statements that we can post on the web site. Perhaps you or one of your staff could help me or suggest someone on denominational staff. For the American Baptist Churches Curtis Ramsey-Lucas doesn't have time to get involved. I no longer know anybody at Valley Forge that I can turn to. Lonnie Turner is involved so I can get through him statements, if any, from the Cooperative Baptist Fellowship. Maybe your organization has statements you would want to post or provide linkage to your web site if they are posted there. Are there other sources?

Thanks in advance for your assistance.

Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <eregehr@ploughshares.ca>
Subject: A new web site
Date: Fri, 19 Apr 2002 17:02:00 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Dear Ernie,

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, is creating a web site called www.zero-nukes.org. It will contain statements from religious organizations on nuclear disarmament and also from the civil sector. There will be a section for which we will ask military leaders and civilian experts to offer scenarios for eliminating all nuclear weapons. There will be opportunity for response and dialogue.

I would like to include statements by the Canadian Council of Churches and other relevant bodies in Canada. If such statements are on a web site, we will have a short introductory paragraph and then provide linkage. Otherwise we can post the statement directly on our site.

Can you help me obtain such statements for Canada? With each statement I would like a short paragraph that tells something about the organization that has made the statement.

This will help us broaden the dialogue as we contribute to developing some specific ideas on how to reach zero nuclear weapons.

Thanks in advance. I'll be in touch further as this web site develops.

Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <dce@wcc-coe.org>,
<sal@wcc-coe.org>
Subject: A new web site
Date: Fri, 19 Apr 2002 16:37:19 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Dear Dwain and Salpy,

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is creating a web site called www.zero-nukes.org. It will contain statements from religious organizations on nuclear disarmament and also from the civil sector. There will be a section for which we will ask military leaders and civilian experts to offer scenarios for eliminating all nuclear weapons. There will be opportunity for response and dialogue.

We want to include statements from the World Council of Churches on this web site. As a start I want to post the section on "Nuclear arms, doctrines and disarmament" from the Report of the Sixth Assembly (1983), the statement made by Dr. Raiser and Cardinal Danneels to the 1998 NPT PrepCom, and linkage to the "Statement on Nuclear Disarmament, NATO Policy and the Churches" (2001) on your web site. There may be other statements that you would like to have us include. For instance, is Dwain's report on "The Evolutin of World Council of Churches Policy on Nuclear Arms and Disarmament, 1948-2000" available on your web site? (I didn't find it.) If not, could it be?

For the page where the Raiser-Danneels statement is presented, we would like to have a photo of the two of them along with the PrepCom chair, Ambassdor Eugeniusz Wyzner, if such a photo was taken at the reception and you have a copy. Otherwise, I would like a photo just of Dr. Raiser.

Thanks for your assistance. I'll be in touch further as this web site develops.

Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <rsider@speakeasy.net>
Subject: A new web site
Date: Fri, 19 Apr 2002 16:39:43 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Dear Ron,

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is creating a web site called www.zero-nukes.org. It will contain statements from religious organizations on nuclear disarmament and also from the civil sector. There will be a section for which we will ask military leaders and civilian experts to offer scenarios for eliminating all nuclear weapons. There will be opportunity for response and dialogue.

We are looking for statements by Evangelical leaders, denominations, and other organizations that advocate the elimination of nuclear weapons, or at least moving in that direction. We want statements that go beyond advocacy on particular treaties or legislation and deal with overall policy objectives.

Could you and your colleagues in Evangelicals for Social Action help us locate such statements? Maybe you have made some yourself. Where possible we will provide linkage to web sites containing the statements. If they are not available in that form, we will post them on www.zero-nukes.org. We would want to receive the statement in a Word attachment if possible. Also, we would like a short paragraph about the person or organization making the statement.

In advance I thank you for your assistance. I'll keep in touch as the web site develops further.

Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <dshank@sojourners.com>
Subject: A new web site
Date: Fri, 19 Apr 2002 16:40:53 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Dear Duane,

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is creating a web site called www.zero-nukes.org. It will contain statements from religious organizations on nuclear disarmament and also from the civil sector. There will be a section for which we will ask military leaders and civilian experts to offer scenarios for eliminating all nuclear weapons. There will be opportunity for response and dialogue.

We are looking for statements by Evangelical leaders, denominations, and other organizations that advocate the elimination of nuclear weapons, or at least moving in that direction. We want statements that go beyond advocacy on particular treaties or legislation and deal with overall policy objectives.

Could you help us locate such statements? Possibly Sojourners magazine has carried some by Jim Wallis and others. You may know of other sources. Where possible we will provide linkage to web sites containing the statements. If they are not available in that form, we will post them on www.zero-nukes.org. We would want to receive the statement in a Word attachment if possible. Also, we would like a short paragraph about the person or organization making the statement.

In advance I thank you for your assistance. I'll keep in touch as the web site develops further.

Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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.

Status: U
Return-Path: <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Received: from web13904.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.67])
by payne.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 16YybXmj3Nl3p40
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 19 Apr 2002 09:12:45 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <20020419131246.36687.qmail@web13904.mail.yahoo.com>
Received: from [172.153.65.38] by web13904.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Fri, 19 Apr 2002 06:12:46 PDT
Date: Fri, 19 Apr 2002 06:12:46 -0700 (PDT)
From: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Banner design
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
In-Reply-To: <001d01c1e4a9\$9c2a2c20\$3461f7a5@default>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-1462969027-1019221966=:35245"

--0-1462969027-1019221966=:35245
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Hi Howard,
Please give me your feedback on the 3rd draft. I did not enhance the illustration for the web so the picture looks a little bit unfocused. I just want to know what you think of the overall look, the dumptruck, missile, truck, etc.
<http://www.twotonedeyes.com/zero-nukes>

Thanks,
Marie
"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote: Marie,

Although you have a more realistic missile in your second design of our banner, I like the first design much better. Among other factors the dark green of design two is too dark for my taste.

I prefer the way you present the site name and our name on the first version because it is more contained and doesn't sprawl across the page. "A Project of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament" in three lines is better than two. I'm undecided on the white space over half of "zero-nukes", but it does tie into the base of the distance mountains.

I prefer the sunflowers of the first version. I'm satisfied with that part of the banner

The problem with the first version is that it doesn't adequately convey that the truck is hauling a nuclear weapon away from a deployment site. Would you be able to using something like the missile of version two? Previously I have suggested a hole being filled by a bulldozer, but you haven't offered me that. (If you are looking for clip art, there are a couple of earthmovers on Microsoft Clip Gallery No. 3 under "industry"). Also, the ground under the truck needs redrawing so that it doesn't look like a river.

I would still like the tractor to be pulling a harrow (a series of disks) or a plow (with a row of blades).

Because the banner is our image I want to get it right. Thanks for your

Status: U

Return-Path: <JHorman@UMC-GBCS.ORG>

Received: from church2.UMC-GBCS.ORG ([66.95.90.3])

by bissell.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 16Z003TW3N13rE0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Sat, 20 Apr 2002 15:45:59 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by church2.umc-gbcs.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <F3TR2PHD>; Sat, 20 Apr 2002 15:45:41 -0400

Message-ID: <619BD1E95646D311B69D0008C79FE32D72FB7C@church2.umc-gbcs.org>

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

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

Subject: RE: Several matters

Date: Sat, 20 Apr 2002 15:45:35 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Howard:

Thanks for the email. We are processing checks now. You can expect it by May 1. We are sending out the roster of attendees this week. We are re-doing the entire PWJ Coor.roster due to a # of changes..and then we need to decide how/when to release it.The folks at the retrtreat wanted the info to be shared-but some folks don't want a public mailing list.

As for the web stuff..can you email Vince Isner to aski him those questions and for help.There are somw copyright issues..even on resolutions! We cannot even print an entire res. on our web-site.But Vince is the person to help with the links, etc.

All the best,

Janet

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

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

Sent: Friday, April 19, 2002 4:34 PM

To: Janet Horman

Subject: Several matters

Dear Janet,

It was a great retreat at Camp Highwood. Your hard work paid rich dividends. Thanks for doing it.

Do you have a roster with addresses, phone numbers for those who attended? Or better yet for the entire network of peace with justice coordinators? If so, I would like to have one.

Do I need to do something to obtain the \$5,000 peace with justice grant that the GBCS granted for work on the web site? We are getting underway and could use the money.

In case you missed it in piled up e-mail, I would like to obtain an entry for the web site for the United Methodist Church. This could include an introductory paragraph that mentions how many United Methodists and local churches there are in the U.S., something about the structure with the General Conference and Council of Bishops. Then I would like to have for posting on the web site the principal policy statements of the UMC on nuclear disarmament, such as the bishops' 1996 pastoral letter, "In Defense of Creation" (not the whole report), the General Conference resolution "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence" and the resolution "The United Methodist Church and Peace" through section I - Disarmament. There may be others you would want to include. We will have a linkage with the GBCS.

I'm willing to help get the UMC stuff in order, but I would prefer that the input come primarily from the official agency.

Thanks in advance,
Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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.

Status: U

Return-Path: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>

Received: from gull.prod.itd.earthlink.net ([207.217.120.84])

by nils.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTMP id 16ZExp4mE3Nl3pm0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 22 Apr 2002 10:11:22 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from user-2iveocq.dialup.mindspring.com ([165.247.97.154] helo=esther)

by gull.prod.itd.earthlink.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #2)
id 16zeX7-0000Vk-00

for mupj@igc.org; Mon, 22 Apr 2002 07:11:09 -0700

Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>

From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>

To: "Howard Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Subject: No Launch on Warning

Date: Mon, 22 Apr 2002 10:16:29 -0400

Message-ID: <NEBBKJHCMLACLOPKCPPBCEPBCHAA.prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

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 V5.00.2919.6600

Howard,

Here is the article I found interesting.

Esther

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

From: Alan F. Phillips [mailto:aphil@hwcen.org]

Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2002 11:27 AM

To: prgrm@backfromthebrink.net

Subject: No Launch on Warning

I am very much in sympathy with your slogan: "It's time to take all nuclear weapons off hair-trigger alert". It is astonishing that an accidental nuclear war has not happened yet.

Here for your interest is a paper of mine that has just been published by the Canadian Project Ploughshares. This is a serious paper that I hope will reach many Departments of Foreign Affairs, and United Nations meetings. Perhaps even the White House.

I have written shorter and simpler articles on the subject, and if you would like one from me for your web site or journal I would be glad to do it. The concept of NO L-o-W is of course intended only as a first step towards more permanent disabling of nuclear weapons, and eventual elimination from the arsenals of all nations.

I will also send, separately, an earlier paper entitled "20 Mishaps that might have started accidental nuclear war", which summarizes the facts

which drew my attention to this grave risk.

Yours sincerely,
Alan Phillips,
Physicians for Global Survival (Canada).

NO LAUNCH ON WARNING by Alan F. Phillips, M.D.

=====
Ploughshares working paper 02-1

Preface by Ernie Regehr:

Any post-Cold War temptation to complacency in the pursuit of nuclear weapons prohibition or abolition should quickly give way to a sobering sense of urgency on reading Alan Phillips' account of nuclear arsenals poised for launching within minutes of an order to do so. And the fact that such an order could (in some instances almost has) come in response to a false warning of attack only serves to add a sense of the macabre to the urgency. It's not that Dr. Phillips' account is alarmist; quite the opposite. Through careful analysis he concludes that a clear policy rejecting launch-on-warning is logical, possible, and necessary to dramatically reduce the risk of inadvertent nuclear war. Nuclear weapons abolition remains an urgent goal that must be pursued as a longer-term objective. But until nuclear disarmament is a reality, it is critically important that nuclear weapon states be persuaded to take all possible measures to reduce nuclear dangers - and prominent among these dangers is the possibility of nuclear attacks being precipitated by a false warning of attack. Policies to preclude launch-on-warning would yield immediate benefits by reducing the risk of inadvertent war, and would also help pave the way toward more extensive de-alerting measures to make launch-on-warning impossible. We commend to nuclear disarmament NGOs and advocates both the analysis and the policy proposal advanced here by Dr. Phillips. His is an important contribution that clearly sets out an issue of immediate concern and a credible and achievable policy response. This study will help the nuclear disarmament community explore ways in which support for a policy of no launch-on-warning can become part of our ongoing efforts toward complete and irreversible nuclear disarmament.

=====

1. Introduction.
2. Definition of Launch on Warning.
3. The Emergence of a Launch on Warning Policy.
4. The Danger of Inadvertent Nuclear War from False Warnings or Chance Coincidences.
5. Distinguishing Between De-Alerting and NO L-o-W.
6. Exploring the NO L-o-W Posture.
7. The Effect on Deterrence.
8. De-alerting: Methods, Benefits and Difficulties.
9. Conclusion.

1. *Introduction*

This paper argues for abandoning the policy of "Launch on Warning" (L-o-W). The discussion is based on the simplifying assumption of a one-against-one nuclear stand-off between the US and Russia, with the stability in that stand-off based on nuclear deterrence. The assumption is appropriate because L-o-W is only relevant between adversaries that regard themselves as mutually vulnerable to a "disarming first strike", rather than, say, to a surprise attack on cities. It is those two countries, and probably only those two, that now follow a policy, or retain the option, of L-o-W. In the present relationship between the two countries an intentionally started nuclear war is extremely improbable. There is, however, the risk of an unintended war starting from one cause or another and under the policy of L-o-W the likeliest cause is a false warning.

The prevention of any nuclear war is of very great importance. Prevention of nuclear war between Russia and the US is vital for the future of the world because both countries retain such large arsenals that if they should go to war the result would be much more extensive than complete destruction of both countries. Radioactivity, and smoke from the many firestorms, would severely affect at least the whole of the northern hemisphere. Nuclear winter, widespread starvation, and other consequences might even combine to exterminate the human species. To risk such a disaster happening because of a mere accident to a man-made system is absurd.

While the claim that long-term stability can be assured through nuclear deterrence must be rejected, deterrence remains the central basis upon which arms control discussions, and agreements, between the governments and military establishments of the US and Russia take place. Nuclear deterrence is assumed for the present discussion because the focus here is on changing just one feature in the two States' military posture. It is argued that the change to a policy of "NO L-o-W" is a logical necessity and is readily possible; it is urgently needed, and it does not require any immediate change in the assumptions upon which current policy is based, whether these are valid or not. The change can and should be made immediately. It can be initiated unilaterally, without causing relative strategic advantage or disadvantage to either side. It does not require formal agreement, nor verification.

The change from L-o-W to NO L-o-W is financially neutral, not requiring substantial expense, nor yielding significant savings. It does not require physical changes to the weapons systems.

2. *Definition of Launch on Warning*

The term "Launch on Warning" is used here in reference to retaliation with rocket-mounted nuclear weapons to a perceived nuclear attack. A L-o-W *capacity* is one that would make it possible to launch a retaliatory attack in response to a warning (by radar or satellite sensors) of attacking missiles, before any incoming warhead had arrived and detonated. This allows the *option* of L-o-W, which permits a decision, within the few minutes available between the warning and the predicted

time of first impact, on whether or not to launch a response before impact. A L-o-W *policy* is one in which it would be standard procedure for a retaliatory launch to be actively considered and probably carried out before the first impact, though in the American case only after authorization by the President, assuming he could be consulted within the short time available.

The term "Launch under Attack" has been used less precisely by US Strategic Command and in Congress, possibly sometimes with the intention of causing confusion. It is commonly presented as meaning the prompt launch of retaliation as soon as one or more incoming nuclear weapons have detonated. However, in the late 1970's it was included in the dictionary of military terms by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and explained as "execution by National Command Authorities of Single Integrated Operational Plan Forces subsequent to tactical warning of strategic nuclear attack against the United States and prior to first impact".{1} This definition is identical to L-o-W. But at times military personnel have said their policy is not L-o-W, but "launch under attack", implying that there is a difference, and that retaliation would be launched only after impact or detonation.

An alternative distinction has sometimes been implied: that L-o-W means to launch on a warning from one system (radar or satellite) alone, and "launch under attack" means launching retaliation before detonation, but only if the warning is confirmed by a second system.{2}

In any event, both Russia and the US have launch on warning capacity, and thus must be assumed to maintain a L-o-W policy{3} or, at the very least, a policy of considering the option of L-o-W.

3. *The Emergence of a Launch on Warning Policy*

The avowed function of nuclear-armed ballistic missiles is "deterrence". Deterrence is in theory achieved when a potential attacker is convinced that an attack will be unavoidably followed by retaliation so devastating that it would be irrational to attack in the first place.

As the accuracy of nuclear weapons advanced, it was realized that a massive pre-emptive salvo directed at command and control systems and retaliatory weapons could diminish or eliminate a capacity to retaliate. If either side believed it could achieve such a "disarming first strike", it might be tempted to attack. To avoid this weakening of deterrence through the pre-emptive destruction of an adversary's retaliatory forces, both sides explored the possibility of launching retaliation before the first impact of a pre-emptive strike - thus "Launch On Warning". It was probably put into effect as soon as such a quick launch became possible, the development of solid fuel as rocket propellant (around 1960) being a decisive factor.

During atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons in the early 1950's the electrical phenomenon called "Electro-Magnetic Pulse" (EMP) was discovered.{4} Around 1960 the U.S. conducted a series of high-altitude

nuclear explosions to investigate it, incidentally causing significant disruption of radio communications each time. The purpose was presumably two-fold: to explore the possibility that the phenomenon could be used by either side to enable a disarming first strike, and to study methods of protecting their own electronic equipment so that deterrence would be maintained even if the enemy was planning to use EMP. This possibility that electrical disruptions might prevent retaliation provided a second reason to adopt L-o-W.

As early as 1960 the propriety and morality of adopting L-o-W was being discussed because of the recognized danger of launching on a false warning, and so starting an unintended nuclear war.{5} In that year the Planning Board wrote that it was "essential" to avoid the possibility of launching unrecalable missiles based on a false warning. They stressed the importance of a "reliable bomb alarm system to provide early positive information of actual missile hits".{6} Such a system was in fact installed. It was not without defects, and at least once these caused a spurious alert.{7}

In 1962, Robert McNamara said that as long as he was Secretary of Defense and Jack Kennedy was President, the U.S. would never launch on warning.{8} But the same year, the Secretary of the Air Force must have been thinking of L-o-W when he informed Kennedy that once the Minuteman missiles had been deployed in the first complex, in their "normal alert status", all "twenty missiles will be able to be launched in thirty seconds".{9}

A discussion in 1969 is on record as showing that some who were opposing "Ballistic Missile Defense" favoured L-o-W, but The White House is said to have opposed it "on the grounds that 50% of warnings from Over-the-Horizon Radar were false".{10} (No true warning of a nuclear ballistic missile attack has ever been received, so presumably the other 50% were true observations of test rocket launches.) However the newly developed satellite early warning system was estimated to produce only one false warning per year, which appears to have been regarded as acceptable. Georgy Arbatov, a Soviet deterrence specialist who had joined the National Security Council, assured Council members that "neither side would wait if it received warning of an attack but instead ... would simply empty its silos by launching a counter-strike at once".{11} That reduces concern about failure of deterrence against a surprise first strike, but underlines the danger from a false warning.

It is probable that by 1969 L-o-W was the military policy on both sides, and had been for a number of years, notwithstanding the record that in 1973 Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird expressed the hope that "that kind of strategy would never be adopted by any Administration or by any Congress".{12} The recollections of former officers and enlisted men of Strategic Air Command (SAC) from the early 1970's confirm that L-o-W was in effect then.{13}

The capability, and presumably the policy, of L-o-W are retained by the US and Russia, even though the Cold War is regarded as over. This seems inexcusably dangerous.

4. *The Danger of Inadvertent Nuclear War from False Warnings or Chance Coincidences*

Launch on Warning has kept the world exposed, for at least 30 years, to the danger of a nuclear war caused by nothing but a coincidence of radar, sensor, or computer glitches, and a temporary failure of human alertness to appreciate that an unexpected message of attack from the warning system is false, the enemy having done nothing. There is at most 20 minutes for the human operators and commanders to call and conduct a "threat conference", while the chief of Strategic Command is put in touch with the President to advise him, and the President decides whether to order retaliation. The disaster of an accidental nuclear war has not happened yet, in spite of a large number of false warnings of which at least a few have had very dangerous features. This is a credit to the care and alertness of the military in both Russia and the US. It should not be taken as reassurance. A single instance of launch of nuclear weapons on a false warning would result in nuclear war, and the end of civilization, just as surely as a nuclear war started by an actual attack. There would be no chance to review the system to make it safer after one failure of that kind.

The threat conferences require, and so far have achieved, the extraordinary standard of perfect accuracy. They have not been rare events. Probably most of them have been routine and it was easy to exclude a real attack; others have been serious enough that the silo lids were rolled back. To get an idea of how the laws of chance apply to the situation, suppose we make a very conservative assumption: that just one conference a year had a risk of error as high as 1% (and that the rest had a much lower risk). It is a simple calculation to show that taking one 1% risk of disaster per year for 30 years results in a 26% probability of one actual disaster in that period. On that assumption, then, we had approximately 3 to 1 odds in favour of surviving the period 1970-2000, and we did survive. But that means, from the risk of accidental war alone, we had (on that assumption) a one in four chance of *not* surviving. A single trial of Russian roulette is safer: it gives a one in six chance of death, or 5 to 1 odds in favour of surviving.{ 14 }

During the Cold War, many mishaps within the nuclear retaliation system on the US side are known to have occurred, including false warnings. There must have also been many similar incidents on the Russian side. One has been reported in which a Russian officer decided on his own initiative not to report an apparently grave warning on his computer screen, on the correct belief that it was a false warning. He may have saved the world, but was disgraced for failing to follow his orders; his career was ruined, and he suffered a mental breakdown.{ 15 }

In a study of rival theories of accident probabilities, Scott Sagan described a large number of errors and accidents within the US nuclear deterrence system. He concluded that the risk of nuclear war from accidents had not been excessive.{ 16 } I came to the opposite conclusion from his data. I have collected 20 instances of mishaps, from that source and others, which with less alertness among military

officers, or accompanied by chance by some coincidental problem, might have started a nuclear war.{17}

One example of a situation which was difficult to assess correctly at the Command Center, was this: On the night of 24 November, 1961, all communication links between SAC HQ and NORAD went dead, and so cut SAC HQ off from the three Ballistic Missile Early Warning Sites, at Thule (Greenland), Clear (Alaska), and Fylingdales (England).{18} For General Power at SAC HQ, there were two possible explanations: either enemy action, or the coincidental failure of all the communication systems, which had multiple ostensibly independent routes including commercial telephone circuits. The SAC bases in the US were therefore alerted by a code message instructing B-52 nuclear bomber crews to prepare to take off, and start their engines, but not to take off without further orders. In the hope of clarifying the situation, radio contact was made with an orbiting B-52 on airborne alert which was near Thule (5,000 kilometers away) at the time. Its crew contacted the Thule base and could report that no attack had taken place, so the alert was cancelled. The reason for the "coincidental" failure was that the "independent" routes for telephone and telegraph between NORAD and SAC HQ all ran through one relay station in Colorado. At that relay station a small fire had interrupted all the lines.{19}

There was a coincidental mishap during this event, which could have been disastrous. It seems there was an error in transmitting the alert code to 380th Bomb Wing at Plattsburg, New York. A former aircraft maintenance technician who was serving at that B-52 bomber base, recently told the author his vivid recollection of the incident. The code order first received by the bomber crews was "alpha", instructing them to take off and proceed directly to their pre-assigned targets, and bomb. They had never received that code before. Before any bomber had taken off the code was corrected to "cocoa", meaning "wait with engines running". If the corrected code had not been received in time it could have been very difficult to stop the bombers.

The episode just described took place before L-o-W was instituted for the ICBMs that were in service. By 1979 the policy of L-o-W was in effect and in that year, on the morning of 9 November, a war games tape was running on a reserve computer when failure of the operational computer automatically switched in the reserve to take its place. The Threat Conference saw the picture of a massive attack in a realistic trajectory from Russian launch sites. On that occasion, preparation to retaliate got as far as launch of the president's National Emergency Airborne Command Post (though without the president), before the error was discovered.

The most recent example known to the public was on 25 January 1995 when, as described in a report of the Standing Committee for Foreign Affairs and International Trade, "the Russian missile early warning system detected a scientific rocket launched off the coast of Norway. This area is frequented by U.S. submarines, whose ballistic missiles could scatter eight nuclear warheads over Moscow within fifteen minutes. Norway had informed the Russian Foreign Ministry about the upcoming launch, but this information had not been transmitted to the military.

Over the next several minutes President Yeltsin was informed of the possible American attack, and, for the first time ever, his 'nuclear briefcase' was switched into alert mode for emergency use, allowing him to order a full Russian nuclear response. Tension mounted as the rocket separated into several stages, but the crisis ended after about eight minutes (just a few minutes before the procedural deadline to respond to an impending nuclear attack) when it became clear that the rocket was headed out to sea and would not pose a threat to Russia".{20}

5. *Distinguishing Between De-Alerting and NO L-o-W*

"De-alerting" is a term commonly used in suggestions and recommendations that nuclear weapons should be taken off "hair-trigger alert" by introducing physical changes to impose an *unavoidable delay* between a decision to launch and the irrevocable step that actually starts the launch. With such a delay L-o-W would of course be impossible; but it is possible and highly desirable to abandon the policy of L-o-W immediately, without waiting for the changes involved in introducing such a delay.

Several reports to governments have indicated the importance of abandoning a hair-trigger stance with weapons of such terrible destructive power. Most of them, however, have not distinguished between terms like "high alert" or "hair-trigger alert", which usually imply the technical ability to "launch on warning", and the policy or option actually to launch before any incoming warhead explodes.

The Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons was established by the Australian government in 1995. Its mandate was to recommend practical steps towards elimination of nuclear weapons from the world. Its report states: "The first requirement for movement towards a nuclear weapon free world is for the five nuclear weapon states to commit themselves unequivocally to proceed with all deliberate speed to a world without nuclear weapons ...".{21} It then defines six additional immediate steps starting with these two: *taking nuclear forces off alert*, and *removal of warheads from delivery vehicles*.

The Canberra report emphasizes the danger of launch-on-warning or launch-under-attack options, implying that they are different, but it does not indicate that giving up either option can be different from "taking nuclear forces off alert". It goes on to say that "taking nuclear forces off alert could be verified by national technical means and nuclear weapon state inspection arrangements. In the first instance, reductions in alert status could be adopted by the nuclear weapon states unilaterally". The report does not make the point that, *if nuclear deterrence is to remain the policy*, it is acceptable to abandon L-o-W unilaterally but unacceptable to de-alert unilaterally.

Similarly, the Report of the Canadian Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, entitled *"Canada and the Nuclear Challenge: Reducing the Political Value of Nuclear Weapons for the Twenty-First Century"*, discusses in a general way the need for both

Russia and the United States to reduce the alert status of their nuclear arsenals: "In the interest of increased nuclear safety and stability, and as a means to advance toward the broader goal of eliminating nuclear weapons, the Committee recommends that the Government of Canada endorse the concept of de-alerting all nuclear forces, subject to reciprocity and verification - including the arsenals of the permanent members of the UN Security Council and the three nuclear-weapons-capable States - and encourage their governments to pursue this option".{22}

At least two studies have advocated the adoption of a clear policy declaration on rejecting launch on warning options as a first step toward de-alerting. A major work from the Brookings Institute, *"Nuclear Turning Point: A Blueprint for Deep Cuts and De-alerting Nuclear Weapons"*, defines de-alerting as a two-step process. "It seeks first to eliminate the hair-trigger option of launch on warning" - essentially a policy commitment not to exercise a L-o-W option, even though there is a capacity for it. Second, in the words of the Brookings paper, de-alerting moves from a policy to forego L-o-W options, to measures that physically "extend the launch preparation time to days, weeks, or longer through graduated reciprocal measures instituted by the two parties".{23}

The *Committee on Nuclear Policy* coordinated by the Stimson Center made a similar recommendation in its 1999 report. It called on the United States to "declare its intention, with a parallel, reciprocal commitment from Russia, to eliminate the launch-on-warning option from nuclear war plans". In other words, it calls on the two states to make mutual commitments to abandon launch on warning options. This commitment, the report said, should be followed by "discussions among the five nuclear weapon states on verifiably removing all nuclear forces from hair-trigger alert".{24}

These are important calls for the public rejection of L-o-W postures and options, but in both instances the reports call for *reciprocal* NO L-o-W policies. Under deterrence theory and practice, however, rejection of the launch-on-warning policy or option does not need to be symmetrical or verifiable. It is of value even if only one side does it, and it is argued below that the only theoretical disadvantage in rejecting L-o-W is actually less if it is *not* verified. If the US were to immediately renounce the L-o-W option, it would then be in a position to tell Russia why it has done so and ask for a reciprocal commitment. One side making that commitment and carrying it out unilaterally does not produce any relative advantage or disadvantage for either side, but it does confer an advantage on both sides, namely, lowering the risk of accidental war.

6. *Exploring the NO L-o-W Posture*

If Russia and the US were actually to abandon the option of launching on warning, even while they retained the capability, they would eliminate the risk of a nuclear war being started by a false warning. Since a false warning is immediately revealed as such when the predicted time has passed for the first rockets to arrive and no detonation has been

detected, simply delaying retaliation until there has been a nuclear detonation guarantees that a war will not be started accidentally from that cause.

Incidents as a result of which a purely accidental war might have been started seem to have outnumbered the actual geopolitical crises when nuclear war was intentionally threatened. And most of the deliberate threats to resort to nuclear weapons, though extremely troubling and dangerous, have been regarded more as threatening gestures than as actual intentions.

Since the Berlin Wall came down, the most serious threat of a nuclear war between Russia and the US known to the public was the "Norwegian Rocket event" of January 1995, described above. Without L-o-W, that is, if the Russian policy had been never to launch a retaliatory attack until after a nuclear detonation was detected, the Russian alert and the anxious few minutes would still have occurred, but there would have been absolutely no danger of nuclear war because the rocket was unarmed. There could not have been a nuclear explosion, even if the guidance system had malfunctioned and directed the rocket over Russia.

To change from L-o-W to NO L-o-W does not require any change of alert status of the retaliatory system. It only requires a change of standing orders and standard operating procedure, such that no launch may take place until a nuclear detonation is reported.

The elimination of L-o-W does not eliminate any other retaliation options. It just ensures that retaliation would not take place without confirmation of a nuclear detonation. As soon as a warning of attack was received, one which a threat conference deemed to be real, the order to prepare for a retaliatory launch could be given. The President (in the US case) would then be charged with deciding, not whether to launch immediately and risk it being an irrevocable response to what could still be a false warning, but whether to launch immediate retaliation *in the event of a detonation*. If the decision was to retaliate upon detonation, full preparation would be made to launch immediately upon receipt of a positive bomb alarm signal.

Bomb alarms were installed many years ago near all military installations and all big cities in the US, and presumably in Russia, which automatically and instantaneously indicate at the Strategic Command Centers the location of any nuclear explosion. If, and only if, indication of a nuclear explosion was received at the predicted arrival time of the attack, the final order to launch could be sent immediately to the silos. No delay to obtain presidential authorization would be needed at that point. The actual retaliatory launch could probably take place within a minute of the first detonation. If the final order to launch was not received within a certain short time after the time of predicted impact, the launch preparations would be reversed.

A policy of NO L-o-W would not eliminate the horrific threat of nuclear annihilation. Only the abolition of nuclear weapons can do that; but a NO L-o-W posture would remove the danger of launching nuclear-armed rockets in response to a false warning. That would probably eliminate

90% of the current risk of nuclear war between the US and Russia. A secondary benefit would be the reduced stress on the President during those vital minutes in which a reported attack was being assessed. He would know that he was not in danger of starting a war on a false warning. Under L-o-W that worry might impair his concentration on the main issues.

Neither side wants an accidental war. They know that if either side mistakenly launches nuclear weapons both countries are going to be destroyed: it makes no difference who started it. If one side changes to NO L-o-W the risk of a purely accidental war from a false warning is approximately halved, immediately. It does not even depend on the other side knowing that the change has been made.

7. *The Effect on Deterrence*

There can be few grounds for objection, by the military or by the governments, to this very necessary safety measure. One possible objection has to be taken seriously: that "NO L-o-W" might impair deterrence and tempt one side to try a "disarming first strike". There are good reasons why this objection should not be allowed to prevent the policy change.

For either side to consider first strike to be a rational option, the attacking side would have to be absolutely sure that its first salvo would fully disarm the other's retaliatory capacity. They would know that any surviving weapons would pose a retaliatory threat that could be launched immediately after the first attack had hit its target. Under NO L-o-W the degree of alertness of surviving weapons would not be reduced, and retaliation for a real attack could still be launched promptly, probably within a minute of the first detonation. Synchronization of detonation times of the opening salvo, from widely separated launch sites to widely separated targets - the enemy missile launch sites and command posts - could not be assured to such precision.

The other possible method of preventing retaliation would be a first salvo engineered to maximize Electro-Magnetic Pulse and disable the other side's electronics. It is hardly credible that the attacking side could feel sure that their EMP would disrupt communication and launch mechanisms sufficiently, since they would know that military electronics will have been shielded. Furthermore, they would know that submarine-launched missiles would not be disabled, because the sea-water shields submarines and their contents.

The side planning a pre-emptive attack would also have to be sure that its adversary had in fact changed to and remained under a policy of NO L-o-W. They cannot be sure of this without verification. So from the point of view of preserving deterrence, verification is actually undesirable. Verification that L-o-W policies were no longer in place would help to reassure the other countries of the world, but it is not necessary in order to gain the benefit of the change.

Thus, a NO L-o-W policy on either side would have minimal impact on deterrence, and would be an advantage to both, simply because it halves the risk of a purely accidental nuclear war. NO L-o-W by both sides makes this particular risk zero.

If, despite these arguments, the military establishment on either side is not persuaded to abandon L-o-W, the head of state must balance the elimination of the very definite risk of accidental war due to a false warning, against a hypothetical possibility of weakened deterrence resulting in war. The results of a nuclear war would be the same, whether started by accident or by intention.

8. *De-alerting: Methods, Benefits and Difficulties*

As described in the report from the Brookings Institute, "de-alerting" moves beyond the policy to forego L-o-W options, to measures that physically extend the launch preparation time to days, weeks, or longer, through graduated reciprocal measures instituted by the two parties.

A wide variety of methods has been suggested to introduce the delay necessary to constitute a de-alerted posture. A very radical measure would be to have all warheads removed from all delivery vehicles, and stored at a distance from them. Less drastic measures could be used to enforce shorter delays, and possible methods include:

- making a heap of earth and rocks on silo lids that would require heavy machinery to remove it;
- removing hydraulic fluid from the machines that raise silo lids;
- de-activating the mechanism that rolls back garage roofs (Russia);
- pinning open a switch in a place that takes time to reach, or within a casing that takes time to open; and
- removing batteries, gyroscopes, or guidance mechanisms from rockets or re-entry vehicles.

For de-alerting to be effective, it should be noted that every nuclear weapon on both sides would have to be de-alerted. Heads of state and diplomats have been apt to say "de-alert as many weapons as possible", but that would not be adequate. To launch one nuclear weapon is sufficient to start a full-scale nuclear war.

Full de-alerting would make sure that nuclear weapons could not be brought into use hastily. It would tend to reduce reliance on them in crisis situations, and thus be a step towards their eventual elimination from national arsenals. De-alerting would also make unauthorized launch of a nuclear weapon far more difficult to do, and would remove entirely the risk of accidental war due to a false warning. It would make more improbable the already unlikely event of a serious dispute between Russia and the US pushing either of the two into intentionally starting a war, by giving more time for diplomatic exchanges between the hostile governments and for conciliatory efforts by third parties.

However desirable and urgent de-alerting is, it poses significant challenges. Until elimination of the weapons is complete and assured by treaty, the two states will continue to regard the possession of nuclear

weapons as essential to deterrence. To maintain deterrence it is necessary for the enforced delay to be closely equal on the two sides, otherwise the side that could launch first might be tempted to try a "disarming first strike". This symmetry will not be easy to ensure, considering that the warheads, the delivery vehicles, and the launch procedures are different in the two countries.

Thus de-alerting will require complex arrangements, and intrusive verification, to ensure the completeness of the de-alerting measures actually carried out, and to ensure that they cannot be secretly reversed. This may require observers from neutral countries, and perhaps from the adversary, in the vicinity of each side's launch sites. At the same time, both sides will be concerned about maintaining the secrecy of key features of their systems. Verification acceptable for submarine-launched missiles would be extremely difficult.

It would take prolonged technical study and negotiation to set up these two systems, the de-alerting itself and the verification, in a way that would satisfy the two parties. Once that had been achieved (which might prove impossible) a formal written agreement would be needed. This might require negotiation of a treaty, needing ratification by the parliament on each side, which raises another possibility of disappointing failure after years of work.

9. *Conclusion*

For the present, adoption of a NO L-o-W policy offers a quick and simple means of reducing the danger of accidental war. It does not need symmetry, verification, agreement, nor even trust, between the adversaries. If adopted unilaterally by one side it is of immediate benefit to both, and it does not impair deterrence. Unilateral operation of NO L-o-W by one country for a time, might well be sufficient for the other to understand the benefit and to realize that the change did not in fact invite a first strike.

Putting NO L-o-W into effect requires only an executive order, followed by a change in standing orders to the effect that no rocket is launched until a nuclear explosion is reported to Strategic Command. There is no reduction in alert status. There would be minor changes in the launch sequence to suit whatever safeguards would be made to ensure that no launch could occur while the crews in the silos were waiting for the final order, and that they would be ready for instant launch if that order came through.

All the world's people would be safer for the change. Therefore all governments have a duty to their people to urge the US and Russian governments to make it at once.

The author acknowledges valuable research assistance by Sarah Estabrooks of Project Ploughshares, and very helpful editing by Sarah and by Ernie Regehr.

Acronyms

EMP ElectroMagnetic Pulse
HQ Headquarters
ICBM Inter-Continental Ballistic Missile
L-o-W Launch on Warning
NORAD North American Aerospace Defense Command
SAC Strategic Air Command (later changed to "Strategic Command")
SIOP Single Integrated Operational Plan
SLBM Submarine-Launched Ballistic Missile

Notes

1. In Bruce Blair, *The Logic of Accidental Nuclear War* (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute) 1992.
2. This is too uncertain a distinction to rely on. If one system were temporarily out of action there would be great pressure to act on an indication from the remaining one.
3. If this is true of Russia, they must be relying on warning from only one system for a large fraction of the time. Their satellite fleet is incomplete and there are periods when segments of their periphery are not doubly monitored. Some of the radar complexes installed under the Soviet system are now in independent States. There is said to be a corridor along which missiles could approach giving no warning early enough for evaluation of the situation before impact. We have no way of knowing whether, for that direction of attack, their retaliation would be purely reflex or would wait for impact.
4. The Electro-Magnetic Pulse (EMP) is an extremely sharp and energetic electromagnetic impulse that is emitted by electrons travelling at nearly the speed of light from a nuclear explosion. It is maximal when the detonation is at very high altitude and the electrons interact with the earth's magnetic field above the atmosphere. It disrupts unshielded electrical and electronic equipment over a wide area.
5. Memorandum of Gerard C. Smith, Director, U.S. Department of State Policy Planning Staff to Foy Kohler, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, 22 June 1960. Marked TOP SECRET. Source: National Security Archive microfiche collection, U.S. Nuclear History: Nuclear Weapons and Politics in the Missile Era, 1955-68. Washington, D.C. 1998. National Security Archive electronic briefing book, "Launch on Warning: The development of U.S. capabilities, 1959-79", William Burr, ed., April 2001. Document 3. <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB43/>
6. Memorandum for the National Security Council from the National Security Council Planning Board, 14 July 1960. Marked TOP SECRET. Subject: U.S. Policy on Continental Defense. Source: National Security Archive microfiche collection, U.S. Nuclear History: Nuclear Weapons and Politics in the Missile Era, 1955-68. Washington, D.C. 1998. Burr, Document 4.

7. Scott D. Sagan, *The Limits of Safety* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993), p. 183.
8. Account quoted by Jeffrey Richelson citing an interview with Jack Ruina in *America's Space Sentinels: DSP Satellites and National Security* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 1999), p. 256. no. 37. In Burr, 2001.
9. Letter from Secretary of the Air Force, Eugene M. Zuckert, to President John F. Kennedy, 26 October 1962. Source: National Security Archive microfiche collection, *U.S. Nuclear History: Nuclear Weapons and Politics in the Missile Era, 1955-68*. Washington, D.C., 1998. Burr, Document 7.
10. Memorandum from Lawrence Lynn, U.S. National Security Council Staff, to Henry Kissinger, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, 1 May 1969. Subject: Talking Paper on "Firing on Warning" Issue. Marked TOP SECRET when with attachment. Source: National Security Archive's Nixon Presidential Materials Project, National Security Council Files, Box 840, Sentinel ABM System, Vol. II, 4/1/69. Burr, Document 9.
11. Memorandum from Helmut Sonnenfeldt, National Security Council Staff to Henry Kissinger, 22 September 1969. Subject: "Message" to You from Arbatov. Marked SECRET/NODIS. Source: National Security Archive's Nixon Presidential Materials Project, National Security Council Files, Box 710, USSR Vol. V, 10/69. Burr, Document 10.
12. U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) Public Affairs Bureau, "The Launch on Warning Question in the First Phase of SALT", 21 December 1973. Marked SECRET NOFORN. Source: ACDA FOIA release to National Security Archive. Burr, Document 11.
13. Author's personal communication with former Air Force Personnel. Anonymity retained.
14. This is not an attempt to calculate an actual probability. It is merely an example to illustrate the cumulative effect of any low-probability risk that is taken repeatedly, or accepted continuously, over a period of time.
15. Incident reported by Allan Little in "How I Stopped Nuclear War", BBC News, 21 October 1998.
16. Sagan, *The Limits of Safety*.
17. Alan F. Phillips, "20 Mishaps that Might Have Started Accidental Nuclear War" (Toronto: Defence Research and Education Centre) 1998.
18. Sagan, p. 176.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 176.

20. Report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Canada and the Nuclear Challenge: Reducing the Political Value of Nuclear Weapons for the Twenty-First Century, December 1998.
21. Report of The Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, Executive Summary, 30 January 1997.
22. SCFAIT Report, Recommendation 5, p. 24.
23. Bruce Blair, The Nuclear Turning Point, A Blueprint for Deep Cuts and De-Alerting, (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute) p.101.
24. Report of the Committee on Nuclear Policy, Jump-START: Retaking the Initiative to Reduce Post-Cold War Nuclear Dangers, The Henry L. Stimson Center, February 1999.

References

Blair, Bruce: in Feiveson, Harold A. et al. The Nuclear Turning Point, A Blueprint for Deep Cuts and De-Alerting. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute. 1999.

Blair, Bruce. The Logic of Accidental Nuclear War. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute 1992.

Burr, William, ed. National Security Archive electronic briefing book, "Launch on Warning: The development of U.S. capabilities, 1959-79". April 2001. <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB43/>

Little, Allan. "How I Stopped Nuclear War". BBC News. 21 October 1998.

Phillips, Alan. "20 Mishaps that Might Have Started Accidental Nuclear War". Toronto: Defence Research and Education Centre. 1998. Online at: www.nuclearfiles.org/anw/

Report of The Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, 30 January 1997.

Report of the Committee on Nuclear Policy, Jump-START: Retaking the Initiative to Reduce Post-Cold War Nuclear Dangers. The Henry L. Stimson Center. February 1999.

Report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Canada and the Nuclear Challenge: Reducing the Political Value of Nuclear Weapons for the Twenty-First Century, December 1998.

Sagan, Scott D. The Limits of Safety. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. 1993.

The author acknowledges valuable research assistance by Sarah Estabrooks of Project Ploughshares, and very helpful editing by Sarah and by Ernie

Regehr.

About the Author:

Dr. Alan Phillips graduated with honours in physics at Cambridge University in 1941. He spent the rest of World War II doing radar research for the British Army. After the war he qualified in medicine at Edinburgh University and specialized in the treatment of cancer by radiation. He retired in 1984. His retirement activities have included the study of nuclear armaments and the risks of accidental nuclear war.

Project Ploughshares Working Papers are published to contribute to public awareness and debate of issues of disarmament and development. The views expressed and proposals made in these papers should not be taken as necessarily reflecting the official policy of Project Ploughshares.

END

FAX

TO: President Bush
202.456.1907

President Vladimir Putin, via Embassy of the Russian Federation, Washington DC
202.298-5735

Dear President Bush and President Putin,

At the summit in Crawford, Texas in the fall of 2001, you shook hands and exchanged vows of friendship. Nevertheless, you both still threaten each other and the world with nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert.

Friends Don't Threaten Friends with Nuclear Weapons!

There is no reason the US and Russia should still be prepared to destroy each other with a quick launch of nuclear missiles. I urge you to work together to take all nuclear weapons off high alert status. The rapid removal of nuclear warheads from missiles, where they can be stored, secured and verified, should be accompanied by binding agreements on the irreversible elimination of nuclear weapons.

It's time to take nuclear weapons off hair-trigger alert!

Name _____ Date _____

Address _____ City _____ State _____ Zip _____ E-mail _____

I sent my fax to President Bush and President Putin today

**Send a copy of this fax to: Back From the Brink Campaign, 6856 Eastern Avenue, NW, Suite 322,
Washington DC 20012, www.backfromthebrink.org, 202-545-1001 202-545-1004 fax.
E-mail prgrm@backfromthebrink.net**

From: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
To: "Marie Kayser" marie_kayser@yahoo.com
Subject: Re: Banner design
Date: Mon, 22 Apr 2002 11:16:50 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="====_NextPart_000_0012_01C1E9EF.373BB540"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Marie,

Thanks for your latest draft of a masthead. I appreciate your efforts. Unfortunately it isn't working out quite right. I guess that I'm unable to convey to you what I have in mind, so your illustration doesn't tell the story I want to tell. We need to simplify. I believe that I now know better what can work.

First, I want the title to be on the left one-third of the masthead, as it was on an earlier draft and as is shown on the attachment (zero-nukes home page). The text works best with four lines as shown. That keeps "Interfaith Committee" and "for Nuclear Disarmament" each together on separate lines.

Second, the rest of the masthead should display a field of sunflowers in a prairie setting, that is, fairly flat or somewhat rolling. This can extend your previous version of sunflowers across the masthead and deeper. The horizon might be a blue sky rather than mountains. In the field is posted a sign that conveys "nuclear weapons prohibited". This can be done with the conventional prohibited symbol: a circle border with a diagonal slash across it. Inside the circle is a fat bomb with tail fins (not a sleek missile like the real ones). On the bomb is the nuclear symbol: a dot surrounded by crisscrossing circles. I have a cartoon drawing of such a "bomb". If you have a fax, I can send it to you, or I'll give it to you when I see you next.

Third, the page names for navigation can be placed horizontally under the drawing.

As noted above, I am attaching text for the home page, which retains the quotes but revises the mission statement for easier reading. The sponsors would be at the left as before. The story of our masthead can be on a separate sub-page. I don't want to use a picture of General Powell or General Horner. I have a photo of five signers of the Cathedral statement to give you, but it might more properly go on the page with the statement itself.

An outline of the web pages is attached. You can pick up the names for the masthead. "What's New" could be either in the row or at a separate spot on the home page. A draft of "What's New" is attached, at this point merely saying that the entire site is new. Additions can come later.

Text for the page on "Religious Statements" is well along. It will be lengthy. Twenty pages are attached. They have some gaps, but it is far enough along for you to start setting it up. There are some logos and other items to import. I am seeking some photos. There are a couple of documents to scan if you have the capacity. I'll bring them to you.

This leads me to suggest that we get together again. I could come by this week on Tuesday or Wednesday afternoon at 2:00 p.m. or later if you would be available.

I'll give you a call.

Howard

zero-nukes

**A Project of the
Interfaith Committee
for Nuclear Disarmament**

[Field of sunflowers. In the field a
"prohibited" sign with a nuclear bomb.]

[page names]

Sponsors

Church of the Brethren,

Washington Office

Cooperative Baptist Fellowship

Mennonite Central Committee,

Washington Office

Pax Christ, USA

Presbyterian Church (USA)

Washington Office

Unitarian Universalist Association

Washington Office for

Faith in Action

United Church of Christ,

Justice and Witness Ministries

United Methodist General Board

of Church and Society

Union of American Hebrew

Congregations

[others to be added later]

Moderator

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Methodists United for Peace

with Justice

Contact:

moderator@zero-nukes.org

Mission

"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.

"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.

"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 a statement by 21 U.S. religious leaders and 18 military professionals, issued at Washington National Cathedral, June 21, 2000.

[in box:]

All nuclear weapons on Earth should be eliminated. That's the conclusion of numerous religious bodies and also many military leaders, scientists, and other experts. If so:

How can this be accomplished?

This web site is dedicated to searching for answers. The site features:

- **How to Achieve Zero Nuclear Weapons** -- presenting the views of military leaders, civilian experts, and ordinary citizens.
- **Feedback** about these proposals.
- **Policy Statements of Religious Organizations**
- **Statements and Reports from the Civil Sector**
- **Facts about the Global Nuclear Arsenal**
- **Treaties and Treaty Proposals**

[end of box]

How to submit your ideas.

[The story of our masthead.](#)

New sub-page.

The Story of Our Masthead

When the Soviet Union dissolved, three newly independent republics, Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine, inherited an arsenal of nuclear weapons. All three chose to send the missiles and nuclear warheads to Russia and become non-nuclear states.

In January 1996 U.S. Secretary of Defense William Perry was present at the Pervomaysk missile base in Ukraine when an empty missile silo was blown up. After the silo was filled in, Perry returned in June and joined Russian Defense Minister Pavel Grachev and Ukraine Defense Minister Valeriy Shmarov in planting sunflower seeds on former missile site. After the sunflowers grew and were harvested, Perry received a bottle of sunflower oil produced from the site.

Since then sunflowers have become a symbol of the movement to abolish nuclear weapons.

Outline of web pages for www.zero-nukes.org

[primary headings in bold to be displayed as navigational guides on home page]

Home Page

Mission

Sponsors

Religious Statements

Interfaith and ecumenical

By denomination

Civil Sector Statements

Typically with brief synopsis and linkage

Arsenals and Treaties

Arsenals (linkage to information source)

Treaties

NPT

Other (linkage to information source)

Proposals (such as nuclear weapons convention)

How to Get to Zero

Reports of Commissions and International Bodies

Canberra Commission

National Academy of Sciences

Final Document of NPT 2000 Review Conference

Scenarios for Achieving Zero Nuclear Weapons

By Military Professionals

By Civilians

Interim Measures

De-alerting

Reductions Approaching Zero

Your Feedback

Site Index

Including list of PDF documents

What's New

April 22, 2002

What's New

[initial text:]

This page last updated on [month day, year]

This entire web site is new. As additions are made, they will be listed on this page.

###

[Subsequently add material in chronology order with latest material on top. For instance:]

June 2000

Religious Statements

Church of the Brethren

United Church of Christ

Civil Sector Statements and Reports

Arms Control Association, "Name of Report"

How to Get to Zero

Military Professionals

General What's His Name

Admiral You Know Who

Civilians

Dr. Famous Scientist

Your Feedback

John Doe, Sioux City, IA

Jane Dumpling, London, England

May 2000

Religious Statements

Friends General Conference

Civic Sector Statements

Federation of American Scientists, "Latest Report"

RELIGIOUS STATEMENTS

Introduction

INTERFAITH AND ECUMENICAL

World Council of Churches

Religious Statements to 1998 NPT PrepCom

1999 Parliament of the World's Religious

Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative (2000)

National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA

Canadian Council of Churches

Conference of European Churches

[others to be added]

DENOMINATIONS

Baptist

Catholic

Holy See

U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops

Pax Christi International

Pax Christi USA

Church of the Brethren

Union of American Hebrew Congregations

Etc.

INTERFAITH AND ECUMENICAL

World Council of Churches

[logo from web page] ***The World Council of Churches*** [www.wcc-coe.org] is a fellowship of 342 churches (that is, denominations) from virtually all Christian traditions in more than 120 countries in all continents. It formed in 1948, not long after the end of

World War II. For its legislative body the WCC has an Assembly composed of representatives of member churches. It meets every seven years. Between meetings the Central Committee and its Executive Committee serve as governing bodies.

Report of the Sixth Assembly (1983)

The most fully developed statement on nuclear disarmament by the World Council of Churches occurred in the Official Report of the Sixth Assembly, meeting in Vancouver, Canada in 1983, as follows:

[PDF document]

Nuclear arms, doctrines and disarmament

[scan paragraphs 13-18 from that report]

Statement to 1998 NPT Preparatory Committee

*In 1998 Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, joined with Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, in a statement entitled **Act Now for Nuclear Abolition** [linkage to the statement elsewhere on this page], presented to the 1998 session of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee. Among other things they stated: [Insert a photo of Dr. Raiser.]*

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment...When used as an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt.

Policy Statement of 2001

*In 2001 the Executive Committee of the World Council of Churches, meeting in Potsdam, Germany, issued a **Statement on Nuclear Disarmament, NATO Policy and the Churches**. [<http://www.wcc-coe.org/wcc/who/cc2001/pi5-e.html>] Among other elements the Executive Committee:*

Reiterates its deep and long-standing concern at the continued risk of Creation posed by the existences of nuclear weapons.

Welcomes the Final Document [linkage to another page on this web site] of the 2000 NPT Review Conference, which established a new global agenda for nuclear disarmament.

Calls upon the member states of NATO and NATO itself to ensure that their nuclear weapon policies conform to the obligations undertaken by states in the Non-Proliferation Treaty and are consistent with pursuit of the global nuclear disarmament agenda.

Religious Statements to 1998 NPT PrepCom

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) has provisions for a Review Conference every five years. In each five year period an NPT Preparatory Committee meets several times to prepare for the next Review Conference. For the 1998 session in Geneva, Switzerland two statements laid out the religious case for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

Act Now for Nuclear Abolition

The Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, presented the following statement to the 1998 PrepCom delegates. [insert photo of Dr. Raiser and Cardinal Danneels, preferably with NPT PrepCom chair]

[PDF document]

The time has come to rid planet Earth of nuclear weapons -- all of them, everywhere. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee has a remarkable opportunity at its upcoming meeting to set the course resolutely for the achievement of this goal.

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. This was quite apparent in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The same result would probably occur in any further use, and indeed would be worse because of the increased destructive power of modern nuclear weapons.

When used as an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt. It loses sight of the inviolable connection between means and end by failing to recognize that just ends cannot be achieved through wrongful means.

During the past 50 years the production and testing of nuclear weapons has proven grievously harmful to individuals and the environment in the vicinity of mining operations, processing plants, production facilities, and test sites. Numerous locales are burdened with lingering radioactivity and deadly waste products that will take decades to clean up. Some sites may never be restored to safe occupancy.

Psalms 24 teaches, "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and those who dwell therein." The First Book of Moses, also known as Genesis, indicates that God made Earth available to humankind to till and keep, that is, to use for mutual benefit and to preserve. Because production and use of nuclear weapons causes grave harm to Earth and its inhabitants, we as good stewards of God's Earth have an obligation to rid the world of this perilous threat.

Numerous religious bodies have condemned nuclear weapons and have called for their abolition. Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemn as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See before the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 15, 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino stated: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....This is a moral challenge, a legal challenge and a political challenge. That multiple-based challenge must be met by the application of our humanity."

In principle the nations of Earth agree on the need to eliminate nuclear weapons. Indeed, they have made a strong commitment in Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) "to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." After reviewing this article at the request of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice unanimously agreed that "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control."

Now is the time to take this obligation seriously. We call upon the members of the NPT Preparatory Committee to make the 1998 session a notable landmark in the journey toward the abolition of all nuclear weapons.

First, we ask the delegates to call resolutely upon the nuclear weapon states to embark upon a series of steps along the road leading to nuclear abolition. There is

broad consensus among study commissions, retired generals and admirals, scientists, and other civilian experts on what these steps should be. They include:

- Declare a policy of no first use amongst themselves and non-use in relation to non-nuclear weapon states.
- Cease all research, development, production, and deployment of new nuclear weapons.
- Refrain from modernizing the existing nuclear arsenal and increasing the number of deployed nuclear weapons.
- Take all nuclear forces off alert and remove warheads from delivery vehicles.
- Achieve faster and deeper bilateral reduction of nuclear weapons by the United States and Russia.

It would be appropriate for the NPT Preparatory Committee to require the nuclear weapon states to provide annual progress reports on how they are carrying out such measures.

Second, we ask the delegates to take the lead in commencing the process of developing a nuclear weapons convention to outlaw and abolish all nuclear weapons. One appropriate method would be to establish a working group of the NPT Preparatory Committee for this purpose. Although the nuclear weapons states should be part of this process, other nations need not wait until they are willing to become engaged. Rather as stewards of God's Earth, non-nuclear weapon states can begin the task of developing a nuclear weapons convention that specifies a fair and effective program to abolish all nuclear weapons.

We appeal to delegates to the NPT Preparatory Committee to consider what is best for the whole Earth and its inhabitants when they vote on issues of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. Loyalty to all humankind exceeds that of loyalty within political blocs of nations. We urge delegates to act now decisively and courageously for the benefit of all the peoples of Earth.

Godfried Cardinal Danneels, President
Pax Christi International

Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, General Secretary
World Council of Churches

March 1998

Co-Signers

The following religious leaders co-signed the statement, "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition".

Archbishop Michael
Metropolitan Bishop
Greek Orthodox Church in Austria

President, Ecumenical Council of
Churches in Austria

Superintendent Helmut Nausner
United Methodist Church in Austria
Secretary, Ecumenical Council of
Churches

Christine Gleixner
Mother Superior of the Order, Sisters of
Bethany, and Vice Chair, Ecumenical
Council of Churches in Austria

Rev. Ivan Petkin
Bulgarian Orthodox Church in Austria

Rev. Johannes El Baramousy
Koptic Orthodox Church in Austria

Bishop Mag. Herwig Sturm
Lutheran Church in Austria

Bishop Bernhard Heitz
Old Catholic Church, Austria

Bishop Dr. Heinrich Fasching
Roman Catholic Church
President, "Justitia et Pax" in Austria

Metropolit Archbishop Ireneji
Russian Orthodox Church in Austria

The Most Rev. J. Barry Curtis
President, Canadian Council of
Churches

Archbishop Michael G. Peers
Primate of the Anglican Church of
Canada

The Rev. Arie G. Van Eek
Council of Christian Reformed Churches
in Canada

The Rev. Telmor Sartison, Bishop
Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada

Marvin Frey
Executive Director
Mennonite Central Committee Canada

The Rev. John D. Congram
Moderator
The Presbyterian Church in Canada

Gale Wills
Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)
in Canada

Commissioner Donald V. Kerr
Territorial Commander
The Salvation Army, Canada

The Very Rev. Bill Phipps
Moderator
United Church of Canada

Rev. Dr. Lothar Engel
Deputy General, Association of
Protestant Churches and Missions in
Germany

Bishop Dr. Walter F. Klaiber
United Methodist Church in Germany

Rev. John Reardon
General Secretary
Council of Churches for Britain and
Ireland

D. Dr. Béla Harmati
Bishop of the Lutheran Church
President, Ecumenical Council of
Churches in Hungary

Dr. Zoltán Bóna
General Secretary, Ecumenical Council
of Churches in Hungary

Rev. Domenico Tomasetto
President, Federation of Protestant
Churches in Italy

Rev. Kenichi Otsu
General Secretary,
National Christian Council in Japan

Rev. Samuel I. Koshiishi

Acting General Secretary
Nippon Sei Ko Kai
(Anglican/ Episcopal Church)

Rev. Junichiro Naito
Executive Secretary
Japan Baptist Convention

Rev. Masakazu Asami
President
Japan Evangelical Lutheran Church

Rev. Satoru Gohada
President
Japan Free Methodist Church

Rev. Sadao Ozawa
General Secretary
United Church of Christ in Japan

William V. Robinson
President, CCANZ (Conference of
Churches in Aotearoa New Zealand)

Rev. Jennifer Dawson
President, CCANZ

Rev. Max Reid
President, CCANZ

Mrs. Jan Cornack
General Secretary, CCANZ

Rev. Billy Taranger
President, Christian Council of Norway

Rev. Ingrid Vad Nilsen
General Secretary
Christian Council of Norway

Bishop Nifon of Slobozia and Calarasi
President, Ecumenical Association of
Churches in Romania

Bishop Christoph Klein
Evangelical AC Church in Romania
Vice President, Ecumenical Association
of Churches in Romania

Bishop Kalman Csiha
Reformed Church of Transylvania
Member, Administrative Council
Ecumenical Association of Churches
in Romania

Christian Teodoresu
General Secretary, Ecumenical
Association
of Churches in Romania

Rev. Thord-Ove Thordson
General Secretary
Christian Council of Sweden

Rev. Tord Ström
General Secretary
Free Church of Sweden

Rev. Krister Andersson
President and General Secretary
Mission Covenant Church of Sweden

A Spiritual, Ethical, and Humanitarian Perspective on Nuclear Weapons

[PDF document]

As part of a series of presentations to the 1998 PrepCom meeting by non-governmental organizations, the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition developed this statement. Co-chairs of the Working Group were Howard W. Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice; Ibrahim Abdil-Mu'id Ramey, Fellowship of Reconciliation (USA); and Dave Robinson, Pax Christi USA. The final draft was polished and presented on April 28, 1998 by Bishop Thomas Gumbleton, past president of Pax Christi USA.. [insert photo of Bishop Gumbleton]

Mr. Chairman and delegates to the 1998 session of the NPT Preparatory Committee, we in the community of non-governmental organizations greatly appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and provide information on vital issues that are on your agenda. My role is to offer some ideas developed by the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition.

You meet at a propitious time. With a new millennium rapidly approaching, the people of this planet would like to enter the new century free from the threat of nuclear holocaust. In the next two weeks you delegates here assembled have a great opportunity to take decisive action to set the course for the abolition of all nuclear weapons on Earth.

The moral grounds for nuclear abolition are expressed in a statement by Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, and Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Church, which you have received. They state

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. ...As an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt.

This view stems from a belief in the sanctity of life, a perspective shared by other world religions: Judaism, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism.

I believe that most of you today, who come from different faiths, in your heart of hearts, in the deep recesses of your mind, also understand the moral depravity of nuclear weapons. The challenge to you is to let your moral judgment guide your actions.

A statement developed for this meeting by the International Peace Conference, based in Prague, offers a pair of reasons for the total rejection of nuclear weapons: first, the threat to Creation and, second, the contribution to moral degradation.

"Nuclear weapons," says this statement, "fundamentally differ from all other weapons because of their potential to destroy all life on this planet. They are terminal in relation to Nature. They can destroy the divine Creation....They take from God the sole power to end the created order, and thus usurp the divine prerogative....Nuclear weapons stand condemned because they can destroy 'the sacred gift of life' and are thus innately demonic and blasphemous."

Secondly, the statement notes, "The terrible suffering caused by nuclear weapons, their potential for total destruction, and their perversion of the fundamental nature of matter have contributed immeasurably to the moral degradation of humanity in our time." This moral decline has escalated from the mass slaughter of World War I to the Nazi concentration camps to the mass bombing of cities in World War II to the development of nuclear weapons and their use on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the 1945. Since then "the East-West nuclear confrontation with the readiness of states to commit global genocide further hugely contributed to the moral de-sensitization of our age, now so evident in many aspects of contemporary life."

From an ethical perspective, Judge Mohammed Bedjaoui, when he was president of the International Court of Justice, stated: "The nuclear weapon, the ultimate evil, destabilizes humanitarian law which is the law of lesser evil. The existence of nuclear weapons is therefore a challenge to the very existence of humanitarian law, not to mention their long-term effects of damage to the human environment, in respect to which the right to life must be exercised."

Judge Bedjaoui spoke in connection with the 1996 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in which the Court decided unanimously that under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all aspects under strict and effective international control."

Notice the words "good faith", two terms with deep religious meaning. In this context they refer to basic honesty, to abiding by one's commitment. You delegates have it within your goodness to act decisively in behalf of all us: humans, animals,

plants, the whole community of life. We have faith that you will show yourself worthy of this trust.

Even if no other nuclear bomb is exploded, the Earth will remain scarred by the nuclear weapons era. Earth and its people have suffered grave harm in the mining of fissionable material, by production of nuclear warheads with the byproduct of radioactive waste, and through nuclear testing in the atmosphere and below the ground.

Beyond harm to people and environmental damage, nuclear weapons have taken an enormous economic toll. Since the 1940s the nuclear weapon states have spent more than \$8 trillion to develop, test, produce, transport, deploy, and safeguard their nuclear arsenal. This vast waste of resources brings to mind the words of U.S. President Dwight D. Eisenhower, himself a former general, words deemed so important that they are engraved beside his tomb in Abilene, Kansas. "Every gun made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed....This is not a way of life at all....Under the cloud of threatening war, it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron."

The great irony is that the nuclear weapon states through these vast expenditures have failed to produce the security they seek. Indeed, it is their own people who are at greatest risk due to their doctrine of mutually assured destruction. Citizens of the allies of nuclear weapon states are themselves vulnerable to nuclear attack because of the military doctrine of the nuclear powers. Any other nation gaining nuclear weapons would join the ranks of the insecure.

Tragically the nuclear weapon states and their allies are victims of a self-imposed and self-destructive addiction to nuclear weapons. Yes, an addiction. Like many other addictions cure can come in two ways.

First, the addicted can exercise self-will, can renounce the addictive substance or orientation, and can through great determination and inner strength free itself from the addiction that is sapping its vitality. In this case, the nuclear weapon states can say individually or join together in a covenant that says, "We renounce the use of nuclear weapons for war-fighting purposes. We renounce nuclear deterrence as an instrument of foreign and military policy." Renunciation would remove the fundamental blockage to carrying out a series of actions that lead to nuclear abolition. Other speakers on this program will describe the steps that can be taken along this road.

Second, friends of the addicted can apply "tough love". They can talk firmly and insist that the addicted take the necessary steps leading out of addiction. In the matter at hand, you delegates from non-nuclear weapon states can exercise tough love by insisting that the nuclear powers embark upon a course of action that moves toward nuclear abolition. You can even develop a plan in the form of a nuclear weapons convention to outlaw and abolish nuclear weapons. Even if you are part of a political bloc with one or more nuclear weapon states, true friendship requires you to apply tough love by acting independently and supporting measures leading to nuclear abolition. Beyond that, each and every one of you has a higher loyalty to all of humankind, to the well-being of all peoples on Earth.

As you prepare to meet the challenges before you during this session of the NPT Preparatory Committee, I invite you to pause and observe one minute of silence. Draw upon the perspective of your personal faith and use this minute to reflect upon the human suffering caused by nuclear weapons in their more than fifty years of existence: the victims at Hiroshima and Nagasaki; the indigenous people and other inhabitants living in the vicinity of test sites in the western United States, Algeria, Russia, Kazakhstan, China, the South Pacific, and Australia; persons far away from test sites but harmed by drifting radioactive fallout; the people who have suffered by the side effects of mining operations and weapon production facilities.

In silence we can remember all who have suffered.. We can share together feelings of regret and contrition. You who are delegates can also use this moment to reflect on what you can accomplish in the next two weeks. You can re-dedicate yourself to working courageously and with imagination to find ways to end the nuclear arms race and rid Earth of this horrible plague on human existence.

May we pause now in silence. [One minute of silence.]

In the spirit of renewal and re-dedication, the NGO community this afternoon would like to offer you ideas on steps that can be undertaken to achieve the abolition of nuclear weapons, an achievable goal that humankind longs to accomplish. Although NGOs have various perspectives on the issues presented, we have collaborated in preparing these statements. We hope that our ideas will be useful to you in your deliberations. Throughout your session we will be available to you to elaborate on what we have presented today. We look forward to further exchange of ideas in the period leading up to the year 2000 NPT review conference.

Lastly I want to thank you personally for the privilege of speaking to you.

1999 Parliament of the World's Religions

*More than 7,000 persons from around the world assembled in Cape Town, South Africa in December 1999 for a Parliament of the World's Religions. In the course of the gathering religious leaders and people of many faiths presented **A Moral Call to Eliminate the Threat of Nuclear Weapons.***

[<http://www.gs institute.org/archives/000029.shtml>] *Among other elements The Call states:*

The threat and use of nuclear weapons is incompatible with civilized norms, standards of morality and humanitarian law which prohibit the use of inhumane weapons and those with indiscriminate effects....We say that a peace based on terror, a peace based upon threats of inflicting annihilation and genocide upon whole populations, is a peace that is morally corrupting.

Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative (2000)

[logo of NRD from www.nrdi.org] *At a ceremony at the Washington National Cathedral in June 2000 21 religious leaders along with 18 military professionals issued a **Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement***

[<http://www.nrdi.org/nuclear/Nuclear02.html>]. *This initiative began as an interfaith project led by Washington National Cathedral, with assistance from the late Senator Alan Cranston, his Global Security Institute [www.gs institute.org], and the Fourth Freedom Forum [www.fourthfreedom.org]. After issuance of the statement the Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative [www.nrdi.org] developed into an educational program and became a part of The Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy, located at Wesley Theological Seminary in Washington, DC.*

[photo of signers with caption. "Participants in the news conference that released the *Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement* included the Very Reverend Nathan D. Baxter, dean of the Washington National Cathedral; Admiral Stansfield Turner, U.S. Navy (Ret.); Bishop William B. Oden, president, Council of Bishops, United Methodist Church; Dr. Muzammi H. Siddiqi, president, The Islamic Society of North America; and General Charles S. Horner, U.S. Air Force (Ret.). Rabbi David Saperstein, director, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, also participated in the news conference.

Highlights of the statement include:

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

Historically, military and religious leaders have not always been in agreement on these issues, but now a consensus is emerging. National security imperatives and ethical demands have converged to bring us to the necessity of outlawing and prohibiting nuclear weapons worldwide.

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

And so it is that we now come together to bear witness anew: it is past time for a great national and international discussion and examination of the true and full implications of reliance on nuclear weapons, to be followed by action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons.

Canadian Council of Churches

[to be added]

Conference of European Churches

[to be added]

DENOMINATIONS

Catholic Church

[*Photo of St. Peter's Cathedral in Rome*] The Catholic Church is the largest body of Christians in the world. It has about 1 billion members. The pope, who is the bishop of Rome, serves as the head of the Catholic Church and governs from Vatican City, sometimes referred to as the Holy See. The pope appoints cardinals to be his main advisers. As a group, they form the College of Cardinals and elect a new pope after a reigning pope dies or resigns. The pope also appoints bishops who preside over churches in different countries.

[Side bar: Picture of John Paul II with caption: Pope John Paul II has called for the banishment of all nuclear weapons through "a workable system for negotiation, even of arbitration".]

Holy See

In recent years policy statements coming from the Holy See on nuclear disarmament are made by Holy See delegation to the United Nations in New York.

"There Has Been Regression"

[PDF document]

Address by Monsignor Francis Chullikat, deputy head of a Holy See delegation to the United Nations, to the Preparatory Committee for the 2005 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in New York on April 10, 2002.

[Possibly a photo of Monsignor Chullikat addressing the NPT PrepCom.]

[Within the body of the text a side bar: " There can be no moral acceptance of military doctrines that embody the permanence of nuclear weapons."]

Mr. Chairman, as the international community begins preparation for the 2005 Review of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, my Delegation notes the deep concern that is widely felt about the state of nuclear disarmament.

At the 2000 Review, it was felt that progress was being made. The Review obtained a clear-cut commitment from the nuclear weapon states that systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI would include: "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."

This commitment was embodied in a list of 13 practical steps the conference unanimously agreed to take. However, the progress made in implementing the 13 steps over the past two years has been indeed discouraging. In fact, the prospects for future implementation are alarming.

As an examination of the 13 steps shows, there has not only been a lack of sufficient progress, there has been regression. Although, thankfully, there has been no nuclear testing in this period, the entry-into-force of the CTBT cannot be seen on the near horizon. The Conference on Disarmament is paralyzed. One of the parties to the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty has given notice of withdrawal. Nuclear weapons are still kept on alert status. The admonition of the International Court of Justice for the completion of negotiations towards elimination is ignored.

Even more serious than the lack of progress is the overt determination of some nuclear weapon states to maintain nuclear weapons in a critical role in their military doctrines. While the international community rightly welcomes the willingness of those with the

most nuclear weapons to reduce their stocks of operationally deployed warheads, what is the real effect of such unilateral disarmament when it is not made irreversible, i.e., when such stocks can be remounted again quickly?

My Delegation is deeply concerned about the old posture of nuclear deterrence that is evolving into the possibility of use in new strategies. This must be stoutly resisted. The Holy See has constantly recalled the fact that the strategy of deterrence can be envisaged only as a stage in the process aimed at disarmament, even of a progressive nature. So long as it is taken as an end in itself, deterrence encourages the protagonists to ensure a constant superiority over one another, in ceaseless race of over-arming.

Mr. Chairman, the concern of the Holy See mounts in seeing the non-proliferation regime, with the NPT as its cornerstone, in disarray. The old policies of nuclear deterrence, which prevailed in the Cold War, must lead now to concrete disarmament measures. The rule of law cannot countenance the continuation of doctrines that hold nuclear weapons as essential.

There can be no moral acceptance of military doctrines that embody the permanence of nuclear weapons. That is why Pope John Paul II has called for the banishment of all nuclear weapons through "a workable system for negotiation, even of arbitration." Those nuclear weapon states resisting negotiations should therefore be strongly urged to finally come to the negotiating table.

In fact, in clinging to their outmoded rationales for nuclear deterrence, they are denying the most ardent aspirations of humanity as well as the opinion of the highest legal authority in the world. In this regard, my Delegation wishes to reaffirm its well-known position: nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century; they cannot be justified. These weapons are instruments of death and destruction. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands unequivocal action towards their elimination. Only when such a noble goal is attained can the international community be assured that nations are acting in "good faith".

Mr. Chairman, my Delegation is confident that the Preparatory Committee will seize this opportunity to develop a sharpened sense of urgency to root out nuclear weapons that are the biggest threat to mankind. To keep developing weapon systems that can jeopardize the natural structure upon which all civilization rests seriously undermines the genuine quest of the family of nations to build a culture of peace for the present and future generations.

"Nuclear Weapons Cannot Be Justified and Deserve Condemnation"

[PDF document]

Excerpt from a statement by Archbishop Renato Martino, the Holy See's permanent observer at the United Nations, to the United Nations' First Committee, October 15, 1997. After expressing support of the Holy See for the recently developed treaty to eliminate land mines, he stated:

[Possibly a photo of Archbishop Martino.]

[Somewhere within the body of the text a side bar: "The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by universal authority."]

If biological weapons, chemical weapons and now land-mines can be done away with, so too can nuclear weapons. No weapon so threatens the longed-for peace of the 21st century as the nuclear.

Let not the immensity of this task dissuade us from the efforts needed to free humanity from such a scourge. With the valuable admonition offered in the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice, the international community can see the legal and moral arguments against nuclear weapons intertwine with the strategic: since nuclear weapons can destroy all life on the planet, they peril all that humanity has ever stood for and indeed humanity itself.

During the acrimonious years of the Cold War with the emphasis on the military doctrine of nuclear deterrence as a constant justification for the nuclear arms build-up, the international community felt powerless to stop the relentless build-up of nuclear weapons. Not now, in the post-Cold War era characterized by new partnerships, the international community cannot shield itself from the assault on life itself that nuclear weapons represent.

The work of this Committee has done in calling for negotiations leading to a Nuclear Weapons Convention must be increased. Those nuclear weapons States resisting such negotiations must be challenged, for, in clinging to their outmoded rationales for nuclear deterrence, they are denying the most ardent aspirations of humanity as well as the opinion of the highest legal authority in the world. The gravest consequences for mankind lie ahead if the world is to be ruled by the militarism represented by nuclear weapons rather than the humanitarian law espoused by the International Court of Justice.

Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition.

The Holy See has previously stated in this Committee: "The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by universal authority". Today we repeat those words, conscious that there is a gathering momentum of world opinion in support of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. This is a moral challenge, a legal challenge and a political challenge. That multiple-based challenge must be met by the application of our humanity.

U.S Conference of Catholic Bishops

[*Import logo from web site: www.usccb.org*]. The Catholic Church with over 64 million members and more than 20,000 local congregations is the largest religious body in the United States. Oversight is provided by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), composed of xxx bishops who are appointed by the pope and serve in the United States and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response

A Pastoral Letter on War and Peace

[PDF document]

In November 1980 the National Conference of Bishops (as it was then known) appointed a committee of bishops, chaired by Cardinal Joseph Bernardin, to draft a pastoral letter on war and peace. The bishops reviewed two drafts and adopted the third and final draft on May 3, 1983. A substantial part of this pastoral letter focuses on nuclear weapons. The summary is presented below. The complete pastoral letter, The Challenge of Peace, is available from....

[Possibly a photo of Cardinal Bernardin or the drafting committee]

[Two side bars, say at one-third and two-thirds through the text.

"No *use* of nuclear weapons which would violate the principle of discrimination or proportionality may be *intended* in a strategy of deterrence."

"In the words of our Holy Father, we need a 'moral about-face.' The whole world must summon the moral courage and technical means to say no to nuclear conflict; no to weapons of mass destruction; no to an arms race which robs the poor and the vulnerable; and no to the moral danger of a nuclear age which places before humankind indefensible choices of constant terror or surrender."

Summary

The Harvest of Justice is Sown in Peace
A Reflection of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops
on the Tenth Anniversary of The Challenge of Peace

[PDF document]

Ten years after issuing The Challenge of Peace the National Conference of Catholic Bishops reviewed the findings of the 1983 pastoral letter and offered their reflections. The Harvest of Justice [<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/harvest.htm>] is available on the web site of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. The section dealing with nuclear disarmament is presented below with permission.

[Perhaps a photo of a wheat field inserted into the above paragraph.]

[At appropriate locations, two side bars:

"We must continue to say No to the very idea of nuclear war." "The eventual elimination of nuclear weapons is more than a moral ideal; it should be a policy goal."

1.Unfinished Business: Nuclear Disarmament and Proliferation.

[change margins to be like above]

Our 1983 pastoral letter focused special attention on the morality of nuclear weapons at a time of widespread fear of nuclear war. Only ten years later, the threat of global nuclear war may seem more remote than at any time in the nuclear age, but we may be facing a different but still dangerous period in which the use of nuclear weapons remains a significant threat. We cannot address questions of war and peace today, therefore, without acknowledging that the nuclear question remains of vital political and moral significance.

The end of the Cold War has changed the nuclear question in three ways. First, nuclear weapons are still an integral component of U.S. security policies, but they are no longer at the center of these policies or of international relations. In 1983, a dominant concern was the ethics of nuclear weapons. Today, this concern, while still critically important, must be considered in the context of a more fundamental question of the ethical foundations of political order: How do we achieve *Pacem in Terris*' vision of a just and stable political order, so that nations will no longer rely on nuclear weapons for their security? Second, we have new opportunities to take steps toward progressive nuclear disarmament. In 1983, the first task was to stop the growth of already bloated nuclear

arsenals; today, the moral task is to proceed with deep cuts and ultimately to abolish these weapons entirely. Third, the threat of global nuclear war has been replaced by a threat of global nuclear proliferation. In addition to the declared nuclear powers, a number of other countries have or could very quickly deploy nuclear weapons, and still other nations, or even terrorist groups, might seek to obtain or develop nuclear weapons. Just as the nuclear powers must prevent nuclear war, so also they, with the rest of the international community, bear a heavy moral responsibility to stop the spread of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons.

a. The Moral Judgment on Deterrence. In 1983, we judged that nuclear deterrence may be morally acceptable as long as it is limited to deterring nuclear use by others; sufficiency, not nuclear superiority, is its goal; and it is used as a step on the way toward progressive disarmament.

Some believe that this judgment remains valid, since significant progress has been made in reducing nuclear weapons, including the most destabilizing ones, while at least some of those that remain are still necessary to deter existing nuclear threats. Others point to the end of the Soviet threat and the apparent unwillingness of the nuclear powers to accept the need to eliminate nuclear weapons as reasons for abandoning our strictly conditioned moral acceptance of nuclear deterrence. They also cite the double standard inherent in nonproliferation efforts: What is the moral basis for asking other nations to forego nuclear weapons if we continue to judge our own deterrent to be morally necessary?

We believe our judgment of 1983 that nuclear deterrence is morally acceptable only under certain strict conditions remains a useful guide for evaluating the continued moral status of nuclear weapons in a post-Cold War world. It is useful because it acknowledges the fundamental moral dilemmas still posed by nuclear weapons, and it reflects the progress toward fulfilling the conditions we elaborated in 1983. At the same time, it highlights the new prospects — and thus the added moral urgency — of making even more dramatic progress in arms control and disarmament as the only basis for the continued moral legitimacy of deterrence.

b.A Post-Cold War Agenda For Nuclear Disarmament. While significant progress has been made in recent years, we believe additional steps are needed if nuclear policies and priorities are to keep up with the dramatic changes in world politics and if our nation is to move away from relying on nuclear deterrence as a basis for its security. Present challenges include the following:

The Role of Nuclear Weapons: We must continue to say No to the very idea of nuclear war. A minimal nuclear deterrent may be justified only to deter the use of nuclear weapons. The United States should commit itself never to use nuclear weapons first, should unequivocally reject proposals to use nuclear weapons to deter any nonnuclear threats, and should reinforce the fragile barrier against the use of these weapons. Indeed, we abhor any use of nuclear weapons.

Arms Control and Disarmament: Nuclear deterrence may be justified only as a step on the way toward progressive disarmament. The end of the Cold War, according to the Holy See, "challenge[s] the world community to adopt a post-nuclear form of security. That security lies in the abolition of nuclear weapons and the strengthening of international law." A first step toward this goal would be prompt ratification and implementation of the START I and START II treaties. Even once these treaties are fully implemented, there will still be more than 10,000 nuclear weapons in the world, containing explosive power hundreds of thousands times greater than the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Therefore, much deeper cuts are both possible and necessary. The eventual elimination of nuclear weapons is more than a moral ideal; it should be a policy goal.

The negotiation of a verifiable comprehensive test ban treaty would not only demonstrate our commitment to this goal, but also would improve our moral credibility in urging nonnuclear nations to forego the development of nuclear weapons. We, therefore, support a halt to nuclear testing as our nation pursues an effective global test ban and renewal of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Also, steps must be taken

to reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism. We must reverse the spread of nuclear technologies and materials. We welcome, therefore, U.S. efforts to achieve a global ban on the production of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons. Finally, one should not underestimate the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency as a forum for the discussion of these issues and as a force encouraging nations to take the steps necessary in this area.

Cooperative Security and a Just International Order:
The nuclear powers may justify, and then only temporarily, their nuclear deterrents only if they use their power and resources to lead in the construction of a more just and stable international order. An essential part of this international order must be a collective security framework that reverses the proliferation of nuclear weapons, guarantees the security of nonnuclear states and ultimately seeks to make nuclear weapons and war itself obsolete. The United States and other nations should also make the investments necessary to help ensure the development of stable, democratic governments in nations which have nuclear weapons or might seek to obtain them.

An active commitment by the United States to nuclear disarmament and the strengthening of collective security is the only moral basis for temporarily retaining our deterrent and our insistence that other nations forego these weapons. We advocate disarmament by example: careful but clear steps to reduce and end our dependence on weapons of mass destruction.

In our five-year report on *The Challenge of Peace*, we said: "To contain the nuclear danger of our time is itself an awesome undertaking. To reshape the political fabric of an increasingly interdependent world is an even larger and more complicated challenge." Now, on this tenth anniversary, we must be engaged in the difficult task of envisioning a future rooted in peace, with new institutions for resolving differences between nations, new global structures of mediation and conflict-resolution and a world order that has moved beyond nuclear weapons once and for all. We are committed to join in this struggle, to bring the Gospel message of justice and peace to this vital work.

Pax Christi International

[logo from www.paxchristi.net] *Pax Christi International* [www.paxchristi.net] is a non-profit, non-governmental Catholic peace movement that began in France at the end of World War II. Today, it is comprised of autonomous national sections, local groups, and affiliated organizations spread over 30 countries and 5 continents, with over 60,000 members worldwide. The movement works in all areas of peace but has a specific focus on demilitarization, security and arms trade, development and human rights, and ecology.

In 1998 Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, joined with the Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches in a statement entitled **Act Now for Nuclear Abolition** [linkage to the statement elsewhere on this page], presented to Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Conference. Among other things they stated: [Insert photo of Cardinal Danneels]

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment...When used as an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt.

In 2000 Pax Christi International published **New Challenges on Nuclear Disarmament Agenda: A Call and Statement on Nuclear Disarmament**. [Note: this can be accessed as a PDF document but I'm not sure how to reference the URL. HWH). Signed by xxx bishops from xx countries on x continents, the statement calls upon "all states to put urgent negotiation of a nuclear disarmament convention at the top of the international agenda."

Pax Christi USA

[logo from www.paxchristiusa.org] *Pax Christi USA* [www.paxchristiusa.org] is the national Catholic peace movement of 14,000 members who are committed to the gospel imperative of seeking peace through nonviolence. It is the United States section of Pax Christi International.

In 1998 on the 15th anniversary of **Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response (the 1983 report of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops)**, xx Catholic bishops affiliated with Pax Christi USA issued a statement on **The Morality of Nuclear Deterrence**. [URL to be obtained]. Speaking for themselves and not the entire National Conference of Catholic Bishops, the Pax Christi bishops indicated:

For the past fifteen years, and particularly in the context of the Cold War, we, the Catholic bishops of the United States, have reluctantly acknowledge the possibility that nuclear weapons could have some moral legitimacy, but only if the goal was nuclear disarmament. It is our present, prayerful judgment that this legitimacy is now lacking.

They concluded by saying:

Nuclear deterrence as a national policy must be condemned as morally abhorrent because it is the excuse and justification for the continued possession and further development of these horrendous weapons. We urge all to join in taking up the challenge to begin the effort to eliminate nuclear weapons now, rather than relying on them indefinitely.

Jewish

Union of American Hebrew Congregations

[logo] Founded in 1873, the **Union of American Hebrew Congregations** (<http://www.uahc.org>) is the central body of the Reform Jewish Movement in North America, encompassing 1.5 million Jews in 900 congregations across the United States and Canada. The UAHC has a long history of supporting arms control measures aimed at reducing nuclear dangers and eventually eliminating nuclear weapons entirely. Resolutions include:

Control of Nuclear Arms, 1981

<http://uahc.org/cgi-bin/resodisp.pl?file=arms&year=1981D>

Preventing Nuclear Holocaust, 1983

<http://uahc.org/cgi-bin/resodisp.pl?file=nuclear&year=1983>

To End the Manufacturing and Trade In Fissionable Material Suitable for the Production of Nuclear Arms, 1989

<http://uahc.org/cgi-bin/resodisp.pl?file=nucleararms2&year=1989>

Halting the Nuclear Arms Race, 1989

<http://uahc.org/cgi-bin/resodisp.pl?file=nucleararms1&year=1989>

[others to be added]

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <visner@umc-gbcs.org>
Subject: New web site
Date: Mon, 22 Apr 2002 12:18:16 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Dear Vince,

At your suggestion, I've retained Marie Kayser to design our new web site,
www.zero-nukes.org.

One of the pages will contain policy statements on nuclear disarmament by various religious denominations. Janet Horman suggests that I work with you to obtain material for the United Methodist Church.

This could include an introductory paragraph that mentions how many United Methodists and local churches there are in the U.S., something about the structure with the General Conference and Council of Bishops. Then I would like to have either with direct linkage to your site or for posting on ours the principal policy statements of the UMC on nuclear disarmament, such as the bishops' 1996 pastoral letter, "In Defense of Creation" (not the whole report), the General Conference resolution "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence", and the resolution "The United Methodist Church and Peace" through section I - Disarmament. There may be others you would want to include. We will have a linkage with the GBCS.

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

Shalom,
Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <mweiner@rac.org>
Subject: Web site material
Date: Mon, 22 Apr 2002 12:20:34 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Mike,

Thanks for providing information about statements of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations on nuclear disarmament. And thanks for the \$100 contribution.

I noticed that the Religious Action Center published a report called "Preventing the Nuclear Holocaust" in 1983. I had never heard of this report. If it is still available, I would like a copy.

Thanks,
Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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.

Status: U

Return-Path: <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Received: from web13902.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.28])

by farley.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 16ZFiI8fx3Nl3pa0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 22 Apr 2002 11:00:20 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020422150014.58912.qmail@web13902.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [205.188.200.157] by web13902.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Mon, 22 Apr 2002 08:00:14 PDT

Date: Mon, 22 Apr 2002 08:00:14 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: Banner design

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

In-Reply-To: <001d01c1e4a9\$9c2a2c20\$3461f7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-1687378900-1019487614=:58876"

--0-1687378900-1019487614=:58876

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Hi,

Did you get a chance to look at the site. I created the banner and the homepage.

<http://www.twotonedeyes.com/zero-nukes>

Thanks,

Marie

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

Although you have a more realistic missile in your second design of our banner, I like the first design much better. Among other factors the dark green of design two is too dark for my taste.

I prefer the way you present the site name and our name on the first version because it is more contained and doesn't sprawl across the page. "A Project of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament" in three lines is better than two. I'm undecided on the white space over half of "zero-nukes", but it does tie into the base of the distance mountains.

I prefer the sunflowers of the first version. I'm satisfied with that part of the banner

The problem with the first version is that it doesn't adequately convey that the truck is hauling a nuclear weapon away from a deployment site. Would you be able to using something like the missile of version two? Previously I have suggested a hole being filled by a bulldozer, but you haven't offered me that. (If you are looking for clip art, there are a couple of earthmovers on Microsoft Clip Gallery No. 3 under "industry"). Also, the ground under the truck needs redrawing so that it doesn't look like a river.

I would still like the tractor to be pulling a harrow (a series of disks) or a plow (with a row of blades).

Because the banner is our image I want to get it right. Thanks for your efforts so far.

Howard

Marie

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Games - play chess, backgammon, pool and more

--0-1687378900-1019487614=:58876

Content-Type: text/html; charset=us-ascii

<P> Hi,

<P>Did you get a chance to look at the site. I created the banner and the homepage.

<P>http://www.twotonedeyes.com/zero-nukes

<P>Thanks,

<P>Marie

<P> <I>"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org></I> wrote:

<BLOCKQUOTE style="PADDING-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; BORDER-LEFT: #1010ff 2px solid">Marie,

Although you have a more realistic missile in your second design of our
banner, I like the first design much better. Among other factors the dark
green of design two is too dark for my taste.

I prefer the way you present the site name and our name on the first version
because it is more contained and doesn't sprawl across the page. "A
Project of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament" in three lines
is better than two. I'm undecided on the white space over half of
"zero-nukes", but it does tie into the base of the distance mountains.

I prefer the sunflowers of the first version. I'm satisfied with that part
of the banner

The problem with the first version is that it doesn't adequately convey that
the truck is hauling a nuclear weapon away from a deployment site. Would
you be able to using something like the missile of version two? Previously
I have suggested a hole being filled by a bulldozer, but you haven't offered
me that. (If you are looking for clip art, there are a couple of
earthmovers on Microsoft Clip Gallery No. 3 under "industry"). Also, the
ground under the truck needs redrawing so that it doesn't look like a river.

I would still like the tractor to be pulling a harrow (a series of disks) or
a plow (with a row of blades).

Because the banner is our image I want to get it right. Thanks for your
efforts so far.

Howard

</BLOCKQUOTE>

Marie

<p>
<hr size=1>Do You Yahoo!?!

Yahoo! Games - play chess, backgammon, pool and more

--0-1687378900-1019487614=:58876--

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Subject: Home page
Date: Mon, 22 Apr 2002 15:34:45 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----=_NextPart_000_0017_01C1EA13.3B2D7E80"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_0017_01C1EA13.3B2D7E80
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Marie,

First, Thursday, April 25 at 2:00 p.m. at your house will be fine. I'll be there then.

I hadn't gone to your site today before I wrote you. I was commenting on the version of the banner that came in on Friday.

Apart from the banner I like your design of the home page. The theme "All nuclear weapons on Earth should be eliminated" is stated boldly at top, center. That's excellent. The picture of the globe works well. "How can this be accomplished?" immediately indicates what the web site is all about.

The quotes down the side also work well. However, you have an "h" in "better" in the Powell quote. The Cathedral statement is available through a web linkage, so you may want to mark it accordingly. I can supply you an URL.

In the box under "How to Achieve Zero Nuclear Weapons" on the second line I would eliminating the dash and have a capital "P" for "Presenting...."

I sent the latest list of sponsors in the attachment, zero-nukes home page.03.doc. Please make corrections from it. There is an "s" on Methodists United....

On the navigation guides I would swap places of "Religious Statements" and "Civil Sector Statements".=20

As I wrote this morning, I want a "What's New" page. You can decide where to put the indicator. Also, I have added "The story of our masthead" as a reference on the first page of the home page with the story on the next sub-page.

I have some concerns about the colors. Even not taking into consider the banner, which will change to the sunflower scene, I feel that there are too many colors that don't particularly blend. For my eyes it is difficult to read the sponsors' names on the blue background. Could there be a lighter blue or blue gray or even an earth color, but not too dark? Would that be the same as the background for "zero-nukes...." on the left end of the banner? Could the yellow from the sunflowers be used elsewhere? You have discretion. I can only react.

For your revision with a wider field of sunflowers, perhaps they could extend farther up. We will need the field deep enough so that the "no nukes" sign can be large enough to be seen adequately. I will fax you the drawing in the morning. It is a caricature, which is what I want, though not an exact copy of the cartoon.

I guess the distant mountains are all right. Maybe the tan could extend to foothills instead of the dark green. But I'm not certain.

This is a wider banner than before. It seems to fit the home page all right, so that's no problem. Would the same banner be used at the top of other pages? Again size wouldn't necessarily be a problem because several of these pages will start with a table of contents. Will the banner also pop up whenever a user goes to a particular statement?

I have covered a lot. We're making progress. I'll see you on Thursday and may send you more material before then.

Shalom,

Howard

-----_NextPart_000_0017_01C1EA13.3B2D7E80

Content-Type: text/html;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN">

<HTML>

<HEAD>

<META content="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1"

http-equiv="Content-Type">

<META content="MSHTML 4.72.3110.7" name="GENERATOR">

</HEAD>

<BODY bgColor="#ffffff">

<DIV>

<P>Marie,</P>

<P>First, Thursday, April 25 at 2:00 p.m. at your house will be fine.

I'll be

there then.</P>

<P>I hadn't gone to your site today before I wrote you. I was commenting

on the

version of the banner that came in on Friday.</P>

<P>Apart from the banner I like your design of the home page. The theme =

--=20

"All nuclear weapons on Earth should be eliminated"; -- is =

stated=20

boldly at top, center. That's excellent. The picture of the globe works =

well.=20

"How can this be accomplished?"; immediately indicates what the =

web=20

site is all about.</P>

<P>The quotes down the side also work well. However, you have an =

"h";=20

in "better"; in the Powell quote. The Cathedral statement is =

available=20

through a web linkage, so you may want to mark it accordingly. I can =

supply you=20

an URL.</P>

<P>In the box under "How to Achieve Zero Nuclear Weapons"; on =

the=20

second line I would eliminating the dash and have a capital =

"P"; for=20

"Presenting....";</P>

<P>I sent the latest list of sponsors in the attachment, zero-nukes home =

page.03.doc. Please make corrections from it. There is an "s"; =

on=20

Methodists United.....</P>

<P>On the navigation guides I would swap places of "Religious=20

Statements"; and "Civil Sector Statements";.</P>

<P>As I wrote this morning, I want a "What's New"; page. You =

can decide=20

where to put the indicator. Also, I have added "The story of our=20

masthead"; as a reference on the first page of the home page with =

the story=20

on the next sub-page.</P>

<P>I have some concerns about the colors. Even not taking into consider =

the=20

banner, which will change to the sunflower scene, I feel that there are =

too many=20

colors that don't particularly blend. For my eyes it is difficult to =

read the=20

sponsors' names on the blue background. Could there be a lighter blue or =

blue=20

gray or even an earth color, but not too dark? Would that be the same as =

the=20

background for "zero-nukes...."; on the left end of the banner? =

Could=20

the yellow from the sunflowers be used elsewhere? You have discretion. I =

can=20

only react. </P>

<P>For your revision with a wider field of sunflowers, perhaps they =

could extend=20

farther up. We will need the field deep enough so that the "no =

nukes";=20

sign can be large enough to be seen adequately. I will fax you the drawing in the morning. It is a caricature, which is what I want, though not an exact copy of the cartoon.

I guess the distant mountains are all right. Maybe the tan could extend to foothills instead of the dark green. But I'm not certain.

This is a wider banner than before. It seems to fit the home page all right so that's no problem. Would the same banner be used at the top of other pages? Again size wouldn't necessarily be a problem because several of these pages will start with a table of contents. Will the banner also pop up whenever a user goes to a particular statement?

I have covered a lot. We're making progress. I'll see you on Thursday and send you more material before then.

Shalom,

Howard

-----_NextPart_000_0017_01C1EA13.3B2D7E80--

Status: U

Return-Path: <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Received: from web13907.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.70])

by niles.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 16ZGLQ2g43Nl3pm0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 22 Apr 2002 12:34:30 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020422163430.65134.qmail@web13907.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [64.12.102.169] by web13907.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Mon, 22 Apr 2002 09:34:30 PDT

Date: Mon, 22 Apr 2002 09:34:30 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: Banner design

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

In-Reply-To: <002201c1ea10\$ebac52c0\$0560f7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-2098386626-1019493270=:62340"

--0-2098386626-1019493270=:62340

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Hi Howard,

Your suggestion for the banner sounds a lot easier and less busy. Please fax me a picture of a fat bomb. Fax it to (202) 833-9177, attn: Marie Kayser. Please send the fax tomorrow morning between 8am to 1pm.

The revised version of the homepage (the URL that I just gave you) doesn't show a picture of Gen. Powell. I will make the changes to the quotes. I am available to meet with you on Thursday at 2pm, if that is convenient for you.

Do you have comments about the layout of the homepage? I have the sponsors on the left side, the quotes on the right side and the main text in the middle.

Thanks,
Marie

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

Thanks for your latest draft of a masthead. I appreciate your efforts. Unfortunately it isn't working out quite right. I guess that I'm unable to convey to you what I have in mind, so your illustration doesn't tell the story I want to tell. We need to simplify. I believe that I now know better what can work.

First, I want the title to be on the left one-third of the masthead, as it was on an earlier draft and as is shown on the attachment (zero-nukes home page). The text works best with four lines as shown. That keeps "Interfaith Committee" and "for Nuclear Disarmament" each together on separate lines.

Second, the rest of the masthead should display a field of sunflowers in a prairie setting, that is, fairly flat or somewhat rolling. This can extend your previous version of sunflowers across the masthead and deeper. The horizon might be a blue sky rather than mountains. In the field is posted a sign that conveys "nuclear weapons prohibited". This can be done with the conventional prohibited symbol: a circle border with a diagonal slash across it. Inside the circle is a fat bomb with tail fins (not a sleek missile like the real ones). On the bomb is the nuclear symbol: a dot surrounded by crisscrossing circles. I have a cartoon drawing of such a "bomb". If you have a fax, I can send it to you, or I'll give it to you when I see you next.

Third, the page names for navigation can be placed horizontally under the drawing.

As noted above, I am attaching text for the home page, which retains the quotes but revises the mission statement for easier reading. The sponsors would be at the left as before. The story of our masthead can be on a separate sub-page. I don't want to use a picture of General Powell or General Horner. I have a photo of five signers of the Cathedral

statement to give you, but it might more properly go on the page with the statement itself.

An outline of the web pages is attached. You can pick up the names for the masthead. "What's New" could be either in the row or at a separate spot on the home page. A draft of "What's New" is attached, at this point merely saying that the entire site is new. Additions can come later.

Text for the page on "Religious Statements" is well along. It will be lengthy. Twenty pages are attached. They have some gaps, but it is far enough along for you to start setting it up. There are some logos and other items to import. I am seeking some photos. There are a couple of documents to scan if you have the capacity. I'll bring them to you.

This leads me to suggest that we get together again. I could come by this week on Tuesday or Wednesday afternoon at 2:00 p.m. or later if you would be available.

I'll give you a call.

Howard

> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword name=zero-nukes home page.03.doc > ATTACHMENT part 3 application/msword name=web outline.04.doc > ATTACHMENT part 4 application/msword name=What's New.doc > ATTACHMENT part 5 application/msword name=RELIGIOUS STATEMENTS.text.doc

Marie

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Games - play chess, backgammon, pool and more

--0-2098386626-1019493270=:62340

Content-Type: text/html; charset=us-ascii

<P> Hi Howard,

<P>Your suggestion for the banner sounds a lot easier and less busy. Please fax me a picture of a fat bomb. Fax it to (202) 833-9177, attn: Marie Kayser. Please send the fax tomorrow morning between 8am to 1pm.

<P>The revised version of the homepage (the URL that I just gave you) doesn't show a picture of Gen. Powell. I will make the changes to the quotes. I am available to meet with you on Thursday at 2pm, if that is convenient for you.

<P>Do you have comments about the layout of the homepage? I have the sponsors on the left side, the quotes on the right side and the main text in the middle.

<P>Thanks,
Marie

<P>

<P> <I>"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org></I> wrote:

<BLOCKQUOTE style="PADDING-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; BORDER-LEFT: #1010ff 2px solid">

<META content="MSHTML 4.72.3110.7" name=GENERATOR>

<DIV>

<P>Marie,</P>

<P>Thanks for your latest draft of a masthead. I appreciate your efforts. Unfortunately it isn't working out quite right. I guess that I'm unable to convey to you what I have in mind, so your illustration doesn't tell the story I want to tell. We need to simplify. I believe that I now know better what can work.</P>

<P>First, I want the title to be on the left one-third of the masthead, as it was on an earlier draft and as is shown on the attachment (zero-nukes home page). The text works best with four lines as shown. That keeps "Interfaith Committee" and "for Nuclear Disarmament" each together on separate lines.</P>

<P>Second, the rest of the masthead should display a field of sunflowers in a prairie setting, that is, fairly flat or

somewhat rolling. This can extend your previous version of sunflowers across the masthead and deeper. The horizon might be a blue sky rather than mountains. In the field is posted a sign that conveys "nuclear weapons prohibited". This can be done with the conventional prohibited symbol: a circle border with a diagonal slash across it. Inside the circle is a fat bomb with tail fins (not a sleek missile like the real ones). On the bomb is the nuclear symbol: a dot surrounded by crisscrossing circles. I have a cartoon drawing of such a "bomb". If you have a fax, I can send it to you, or I'll give it to you when I see you next.</P>

<P>Third, the page names for navigation can be placed horizontally under the drawing.</P>

<P>As noted above, I am attaching text for the home page, which retains the quotes but revises the mission statement for easier reading. The sponsors would be at the left as before. The story of our masthead can be on a separate sub-page. I don't want to use a picture of General Powell or General Horner. I have a photo of five signers of the Cathedral statement to give you, but it might more properly go on the page with the statement itself.</P>

<P>An outline of the web pages is attached. You can pick up the names for the masthead. "What's New" could be either in the row or at a separate spot on the home page. A draft of "What's New" is attached, at this point merely saying that the entire site is new. Additions can come later. </P>

<P>Text for the page on "Religious Statements" is well along. It will be lengthy. Twenty pages are attached. They have some gaps, but it is far enough along for you to start setting it up. There are some logos and other items to import. I am seeking some photos. There are a couple of documents to scan if you have the capacity. I'll bring them to you.</P>

<P>This leads me to suggest that we get together again. I could come by this week on Tuesday or Wednesday afternoon at 2:00 p.m. or later if you would be available.</P>

<P>I'll give you a call.</P>

<P>Howard</P></DIV>

<BLOCKQUOTE style="PADDING-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid">

<DIV> </DIV></BLOCKQUOTE>> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword name=zero-nukes home page.03.doc > ATTACHMENT part 3 application/msword name=web outline.04.doc > ATTACHMENT part 4 application/msword name=What's New.doc > ATTACHMENT part 5 application/msword name=RELIGIOUS STATEMENTS.text.doc </BLOCKQUOTE>

Marie

<p>
<hr size=1>Do You Yahoo!?!

Yahoo! Games - play chess, backgammon, pool and more --0-2098386626-1019493270=:62340--

Status: U

Return-Path: <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Received: from web13905.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.68])

by farley.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 16ZJVi4FE3N13pa0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 22 Apr 2002 15:56:28 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020422195627.93163.qmail@web13905.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [64.157.56.113] by web13905.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Mon, 22 Apr 2002 12:56:27 PDT

Date: Mon, 22 Apr 2002 12:56:27 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: Home page

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

In-Reply-To: <001a01c1ea34\$d931c0c0\$9361f7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-1087952598-1019505387=:92596"

--0-1087952598-1019505387=:92596

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Hi,

Thanks for the speedy reply. The banner is definitely too wide. This will change once I revise the banner which would only show a field of sunflowers and the sign (no truck with the weapon). This will narrow down the overall size of the banner which will show more of the main text on the homepage. And yes, all the web pages will show the banner on top.

I will change the navigation buttons per your suggestions below and add something where users can click to read the story behind the masthead design.

I will make the spelling corrections.

In terms of the color, let's agree on a color theme. I like the idea of earth tones. Here are my suggestions: brown, orange, goldish-yellow, black, white. I can change the blue background in the left column to brown and make the text white, instead of black. I will play around with the colors and see how they look on the homepage.

See you thursday.

Marie

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

Marie,

First, Thursday, April 25 at 2:00 p.m. at your house will be fine. I'll be there then.

I hadn't gone to your site today before I wrote you. I was commenting on the version of the banner that came in on Friday.

Apart from the banner I like your design of the home page. The theme -- "All nuclear weapons on Earth should be eliminated" -- is stated boldly at top, center. That's excellent. The picture of the globe works well. "How can this be accomplished?" immediately indicates what the web site is all about.

The quotes down the side also work well. However, you have an "h" in "better" in the Powell quote. The Cathedral statement is available through a web linkage, so you may want to mark it accordingly. I can supply you an URL.

In the box under "How to Achieve Zero Nuclear Weapons" on the second line I would eliminating the dash and have a capital "P" for "Presenting...."

I sent the latest list of sponsors in the attachment, zero-nukes home page.03.doc. Please make corrections from it. There is an "s" on Methodists United.....

On the navigation guides I would swap places of "Religious Statements" and "Civil Sector Statements".

As I wrote this morning, I want a "What's New" page. You can decide where to put the indicator. Also, I have added "The story of our masthead" as a reference on the first page of the home page with the story on the next sub-page.

I have some concerns about the colors. Even not taking into consider the banner, which will change to the sunflower scene, I feel that there are too many colors that don't particularly blend. For my eyes it is difficult to read the sponsors' names on the blue background. Could there be a lighter blue or blue gray or even an earth color, but not too dark? Would that be the same as the background for "zero-nukes...." on the left end of the banner? Could the yellow from the sunflowers be used elsewhere? You have discretion. I can only react.

For your revision with a wider field of sunflowers, perhaps they could extend farther up. We will need the field deep enough so that the "no nukes" sign can be large enough to be seen adequately. I will fax you the drawing in the morning. It is a caricature, which is what I want, though not an exact copy of the cartoon.

I guess the distant mountains are all right. Maybe the tan could extend to foothills instead of the dark green. But I'm not certain.

This is a wider banner than before. It seems to fit the home page all right, so that's no problem. Would the same banner be used at the top of other pages? Again size wouldn't necessarily be a problem because several of these pages will start with a table of contents. Will the banner also pop up whenever a user goes to a particular statement?

I have covered a lot. We're making progress. I'll see you on Thursday and may send you more material before then.

Shalom,

Howard

Marie

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Games - play chess, backgammon, pool and more

--0-1087952598-1019505387=:92596

Content-Type: text/html; charset=us-ascii

<P> Hi,

<P>Thanks for the speedy reply. The banner is definitely too wide. This will change once I revise the banner which would only show a field of sunflowers and the sign (no truck with the weapon). This will narrow down the overall size of the banner which will show more of the main text on the homepage. And yes, all the web pages will show the banner on top.

<P>I will change the navigation buttons per your suggestions below and add something where users can click to read the story behind the masthead design.

<P>I will make the spelling corrections.

<P>In terms of the color, let's agree on a color theme. I like the idea of earth tones. Here are my suggestions: brown, orange, goldish-yellow, black, white. I can change the blue background in the left column to brown and make the text white, instead of black. I will play around with the colors and see how they look on the homepage.

<P>See you thursday.

<P>Marie

<P> <I>"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org></I> wrote:
<BLOCKQUOTE style="PADDING-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; BORDER-LEFT: #1010ff 2px solid">
<META content="MSHTML 4.72.3110.7" name=GENERATOR>
<DIV>
<P>Marie,</P>
<P>First, Thursday, April 25 at 2:00 p.m. at your house will be fine. I'll be there then.</P>
<P>I hadn't gone to your site today before I wrote you. I was commenting on the version of the banner that came in on Friday.</P>
<P>Apart from the banner I like your design of the home page. The theme -- "All nuclear weapons on Earth should be eliminated" -- is stated boldly at top, center. That's excellent. The picture of the globe works well. "How can this be accomplished?" immediately indicates what the web site is all about.</P>
<P>The quotes down the side also work well. However, you have an "h" in "better" in the Powell quote. The Cathedral statement is available through a web linkage, so you may want to mark it accordingly. I can supply you an URL.</P>
<P>In the box under "How to Achieve Zero Nuclear Weapons" on the second line I would eliminating the dash and have a capital "P" for "Presenting...."</P>
<P>I sent the latest list of sponsors in the attachment, zero-nukes home page.03.doc. Please make corrections from it. There is an "s" on Methodists United.....</P>
<P>On the navigation guides I would swap places of "Religious Statements" and "Civil Sector Statements". </P>
<P>As I wrote this morning, I want a "What's New" page. You can decide where to put the indicator. Also, I have added "The story of our masthead" as a reference on the first page of the home page with the story on the next sub-page.</P>
<P>I have some concerns about the colors. Even not taking into consider the banner, which will change to the sunflower scene, I feel that there are too many colors that don't particularly blend. For my eyes it is difficult to read the sponsors' names on the blue background. Could there be a lighter blue or blue gray or even an earth color, but not too dark? Would that be the same as the background for "zero-nukes...." on the left end of the banner? Could the yellow from the sunflowers be used elsewhere? You have discretion. I can only react. </P>
<P>For your revision with a wider field of sunflowers, perhaps they could extend farther up. We will need the field deep enough so that the "no nukes" sign can be large enough to be seen adequately. I will fax you the drawing in the morning. It is a caricature, which is what I want, though not an exact copy of the cartoon.</P>
<P>I guess the distant mountains are all right. Maybe the tan could extend to foothills instead of the dark green. But I'm not certain. </P>
<P>This is a wider banner than before. It seems to fit the home page all right, so that's no problem. Would the same banner be used at the top of other pages? Again size wouldn't necessarily be a problem because several of these pages will start with a table of contents. Will the banner also pop up whenever a user goes to a particular statement?</P>
<P>I have covered a lot. We're making progress. I'll see you on Thursday and may send you more material before then.</P>
<P>Shalom,</P>
<P>Howard</P></DIV></BLOCKQUOTE>

Marie

<p>
<hr size=1>Do You Yahoo!?!

Yahoo! Games - play chess, backgammon, pool and more
--0-1087952598-1019505387=:92596--

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Home page
Date: Mon, 22 Apr 2002 18:03:36 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0010_01C1EA28.0611B620"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_0010_01C1EA28.0611B620
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Marie,

Regarding your suggested colors, they are worth looking at. The brown = should be on the tan side. I presume that goldish-yellow would be like = the present sunflowers, which are the right color. Would orange be = used on the circle and slash of the "no-nukes" sign? It is often red on = such signs, but orange would be all right. You will have green in the = sunflower field, as you do now, so that adds another color.

I'll fax the bomb drawing in the morning.

I look forward to seeing the next version.

Howard

-----_NextPart_000_0010_01C1EA28.0611B620
Content-Type: text/html;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN">  
<HTML>  
<HEAD>
```

```
<META content=3Dtext/html;charset=3Diso-8859-1 =  
http-equiv=3DContent-Type>  
<META content=3D"MSHTML 4.72.3110.7" name=3DGENERATOR>  
</HEAD>  
<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>  
<DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2>Marie,</FONT></DIV>  
<DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>  
<DIV><FONT size=3D2>Regarding your suggested colors, they are worth =  
looking=20
```

at. The brown should be on the tan side. I presume that =
goldish-yellow=20
would be like the present sunflowers, which are the right =
color. =20
Would orange be used on the circle and slash of the "no-nukes" =

sign? It is often red on such signs, but orange would be all =
right. =20

You will have green in the sunflower field, as you do now, so that adds =
another=20

color.</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>I'll fax the bomb drawing in the=20
morning.</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>I look forward to seeing the next =
version.</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>Howard</DIV>

<BLOCKQUOTE=20

style=3D"BORDER-LEFT: #000000 solid 2px; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; PADDING-LEFT: =
5px">

<DIV> </DIV></BLOCKQUOTE></BODY></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_000_0010_01C1EA28.0611B620--

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Vince Isner" <VIsner@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
Subject: Re: New web site
Date: Tue, 23 Apr 2002 13:58:35 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Vince,

Thanks for your reply. And thanks for the linkage to your disarmament page. I find a couple of my items there: my article for Christian Social Action and the 2000 letter to presidential candidates.

When you and your staff get to it, it would be very useful to have the Pastoral Letter from "In Defense of Creation" (1986) and the two resolutions from the 2000 General Conference: "Saying No to Deterrence" and "The Methodist Church and Peace", at least the disarmament section.

I'm trying to activate the web site by May 10. We want as much available by then but will add other material as it is ready.

Shalom,
Howard

Status: U

Return-Path: <VIsner@UMC-GBCS.ORG>

Received: from church2.UMC-GBCS.ORG ([66.95.90.3])

by osgood.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 16ZZIYFn3Nl3pt0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 23 Apr 2002 08:48:47 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by church2.umc-gbcs.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <JPH52827>; Tue, 23 Apr 2002 08:48:26 -0400

Message-ID: <619BD1E95646D311B69D0008C79FE32D8438CA@church2.umc-gbcs.org>

From: Vince Isner <VIsner@UMC-GBCS.ORG>

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

Cc: Gretchen Hakola <GHakola@UMC-GBCS.ORG>, Bernadette Abeywickrama
<BAbeywickrama@UMC-GBCS.ORG>

Subject: RE: New web site

Date: Tue, 23 Apr 2002 08:48:25 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Hi Howard:

I'm delighted you'll be working with Marie. She's very good. I'm also happy to provide the information you need. It will take a little writing, but in the meantime, check out this page for articles and statements from GBCS on the issue of disarmament. Some are dated, as is our site (we're also getting ready to redesign our entire site!) - hope this helps:

<http://www.umc-gbcs.org/disarm.htm>

And yes, let's talk soon. I'll put a more comprehensive statement on my "to-do" list.

Thanks,

Vince

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

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

Sent: Monday, April 22, 2002 12:18 PM

To: Vince Isner

Subject: New web site

Dear Vince,

At your suggestion, I've retained Marie Kayser to design our new web site, www.zero-nukes.org.

One of the pages will contain policy statements on nuclear disarmament by various religious denominations. Janet Horman suggests that I work with you to obtain material for the United Methodist Church.

This could include an introductory paragraph that mentions how many United

Methodists and local churches there are in the U.S., something about the structure with the General Conference and Council of Bishops. Then I would like to have either with direct linkage to your site or for posting on ours the principal policy statements of the UMC on nuclear disarmament, such as the bishops' 1996 pastoral letter, "In Defense of Creation" (not the whole report), the General Conference resolution "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence", and the resolution "The United Methodist Church and Peace" through section I - Disarmament. There may be others you would want to include. We will have a linkage with the GBCS.

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

Shalom,
Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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.

Status: U

Return-Path: <millerph@att.net>

Received: from mtiwmhc23.worldnet.att.net ([204.127.131.48])

by pickering.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 16ZY325AC3Nl3p20
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 23 Apr 2002 07:01:24 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from webmail.worldnet.att.net ([204.127.135.75])

by mtiwmhc23.worldnet.att.net

(InterMail vM.4.01.03.27 201-229-121-127-20010626) with SMTP

id <20020423110125.DIOT28245.mtiwmhc23.worldnet.att.net@webmail.worldnet.att.net>

for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 23 Apr 2002 11:01:25 +0000

Received: from [12.78.119.45] by webmail.worldnet.att.net;

Tue, 23 Apr 2002 11:01:24 +0000

From: millerph@att.net

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

Subject: Re: New board members nominated

Date: Tue, 23 Apr 2002 11:01:24 +0000

X-Mailer: AT&T Message Center Version 1 (Mar 27 2002)

Message-Id: <20020423110125.DIOT28245.mtiwmhc23.worldnet.att.net@webmail.worldnet.att.net>

Good Work Howard! I approve.

I was delayed on my trip and just got back yesterday.

I'll deposit the contribution you sent today.

Phil

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <millerph@att.net>
Subject: Re: Fw: "EarthLink Invoice #67795971, Please Read"
Date: Tue, 23 Apr 2002 16:51:34 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Phil,

You're right. I didn't realized that you had anticipated this bill. I probably sent it in with the old invoice, but it will be credited to our account.

You'r a good treasurer to be so observant.

Howard

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

From: millerph@att.net <millerph@att.net>
To: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2002 3:17 PM
Subject: Re: Fw: "EarthLink Invoice #67795971, Please Read"

>Is this not the EarthLink invoice for which I sent you a
>check in advance? Before I left for New Orleans?

Status: U
Return-Path: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
Received: from pintail.mail.pas.earthlink.net ([207.217.120.122])
by hazard.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 1700JO27K3NkYBY0
Tue, 23 Apr 2002 09:53:43 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from user-2iveo2u.dialup.mindspring.com ([165.247.96.94] helo=esther)
by pintail.mail.pas.earthlink.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #2)
id 1700jC-00062J-00; Tue, 23 Apr 2002 06:53:06 -0700
Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
Subject: ICON FOR YOUR WEB SITE
Date: Tue, 23 Apr 2002 09:57:50 -0400
Message-ID: <NEBBKJHCMLACLOPKCPPBMEPGCHAA.prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0000_01C1EAAD.54B563A0"
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 V5.00.2919.6600

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_0000_01C1EAAD.54B563A0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Dear Friends of the Brink Campaign,

Even though the crises in the Middle East and daily messages about the war on terrorism have taken over the airwaves and may very well be the current focus of the administration, preparations for the U.S. and Russian May Moscow Summit regarding the Nuclear Posture Review go on apace.

Those who oppose having any nuclear weapon on full-alert, ready to be launched for any reason can be part of that preparation. The Brink Campaign is calling on everyone to send fax messages to President Bush and President Putin reminding them that "Friends Don't Threaten Friends and urging them to reach binding agreement on the irreversible elimination of nuclear weapons.

We are making it easy for your organization. Here is an attached picture and direct link with our Action Center at <http://backfromthebrink.policy.net/> that can be used by your web master to create an icon for your web site. This link allows your members to send a fax directly to President Bush. Our friends in NGO's in Russia are also organizing to send messages to President Putin.

If you need further information, please call me at 202-545-1001.

Let us know if you put this link on your web site. Thanks in advance.

Esther

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

CHECK OUT OUR NEW WEBSITE AT www.backfromthebrink.org AND TAKE ACTION TODAY!

-----_NextPart_000_0000_01C1EAAD.54B563A0

Content-Type: image/gif;
name="claspinghands.gif"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64
Content-Disposition: attachment;
filename="claspinghands.gif"

R0lGODlhgACAAPcAAAAAAAAAAACAAICAgAAAgICAgQEBAICBAIEBAQEBAQGBgACBgICBgYEBgYGCEI
CCEYGCKICCKIECKYECKYGCkpKTEYEDEpITExKTEMTkICDKYEDkpITkxKUIxKUIxMUI5MUJC
OUoQEEoQEEohIUoxIUo5MUo5OUpCMUpCOVIQEFIQEFihGFIXIVI5KVI5MVJCMVJCOVohGFoxKVpC
OVpKOVpKQlpaY2MQGGMhGGMxIWM5KWNCKWNCWNCOWNKOWNSOWNSQmNSSmNaUmsYGGshG
GspGGs5
KWtKMWtSQmtaQmtjSmtjUnMYGHMhGHMpGHMxIXMxKXM5MXNCKXNCMXNKMxNSMXNaQnNaQnNaU
nNj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SmtjUnMYGHMhGHMpGHMxIXMxKXM5MXNCKXNCMXNKMxNSMXNaQnNaQnNaUnNjUnNjWnspGHspIX
s5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l

e9ata9atc9ate9ate96te96tjN61e961jP///wj+AP8JHEiwoMGDCBMqXMiwocOHECNKnEixosWL
GDNq3Mixo8ePIEOKHEmypMmTKFOqXMmypcuXMGPKNEmzps2bOHPq3Mmzp8+fQIMKHUq0qNGjSHkC
CMA0AICnUKEOGBBggIEFCxxIsGBhA4cSLVzACIikCRYsZMqYefOmTh0/f/4kSjSJEiVReCIN2ssX
r19RpAKTqnWr8LLDiBFju3btMDZsiSNLRly48i1RIOYmokTK7qJfG04wNWCawICoAKYGIJ1VwoSu
HL66EPvjR5IrV8iYafMGjls/cAFp3mu3uF6+fO1ivgs4sOXJiZkxg06dsuXLmeca/xwIkFXSBqr+
TmWd1cFrr19LiIXxA4jZK2rdtK1zB65czcONG0eOXH/zUpVVJ+CA193SmWb6fQbIaleBV94EFHCF
XgnqwcCee1jAZ8Zavt1xR1yACifffZ3XpdxX/e9FIHXOkBDjgi5MVeOBci3DGIGeLXOXAJju+ZkFs
HnhA4Qsw1PBDEEkogVt8vrlVH4giavbZLiXq119xV9oLIGCGQQcZjDfEV4ook9DIWSU4PhAhV1xx
IKQJRBZpZBBK3KaFFhu6Acee9HkYXJSJLBIolSbaRdxfmCVX3H+F4ULdY2BKlksu15FSpnaBofnZ
BbF1KiQMNNQwJ5JJHEnnhvuyaeHT4YI6JT+hBa6F6J4hUKccVsWlotkj0EaqWSVZrdZpp4JSeGx
7AVBZ6ml3qnWhmbIx2efHv7hqpRTVmnrlRWG4pe3+gnWoq7R9Wrul78uY9mMwwpGyRAXxGuhhTUw
e+q90EbL1rSs/hklrNruxy2tf+EAeGJe3lHvuY9KleWulhZfZJmeBURKDAMqKGmoNSC5xL77Q6qkq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Q
AxKwfVS2iD6JRXqVAASgluO1WkJXezjnjoVAclgjZqFgvaoWV2nD+ZwDiV5l36YhNRwCnmgCTK1
Cn1Wl+LwldQQlhKgAD9HUdvnYQbgAVABICCGerQXZTdHe060AJCwlSuJj/oAdueQWfXwVZrVIMWH
D++QgsAgCIWpCpzgCBYXD18FDZygAREAmehUgxRpAB8QBHAwFyukR+hleufYc5t5TFFkAIPAcu5

l/QQISYXIZullF/+Vw/v4A3UAA2pMAhyMAj9V3arYFbegAzCkAYR0Jt5BUp0xYPIRQAYEASBMC6k
ICjHmZnN2Z88x5kEYABqIjPQGH+faJRSV0pOZXI3mp0AiNkAeCoAlZqAp6AIOqkApyMAIaoAGv
1ZFkuE4GcAFBcAeUcBgQUzGJwICLI5Bd3rK+Z+xJaDj4IFNyY9dB3n1YF3VWV13J96B5MAiEQAj8
V6GE0AUioAl4IAIcCgHLtGimhAAdoAV4QDGIADMPeiA716IYNnuq55kSuFoLIAfmQIqjGJBO2HUh
qFnIt5UKGZtpkAeE4AjNlWqqcKeEiAdG4KEQoAEOkIaghBoEQKL+gNA9y4ALQwQY3J0lmbGlv6Z9
8Ph3F4iRB+QAE+CJe9mHgemHS+h17/BV1ZiQ47CeTyCkc9p8/acKhLAHaeAEf1perAcVUmoGtnAu
6iIui2ogFTMJv0mpLup3VAZ7zlkAAuAAgwCQT6im9leN7DdZXkUO5vCp8+BVxeAEMrCqXoCqL6kK
mjAleaAHKuBhToEAH8AEd+BLvdIwusoZDzMpuoomvLpzdeie7d6AAqjBAQBeVCjZsqPYFedUsmB
XUWH5DCqciAcAXckasAJmtB8zTciQHquP4kAFeABNmAGJ9o56koKNyIKpTApOUUsIKBoErh651NU
fNdZnkdAEbD+BzW6hPIXs6W5rJQlh6I6Dt4JDHmwAjkwB3lQBdKgBg37sIVQCBrsSQ+QAmhQCZek
sQ2TCxWjJTUF4KBjiOLlgrYgyjLQuMHppvYcxAgB9SgkvcofE4plcflVT7qDfq3CU6wAiqQBnog
B10wAlBgdntqCF1wGgTwACAwbIBACIOLCztlNeciHYg7HcsAtVbLGYRLtYFxi5RQSuB1suv0iEI4
UQEAAUWgCeOgWXoZf9CID+gAdl0Vla64f3tABDipGnAqkiqAX5wCIZwCGtgAjFgBomgqJOSC4+7
U5eUuLibGL7bGcUhuCFLCpqyCBHljwLkaYnjAAgASrACX7+Kbp6mQ9e96xdVZ3JIAyCwAVOIAo
4ARcwKp0qwIjAAfiohfuGxi/2yjAixgNo7jEq7y4klMGgl+U8BISRjITqUU815xO5gAy0AnpoA/P
dbbo4FXHFYfjQI3OQAhp0AVQoAIqUAQVzAVpgMEsoAiEWzHY1CK+q7+NMikCUryVEDf4qbyMMCU6
J65H15ylpwAasAfJgA7pAIJA5sCYNw1XCMRmFZtOoAK8OQJGkAZc0AVOkANGcAQtlhgVzMLlq6vO
Mb8o2rtabCD9+xn8ZMURPCW+mIMpu4OLFgI7ogFywAqXVbDeaW5O5wzQcHHQoHINicEyIANGIAMk
8AVqoAb+X/AFFCPftdTCuAq8WpzIVDvFn5E51TDFITJbZHw+HRIF35dvQhUEZkACI5AHqHAJmAAm
Ived0AAMpnzKKhehRYDERdAFaWAEM1AHbeAGiZA9Uzwog6w/iJzIxdSzsCIu+KUGIUIJK/VaRcolM
SHXJAsAEcZAFKpAJzbALzCAN0QAMqYcQmrAJ2twIm9AictAEI5ADTyC+TXwEl8ZYjsyxCoLLHHTF
hKvIVNvF0wPML+wqgRDDK2TMfOd9w1oACTBKWhAHV4ADmNAMqMAN8gAO0UCYXWA13ZwHaVAEReA
E

OiADOeDKTmAETHAFbXAHm8FP+BXSwwZwIVaUIVYtfgoH+U4hMuFyMRiaFX/UMCHhgTe2oz5RLr283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 dz9SZv8lrP9WnO6bp1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-----_NextPart_000_0000_01C1EAAD.54B563A0--

Status: U

Return-Path: <act@armscontrol.org>

Received: from otp.elinkisp.com ([66.7.15.149])

by kendall.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17054E63N3N13pM0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 23 Apr 2002 14:31:31 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from 8wr3001 ([66.7.2.230])

by otp.elinkisp.com (8.10.0/8.10.0) with SMTP id g3NIV6n31733
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 23 Apr 2002 14:31:06 -0400

From: "Rebecca Whitehair" <act@armscontrol.org>

To: <mupj@igc.org>

Subject: Perry, Shmarov, and Grachev photo

Date: Tue, 23 Apr 2002 14:33:21 -0700

Message-ID: <NEBBKBFHDLHOKGFLFNIJGEIMCDAA.act@armscontrol.org>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

Importance: Normal

Here is the link for the Department of Defense photo of Perry, Shmarov, and Grachev planting sunflowers at a former Ukraine missile site. Hope that it helps out. Let me know if I can be of further assistance.

<http://www.defenselink.mil/photos/Jun1996/960604-N-8492C-001.html>

Best regards,

Rebecca Whitehair
Associate Editor
Arms Control Today

(202) 463-8270 x 110

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Subject: Fw: Perry, Shmarov, and Grachev photo
Date: Tue, 23 Apr 2002 16:32:51 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Marie,

Here is information I obtained about a picture of Secretary Perry and others planting sunflowers in the Ukraine. It can go with "The Story of Our Banner". I tried the site but got no results. Maybe I don't have the right software. You can try it.

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

From: Rebecca Whitehair <act@armscontrol.org>
To: mupj@igc.org <mupj@igc.org>
Date: Tuesday, April 23, 2002 2:31 PM
Subject: Perry, Shmarov, and Grachev photo

>Here is the link for the Department of Defense photo of Perry, Shmarov, and
>Grachev planting sunflowers at a former Ukraine missile site. Hope that it
>helps out. Let me know if I can be of further assistance.

>
><http://www.defenselink.mil/photos/Jun1996/960604-N-8492C-001.html>

>Best regards,

>
>Rebecca Whitehair
>Associate Editor
>Arms Control Today
>
>(202) 463-8270 x 110
>

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Subject: A new page
Date: Tue, 23 Apr 2002 16:48:13 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Marie,

When I started working on "Civil Sector Statements", I realized that there some I want to use which are made by generals and admirals. Although most are retired, they aren't seen as civilians strictly speaking. So I decided to add another page (which of course will be an add-on on your contract).

This means another entry on the home page. For the navigation buttons add one that says "Military Leaders Speak Out". Put it between "Religious Statements" and "Civil Sector Statements". I believe there is space to work it in.

Under site features add: "What Military Leaders Say". Put it after "Statements and Reports from the Civil Sector". (My placement is intuitive.)

When you are ready I can give you the initial material for the "Military Leaders Speak Out" page.

Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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.

Status: U

Return-Path: <JHusband@nas.edu>

Received: from himalaya.nas.edu ([144.171.1.23])

by strange.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 1706i45f43Nl3oW0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 23 Apr 2002 15:49:28 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from smtpmta.nas.edu (smtpmta.nas.edu [144.171.1.40])

by himalaya.nas.edu (8.9.1/8.9.1) with SMTP id PAA04514
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 23 Apr 2002 15:47:19 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by smtpmta.nas.edu (Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.7 (934.1 12-30-1999)) id 85256BA4.006CE394 ; Tue, 23 Apr 2002 15:49:21 -0400

X-Lotus-FromDomain: NAS

From: "Jo Husbands" <JHusband@nas.edu>

To: mupj@igc.org

Message-ID: <85256BA4.006CE2D7.00@smtpmta.nas.edu>

Date: Tue, 23 Apr 2002 15:49:18 -0400

Subject: Contact information for CISAC members

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Disposition: inline

Steve Fetter -- sfetter@wam.umd.edu

John Holdren -- john_holdren@harvard.edu

Pief Panofsky -- pief@slac.stanford.edu

Good luck.

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Jo Husbands" <JHusband@nas.edu>
Subject: Re: Contact information for CISAC members
Date: Tue, 23 Apr 2002 16:53:07 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Thanks for your assistance. I'll keep you informed about our new web site,
www.zero-nukes.org when it becomes operational

Howard Hallman

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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.

Status: U

Return-Path: <rsider@speakeasy.net>

Received: from mail.speakeasy.net ([216.254.0.217])

by payne.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 170bKg3m53Nl3p40
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 23 Apr 2002 21:38:56 -0400 (EDT)

Received: (qmail 32170 invoked from network); 24 Apr 2002 01:38:57 -0000

Received: from unknown (HELO speakeasy.net) ([66.92.237.11]) (envelope-sender <rsider@speakeasy.net>)
by mail17.speakeasy.net (qmail-ldap-1.03) with SMTP
for <mupj@igc.org>; 24 Apr 2002 01:38:57 -0000

Message-ID: <3CC60BA0.9E70639A@speakeasy.net>

Date: Tue, 23 Apr 2002 21:34:24 -0400

From: Ron Sider <rsider@speakeasy.net>

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Subject: Re: A new web site

References: <001701c1e7e2\$99be5f60\$a961f7a5@default>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I will see what I can do.

Ron

"Howard W. Hallman" wrote:

> Dear Ron,

>

> The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is creating a web site
> called www.zero-nukes.org. It will contain statements from religious
> organizations on nuclear disarmament and also from the civil sector. There
> will be a section for which we will ask military leaders and civilian
> experts to offer scenarios for eliminating all nuclear weapons. There will
> be opportunity for response and dialogue.

>

> We are looking for statements by Evangelical leaders, denominations, and
> other organizations that advocate the elimination of nuclear weapons, or at
> least moving in that direction. We want statements that go beyond advocacy
> on particular treaties or legislation and deal with overall policy
> objectives.

>

> Could you and your colleagues in Evangelicals for Social Action help us
> locate such statements? Maybe you have made some yourself. Where possible
> we will provide linkage to web sites containing the statements. If they
> are not available in that form, we will post them on www.zero-nukes.org. We
> would want to receive the statement in a Word attachment if possible. Also,
> we would like a short paragraph about the person or organization making the
> statement.

>

> In advance I thank you for your assistance. I'll keep in touch as the web
> site develops further.

>

> Howard

- >
- > Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
- > 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.

Status: U
Return-Path: <lydia@fcnl.org>
Received: from local.fcnl.org ([65.207.12.2])
by pickering.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id
170olv7zz3NI3p20
Wed, 24 Apr 2002 11:06:05 -0400 (EDT)
Received: by local.fcnl.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
id <2LYPD517>; Wed, 24 Apr 2002 11:00:30 -0400
Message-ID: <E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF6C51202@local.fcnl.org>
From: Lydia Milnes <lydia@fcnl.org>
To: 'Signers of the FY02 Defense Supplemental Letter' <noone@fcnl.org>
Subject: Final Copy of FY02 Defense Supplemental Letter with Signatures
Date: Wed, 24 Apr 2002 11:00:24 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
boundary="----_=_NextPart_000_01C1EBA0.C33F6110"

Hello everyone-

Thank you all so much for signing (or getting your organization to sign) our letter regarding the proposed FY02 defense supplemental. The letter was faxed yesterday to the House Appropriations and International Relations Committees, and we plan to distribute the letter further in the coming days. We believe that the House Appropriations Committee will be marking up a bill based on the President's proposal early next week.

The letter with your signatures is attached as a Word file and pasted below. The letter was sent out with seven additional briefing sheets, and a cover note that explains that signers of the letter have not necessarily endorsed the briefing sheets. If you would like copies of these seven one-page briefing sheets, please let me know and I will send them over.

Thanks again for signing this letter!

Sincerely,
Lydia

Lydia Milnes
Legislative Program Assistant
Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quakers)
245 Second Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002 - 5795
Phone: 202-547-6000 ext. 121
Toll Free: 1-800-630-1330
Fax: 202-547-6019
website: <http://www.fcnl.org>
"We Seek a World Free of War and the Threat of War"

FY2002 Supplemental Request Sets U.S. on Wrong Path say Forty-eight National Organizations

April 23, 2002

Dear Member of Congress:

Soon you will be asked to vote on a \$27 billion FY2002 supplemental spending request from President Bush which we, the undersigned groups, believe will set U.S. foreign policy on the wrong path under the guise of a "global war on terrorism." Overwhelmingly military in nature, this request will do little to reduce violence and may actually undermine efforts to advance peace and security in the long run. We urge you to oppose this FY2002 supplemental appropriations proposal as written. At a minimum, the supplemental request should:

- 1) Maintain existing human rights conditions for countries receiving foreign military aid. The request would remove or override current restrictions on military aid to countries with notoriously poor human rights records, such as Colombia and Indonesia. In addition, the proposal attempts to circumvent current congressional restrictions on security assistance -- from human rights conditions to congressional notification of weapons transfers -- by allowing aid to be provided "notwithstanding any other provision of law." The "notwithstanding" provision should be removed. The final legislation should make clear that the Administration will be required to comply with international and U.S. human rights standards and humanitarian law.
- 2) Maintain control of military foreign aid within the Department of State. Funds administered by the Department of Defense are not subject to the same restrictions or human rights conditions as funds given through the Department of State. It is the role of the State Department, not the Pentagon, to formulate U.S. foreign policy and interpret it abroad. By channeling millions of dollars in foreign aid through the Pentagon, President Bush's supplemental request could undermine U.S. diplomatic efforts by circumventing limits on U.S. military contact with countries that systematically violate human rights, are corrupt, or are not democratic.
- 3) Address real humanitarian problems. The request provides few resources to make good on President Bush's promise to address terror by building hope and opportunity in poor countries. It also contains very little support for long-term reconstruction and multi-national peacekeeping efforts that will be necessary to stabilize Afghanistan. For example, the request includes only minimal assistance for programs to improve basic health, education,

agricultural development, infrastructure and governance. Additionally, despite being recognized as a global health and security emergency, no new funding has been requested to address the pandemic of HIV/AIDS.

4) Maintain congressional control of the purse strings and oversight of foreign aid programs. Major policy changes, such as changing the mission of aid to Colombia from counter-narcotics to counter-terror, should be carefully deliberated and fully debated by the appropriate oversight committees and the full Congress. Such critical policy changes are too significant to be rushed through as part of an emergency spending bill. The goals and benchmarks for such aid should be clearly spelled out before any funds are appropriated.

We urge you to oppose the Administration's FY2002 supplemental spending request unless it is revised to maintain existing longstanding human rights conditions for countries receiving military foreign aid, maintain control of military foreign aid within the State Department, address real humanitarian problems worldwide, and protects congressional oversight of the authorization and spending of these funds.

Sincerely,

Salih Booker
Executive Director
Africa Action

Marcel Kitissou
Executive Director
Africa Faith and Justice Network

Wanjiru Kamau, Ed. D.
Founder & President
African Immigrants & Refugees Foundation

James Matlack
Director, Washington Office
American Friends Service Committee

Alexandra Arriaga
Director of Government Relations
Amnesty International USA

Dr. Ian Davis
Director
British American Security Information
Council (BASIC)

Don Kraus
Executive Director
Campaign for U.N. Reform

Rachel Stohl
Research Analyst
Center for Defense Information*

William Goodfellow
Executive Director
Center for International Policy

Adam Isacson
Senior Associate
Center for International Policy

J. E. McNeil
Executive Director
Center on Conscience & War (NISBCO)

Rev. Ron Stief
Director, Washington Office

Church of Christ/Justice and Witness
Ministries

Greg Davidson Laszakovits
Coordinator
Church of the Brethren Washington Office

Rev. John L. McCullough
Executive Director
Church World Service

Barbara Gerlach and Cristina Espinel
Co-Chairs
Colombia Human Rights Committee

Marianne Loewe
Executive Director
Concern America

Rev. Lonnie Turner
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship

Jenefer Ellingston
DC Statehood Green Party, Washington
DC

Karen Orenstein
Washington Coordinator
East Timor Action Network

Tamar Gabelnick
Director, Arms Sales Monitoring Project
Federation of American Scientists

Alistair Millar
Vice President
Fourth Freedom Forum

Fr. David Moczulski, OFM
Executive Director
Franciscan Washington Office for Latin
America

Joe Volk
Executive Secretary

Friends Committee on National Legislation

Maurice S Paprin
Chairman
Fund for New Priorities in America

Alice Zachmann
Director
Guatemala Human Rights
Commission/USA

Martha Honey
Co-Director
Foreign Policy In Focus
Institute for Policy Studies

Rev. Richard Ryscavage
Executive Director
Jesuit Refugee Service

Elisa Massimino
Director, Washington Office
Lawyers Committee for Human Rights

J. Daryl Byler
Director, Washington Office
Mennonite Central Committee

Howard W. Hallman
Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Rev. Bob Edgar
General Secretary
National Council of the Churches of Christ
in the USA

Greg Speeter
Executive Director
National Priorities Project

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

Sarah C. Aird
Executive Director
Network in Solidarity with the People of
Guatemala (NISGUA)

George R. Vickers
Regional Director for Latin America
Open Society Policy Center

Kevin Martin
Executive Director
Peace Action Education Fund

Robert K. Musil, Ph.D.
MPH Executive Director and CEO
Physicians for Social Responsibility

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

Jim Atwood
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship

Todd Howland
Director, Center for Human Rights
Robert F. Kennedy Memorial

Gail Taylor
Legislative Director
SOA Watch

Peter Davies
UN Representative
Saferworld

David Schott
Sister Parish*

Stephen G. Price

Director, Office of Justice and Peace
Society of African Missions

Dr. Valora Washington
Executive Director
Unitarian Universalist Service Committee

Jaydee R. Hanson
Assistant General Secretary
General Board of Church and Society
United Methodist Church

Mike Amitay
Executive Director
Washington Kurdish Institute

Charlotte Utting
Vice-President
Washington State Africa Network

Steve Bennett
Executive Director
Witness for Peace

Susan Shaer
Executive Director
Women's Action for New Directions

Phyllis S. Yingling
President, United States Section
Women's International League for Peace
and Freedom

Mark Epstein
Executive Director
World Federalist Association

William D. Hartung
Director, Arms Trade Resource Center
World Policy Institute at the New School

*Organization listed for identification purposes only

Respond to: Joe Volk <joe@fcnl.org>, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second St NE, Washington DC 20002. Phone: 202-547-6000.

Attachments:

One Page Briefing Sheets on:

- Security Assistance Funds
- Military Training
- Humanitarian and Development Assistance
- Funding for HIV/AIDS
- U.S. Engagement in Colombia
- U.S. Engagement with Indonesia
- U.S. Involvement in Africa

<<suppsignforCongress.rtf>>

FY2002 Supplemental Request Sets U.S. on Wrong Path say Forty-eight National Organizations

April 23, 2002

Dear Member of Congress:

Soon you will be asked to vote on a \$27 billion FY2002 supplemental spending request from President Bush which we, the undersigned groups, believe will set U.S. foreign policy on the wrong path under the guise of a "global war on terrorism." Overwhelmingly military in nature, this request will do little to reduce violence and may actually undermine efforts to advance peace and security in the long run. We urge you to oppose this FY2002 supplemental appropriations proposal as written. At a minimum, the supplemental request should:

1) Maintain existing human rights conditions for countries receiving foreign military aid.

The request would remove or override current restrictions on military aid to countries with notoriously poor human rights records, such as Colombia and Indonesia. In addition, the proposal attempts to circumvent current congressional restrictions on security assistance -- from human rights conditions to congressional notification of weapons transfers -- by allowing aid to be provided "notwithstanding any other provision of law." The "notwithstanding" provision should be removed. The final legislation should make clear that the Administration

will be required to comply with international and U.S. human rights standards and humanitarian law.

2) Maintain control of military foreign aid within the Department of State. Funds administered by the Department of Defense are not subject to the same restrictions or human rights conditions as funds given through the Department of State. It is the role of the State Department, not the Pentagon, to formulate U.S. foreign policy and interpret it abroad. By channeling millions of dollars in foreign aid through the Pentagon, President Bush's supplemental request could undermine U.S. diplomatic efforts by circumventing limits on U.S. military contact with countries that systematically violate human rights, are corrupt, or are not democratic.

3) Address real humanitarian problems. The request provides few resources to make good on President Bush's promise to address terror by building hope and opportunity in poor countries. It also contains very little support for long-term reconstruction and multi-national peacekeeping efforts that will be necessary to stabilize Afghanistan. For example, the request includes only minimal assistance for programs to improve basic health, education, agricultural development, infrastructure and governance. Additionally, despite being recognized as a global health and security emergency, no new funding has been requested to address the pandemic of HIV/AIDS.

4) Maintain congressional control of the purse strings and oversight of foreign aid programs. Major policy changes, such as changing the mission of aid to Colombia from counter-narcotics to counter-terror, should be carefully deliberated and fully debated by the appropriate oversight committees and the full Congress. Such critical policy changes are too significant to be rushed through as part of an emergency spending bill. The goals and benchmarks for such aid should be clearly spelled out before any funds are appropriated.

We urge you to oppose the Administration's FY2002 supplemental spending request unless it is revised to maintain existing longstanding human rights conditions for countries receiving military foreign aid, maintain control of military foreign aid within the State Department, address real humanitarian problems worldwide, and protects congressional oversight of the authorization and spending of these funds.

Sincerely,

Salih Booker
Executive Director
Africa Action

Marcel Kitissou
Executive Director
Africa Faith and Justice Network

Wanjiru Kamau, Ed. D.
Founder & President

**African Immigrants and Refugees
Foundation**

James Matlack
Director, Washington Office
American Friends Service Committee

Alexandra Arriaga
Director of Government Relations
Amnesty International USA

Dr. Ian Davis
Director
**British American Security Information
Council (BASIC)**

Don Kraus
Executive Director
Campaign for U.N. Reform

Rachel Stohl
Research Analyst
Center for Defense Information*

William Goodfellow
Executive Director
Center for International Policy

Adam Isacson
Senior Associate
Center for International Policy

J. E. McNeil
Executive Director
Center on Conscience & War (NISBCO)

Rev. Ron Stief
Director, Washington Office
**Church of Christ/Justice and Witness
Ministries**

Greg Davidson Laszakovits
Coordinator
**Church of the Brethren Washington
Office**

Rev. John L. McCullough
Executive Director
Church World Service

Barbara Gerlach and Cristina Espinel
Co-Chairs
Colombia Human Rights Committee

Marianne Loewe
Executive Director
Concern America

Rev. Lonnie Turner
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship

Jenefer Ellingston
**DC Statehood Green Party, Washington
DC**

Karen Orenstein
Washington Coordinator
East Timor Action Network

Tamar Gabelnick
Director, Arms Sales Monitoring Project
Federation of American Scientists

Alistair Millar
Vice President
Fourth Freedom Forum

Fr. David Moczulski, OFM
Executive Director
**Franciscan Washington Office for Latin
America**

Joe Volk
Executive Secretary
**Friends Committee on National
Legislation**

Maurice S Paprin
Chairman
Fund for New Priorities in America

Alice Zachmann
Director
**Guatemala Human Rights
Commission/USA**

Martha Honey
Co-Director
**Foreign Policy In Focus
Institute for Policy Studies**

Rev. Richard Ryscavage
Executive Director
Jesuit Refugee Service

Elisa Massimino
Director, Washington Office
Lawyers Committee for Human Rights

J. Daryl Byler
Director, Washington Office
Mennonite Central Committee

Howard W. Hallman
Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Rev. Bob Edgar
General Secretary
National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA

Greg Speeter
Executive Director
National Priorities Project

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

Sarah C. Aird
Executive Director
Network in Solidarity with the People of Guatemala (NISGUA)

George R. Vickers
Regional Director for Latin America
Open Society Policy Center

Kevin Martin
Executive Director
Peace Action Education Fund

Robert K. Musil, Ph.D.
MPH Executive Director and CEO
Physicians for Social Responsibility

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

Jim Atwood
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship

Todd Howland
Director, Center for Human Rights
Robert F. Kennedy Memorial

Gail Taylor
Legislative Director
SOA Watch

Peter Davies
UN Representative
Saferworld

David Schott
Sister Parish*

Stephen G. Price
Director, Office of Justice and Peace
Society of African Missions

Dr. Valora Washington
Executive Director
Unitarian Universalist Service Committee

Jaydee R. Hanson
Assistant General Secretary
General Board of Church and Society United Methodist Church

Mike Amitay
Executive Director
Washington Kurdish Institute

Charlotte Utting
Vice-President
Washington State Africa Network

Steve Bennett
Executive Director
Witness for Peace

Susan Shaer
Executive Director
Women's Action for New Directions

Mark Epstein
Executive Director
World Federalist Association

Phyllis S. Yingling
President, United States Section
**Women's International League for Peace
and Freedom**

William D. Hartung
Director, Arms Trade Resource Center
World Policy Institute at the New School

*Organization listed for identification purposes only

Respond to: Joe Volk <joe@fcnI.org>, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second St NE, Washington DC 20002. Phone: 202-547-6000.

Attachments:

One Page Briefing Sheets on:

- Security Assistance Funds

- Military Training

- Humanitarian and Development Assistance

- Funding for HIV/AIDS

- U.S. Engagement in Colombia

- U.S. Engagement with Indonesia

- U.S. Involvement in Africa

Status: U
Return-Path: <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Received: from web13907.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.70])
by walker.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 170uxR15203N13s70
for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 24 Apr 2002 17:43:23 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <20020424214322.87731.qmail@web13907.mail.yahoo.com>
Received: from [166.90.30.222] by web13907.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Wed, 24 Apr 2002 14:43:22 PDT
Date: Wed, 24 Apr 2002 14:43:22 -0700 (PDT)
From: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Home page
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
In-Reply-To: <001a01c1ea34\$d931c0c0\$9361f7a5@default>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-1048351460-1019684602=:87717"

--0-1048351460-1019684602=:87717
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Hi,
Please revisit the site before we meet tomorrow.
<http://www.twotonedeyes.com/zero-nukes>
We can talk about the banner, colors, etc.
Also, can we meet at 1:30 instead of 2pm? I have a 2:30 appointment. Will 45 minutes be sufficient for our meeting?
Thanks,
Marie
"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote:
Marie,

First, Thursday, April 25 at 2:00 p.m. at your house will be fine. I'll be there then.

I hadn't gone to your site today before I wrote you. I was commenting on the version of the banner that came in on Friday.

Apart from the banner I like your design of the home page. The theme -- "All nuclear weapons on Earth should be eliminated" -- is stated boldly at top, center. That's excellent. The picture of the globe works well. "How can this be accomplished?" immediately indicates what the web site is all about.

The quotes down the side also work well. However, you have an "h" in "better" in the Powell quote. The Cathedral statement is available through a web linkage, so you may want to mark it accordingly. I can supply you an URL.

In the box under "How to Achieve Zero Nuclear Weapons" on the second line I would eliminate the dash and have a capital "P" for "Presenting...."

I sent the latest list of sponsors in the attachment, zero-nukes home page.03.doc. Please make corrections from it. There is an "s" on Methodists United.....

On the navigation guides I would swap places of "Religious Statements" and "Civil Sector Statements".

As I wrote this morning, I want a "What's New" page. You can decide where to put the indicator. Also, I have added "The story of our masthead" as a reference on the first page of the home page with the story on the next sub-page.

I have some concerns about the colors. Even not taking into consider the banner, which will change to the sunflower

scene, I feel that there are too many colors that don't particularly blend. For my eyes it is difficult to read the sponsors' names on the blue background. Could there be a lighter blue or blue gray or even an earth color, but not too dark? Would that be the same as the background for "zero-nukes...." on the left end of the banner? Could the yellow from the sunflowers be used elsewhere? You have discretion. I can only react.

For your revision with a wider field of sunflowers, perhaps they could extend farther up. We will need the field deep enough so that the "no nukes" sign can be large enough to be seen adequately. I will fax you the drawing in the morning. It is a caricature, which is what I want, though not an exact copy of the cartoon.

I guess the distant mountains are all right. Maybe the tan could extend to foothills instead of the dark green. But I'm not certain.

This is a wider banner than before. It seems to fit the home page all right, so that's no problem. Would the same banner be used at the top of other pages? Again size wouldn't necessarily be a problem because several of these pages will start with a table of contents. Will the banner also pop up whenever a user goes to a particular statement?

I have covered a lot. We're making progress. I'll see you on Thursday and may send you more material before then.

Shalom,

Howard

Marie

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Games - play chess, backgammon, pool and more

--0-1048351460-1019684602=:87717

Content-Type: text/html; charset=us-ascii

<P> Hi,

<P>Please revisit the site before we meet tomorrow.

<P>http://www.twotonedeyes.com/zero-nukes

<P>We can talk about the banner, colors, etc.

<P>Also, can we meet at 1:30 instead of 2pm? I have a 2:30 appointment. Will 45 minutes be sufficient for our meeting?

<P>Thanks,
Marie

<P> <I>"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org></I> wrote:

<BLOCKQUOTE style="BORDER-LEFT: #1010ff 2px solid; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px"><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN">

<META content="MSHTML 4.72.3110.7" name=GENERATOR>

<DIV>

<P>Marie,</P>

<P>First, Thursday, April 25 at 2:00 p.m. at your house will be fine. I'll be there then.</P>

<P>I hadn't gone to your site today before I wrote you. I was commenting on the version of the banner that came in on Friday.</P>

<P>Apart from the banner I like your design of the home page. The theme -- "All nuclear weapons on Earth should be eliminated" -- is stated boldly at top, center. That's excellent. The picture of the globe works well. "How can this be accomplished?" immediately indicates what the web site is all about.</P>

<P>The quotes down the side also work well. However, you have an "h" in "better" in the Powell quote. The Cathedral

statement is available through a web linkage, so you may want to mark it accordingly. I can supply you an URL.</P>
<P>In the box under "How to Achieve Zero Nuclear Weapons" on the second line I would eliminating the dash and have a capital "P" for "Presenting...."</P>
<P>I sent the latest list of sponsors in the attachment, zero-nukes home page.03.doc. Please make corrections from it. There is an "s" on Methodists United.....</P>
<P>On the navigation guides I would swap places of "Religious Statements" and "Civil Sector Statements". </P>
<P>As I wrote this morning, I want a "What's New" page. You can decide where to put the indicator. Also, I have added "The story of our masthead" as a reference on the first page of the home page with the story on the next sub-page.</P>
<P>I have some concerns about the colors. Even not taking into consider the banner, which will change to the sunflower scene, I feel that there are too many colors that don't particularly blend. For my eyes it is difficult to read the sponsors' names on the blue background. Could there be a lighter blue or blue gray or even an earth color, but not too dark? Would that be the same as the background for "zero-nukes...." on the left end of the banner? Could the yellow from the sunflowers be used elsewhere? You have discretion. I can only react. </P>
<P>For your revision with a wider field of sunflowers, perhaps they could extend farther up. We will need the field deep enough so that the "no nukes" sign can be large enough to be seen adequately. I will fax you the drawing in the morning. It is a caricature, which is what I want, though not an exact copy of the cartoon.</P>
<P>I guess the distant mountains are all right. Maybe the tan could extend to foothills instead of the dark green. But I'm not certain. </P>
<P>This is a wider banner than before. It seems to fit the home page all right, so that's no problem. Would the same banner be used at the top of other pages? Again size wouldn't necessarily be a problem because several of these pages will start with a table of contents. Will the banner also pop up whenever a user goes to a particular statement?</P>
<P>I have covered a lot. We're making progress. I'll see you on Thursday and may send you more material before then.</P>
<P>Shalom,</P>
<P>Howard</P></DIV></BLOCKQUOTE>

Marie

<p>
<hr size=1>Do You Yahoo!?!

Yahoo! Games - play chess, backgammon, pool and more
--0-1048351460-1019684602=:87717--

Status: U

Return-Path: <bounce-fd_newsletter-2499258@burst.sparklist.com>

Received: from burst.sparklist.com ([207.250.144.129])

by tyner.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 170x3B4sM3Nl3rs0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 24 Apr 2002 20:24:19 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Wed, 24 Apr 2002 19:13:42 -0500

Subject: Final Draft - Tech Support Update

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

From: <newsletter@finaldraft.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:leave-fd_newsletter-2499258N@burst.sparklist.com>

Reply-To: newsletter@finaldraft.com

X-Hosted-By: <http://SparkLIST.com/> - High-Performance Email List Publishing Experts

Message-Id: <200204242024.170x3B4sM3Nl3rs0@tyner.mail.mindspring.net>

Final Draft - Tech Support Update

April 24, 2002

Contents of this Update:

1. Final Draft Version 6 Update
2. Final Draft Knowledge Base
3. Final Draft E-mail Changes
4. Welcome to the Team

THE LATEST FINAL DRAFT VERSION 6 UPDATE:

We have released the update to Version 6.0.2.5 for Mac, which is a free download at <http://www.finaldraft.com/downloads/index.html>

The update for Windows will be released within ten days to two weeks, if not sooner.

This updated release has bug fixes as well as adding an Avid MetaSync Export feature and carbonizing the "Ask The Expert" feature.

If you do not want to download the update, a CD with the update installer can be purchased for \$20. Please contact the Sales Department at 800-231-4055.

If you have not yet upgraded to Version 6, now is the time to do so. Until April 30th, the upgrade is available for a special price of \$69 (plus shipping and tax, where applicable). Please contact the Sales Department at 800-231-4055 or place your order on-line.

FINAL DRAFT KNOWLEDGE BASE

Have you checked out our comprehensive on-line Knowledge Base with answers to about 500 questions? Now is the time to test it out. Please go to <http://finaldraft.custhelp.com/cgi-bin/finaldraft.cfg/php/enduser/home.php>.

In addition to the Getting Started and the full Version 6 manual that you

will find installed to the Final Draft folder on your hard drive, this is the place to go to have most of your questions answered. You can search using keywords and phrases. Or read through them all. So, grab a cup of coffee, 'cause there's lots of time saving helpful information.

Because our phone lines have been increasingly busy during tech support phone hours, the Knowledge Base may be the fastest solution to all of your questions.

IMPORTANT CHANGE TO TECH SUPPORT E-MAIL

To provide you with improved e-mail tech support, e-mails will no longer be accepted at the support@finaldraft.com e-mail address. Instead, when you access the Knowledge Base, you will see the "Ask A Question" section. If you have exhausted your search under Find Answers or cannot find your answer in the Final Draft manual, you can submit a question to the tech support team through this section.

All e-mail questions should be sent through this page and will be answered within 2 business days. You will need to include your Customer Number (FD?-XXX-XXX-XXX-XXX), version number of Final Draft and operating system information as well as any other pertinent information. This helps tech support answer your questions in a timelier manner. We ask that your questions be as detailed as possible. Please keep in mind that some questions are more difficult than others to answer via e-mail, so we may ask you to give us a call for further assistance.

All sales-related inquiries should be directed to sales@finaldraft.com through your regular e-mail.

Any other e-mail inquiries that are not tech support-related, including company information, script contests, etc., should be directed to info@finaldraft.com.

NEW IN TECH SUPPORT

While many of you are sorry to see J.W. (and his sarcastic wit) leave us, we are happy to have two new faces (or voices, to all of you) in tech support. Risa and Ariana have joined our team. So, if you speak to one of them, be sure to welcome them aboard!

Status: U
Return-Path: <bbhardt@mail.esc4.com>
Received: from mail.academicplanet.com ([209.245.216.197])
by kendall.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 170Mp5oo3Nl3pM0
Thu, 25 Apr 2002 12:47:31 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from brenda (dialup-64.158.33.147.Dial1.Houston1.Level3.net [64.158.33.147])
by mail.academicplanet.com (8.11.1/8.11.0) with SMTP id g3PDFxG10449;
Thu, 25 Apr 2002 08:15:59 -0500
From: "Brenda Hardt" <bbhardt@mail.esc4.com>
To: "PwJ Message" <aahardt@mail.esc4.com>
Subject: FW: [FAVAN] Middle East initiative
Date: Thu, 25 Apr 2002 08:03:41 -0500
Message-ID: <CAEJIIEFGMEIGGLHDKPOAEOFCHAA.bbhardt@mail.esc4.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="utf-8"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000
Importance: Normal

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

From: ppjnvogt@aol.com [mailto:ppjnvogt@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 24, 2002 10:27 AM
To: favan@yahoogroups.com
Subject: [FAVAN] Middle East initiative

I know that many of you are deeply concerned about what is happening in =
the=20
Middle East. Here is an initiative you may want to consider supporting.

Jim Vogt, Administrator/Coordinator
Parenting for Peace and Justice Network (PPJN)
Families Against Violence Advocacy Network (FAVAN)
523 E. Southern Ave. Covington, KY 41015
859-291-6197; Fax: 859-291-4742
ppjnvogt@aol.com; website: www.ipj-ppj.org

Dear Friends,

During the past weeks, I have been working out with Jim Wallis of =
Sojourners,=20
Bob Edgar of the National Council of Churches, and several other =
Christian=20
leaders, and with a number of rabbis and other teachers/ leaders in the=20
Jewish community, an important statement calling for serious and =

sustained US=20
action for peace in the Middle East. More than 40 Jewish leaders have =
now=20
signed the statement, and Jim has urged the recipients of the Sojo Email =
newsletter to do so.

I very much hope you also will join. Please =E2=80=93 it is CRUCIAL =
=E2=80=93 that you BOTH=20
write back by Email to me and, even more important, fill out the coupon =
at=20
the end to add arms and legs as well as heart and mind and spirit to =
your=20
support. =20

Shalom, Arthur

Dear Sojo Mail Readers,

In my Hearts & Minds column this week, I mentioned a religious statement =
our=20
friend, Rabbi Arthur Waskow was initiating. That statement, and an =
initial=20
list of 38 [now more] signers - primarily Rabbis - follows.

I support this statement, and encourage you to respond.

Jim Wallis

Dear Friends,

We are sending you an inter-religious call for US action to
help make peace in the Middle East.

It was drafted in close consultation among several Jewish
and Christian leaders, and is being sent out with their=20
endorsement to others in their communities.=20

We seek to publish this statement in a leading American=20
newspaper. So please use the coupon at the end of this=20
post to add your name and support. Am Kolel Social=20

Action Committee, the recipient, is a tax-exempt Jewish religious organization, so contributions are tax-deductible.

Please remember to respond by using the coupon below as well as to this Email.

Thanks, and blessings of shalom,
Arthur .
Rabbi Arthur Waskow

IN THE NAME OF GOD, SEEK PEACE AND PURSUE IT

The destruction of lives and communities and human dignity now happening in the Middle East besmirches the very Name of God and endangers the peace of the world.

We condemn the deliberate targeting of civilians through suicide bombings.

We condemn the totally foreseeable and inevitable deaths of civilians through the shelling and bombing of their neighborhoods.

We condemn the use of violence to pursue political ends.

Whether these various acts of violence are "morally equivalent" or not means little to the dead, the maimed, and their suffering survivors. What matters is to end this violence.

The Israeli and Palestinian peoples seem unable to do so

because they are caught up in the fear and rage that has=20
spiraled out of control. For the sake of human decency and
for the sake of the peace of the world as a whole, we call=20
on the United States to act.

The immediate present and the future are intertwined so
tightly that action by the United States must address both:

On the one hand, the immediate violence cannot be ended=20
without swift motion to achieve a solution in which a=20
secure State of Israel and a viable State of Palestine=20
live side by side in peace. On the other hand, that goal
cannot be achieved without ending the present violence.

Both hands are necessary.

We therefore call on the United States to take two actions
at once, and simultaneously:

1. Bring about the creation of an international force to=20
protect both Israelis and Palestinians from violence.
2. Call a regional peace conference including Israel, the
Palestinian Authority, and all the Arab states, and peace-
committed religious leaders and leaders of civil society in
the region, to take up at once the Saudi proposals for=20
regional peace endorsed by the Beirut Conference and the=20
peace proposals that came close to agreement between=20
Israel and the Palestinian Authority at Taba late in 2000.

The United States should bend every effort to secure=20
agreement on the emergence of a viable Palestine and a=20

secure Israel, based on the 1967 boundaries with=20
adjustments that the two parties mutually agree on, and on
commitments to meet the moral and material needs of the
region's refugees while preserving Israel's character as an
expression of Jewish peoplehood and Palestine's ability to=20
meet the deep needs of the Palestinian people wherever
they live.

Today all the holy places in the Middle East are being=20
desecrated by violence, whether they are under direct=20
attack or not. Only in such a settlement can the holiness
of those places be affirmed. Today the Image of God in=20
every human being is being desecrated. Only through such a
settlement can the greatness of God be affirmed.

In the Name of God Who is compassionate and just, in=20
the Name of God Who suffers in the suffering of human=20
beings, in the Name of God Who demands that we pursue=20
justice through just means and seek peace by actively=20
pursuing it, we call on the United States to act at once.

Rabbi Rebecca Alpert=20
* Associate Professor of Religion and
Women's Studies, Temple University

Rabbi Micah Becker-Klein=20
* Congregation Ahavas Achim, Keene, NH=20

Rabbi Haim Dov Beliak=20
* Coalition for Justice in Hawaiian Gardens and Jerusalem

Rabbi Philip Bentley
Jewish Peace Fellowship

Rabbi Lewis Bogage=20
* DePauw University, Greencastle, IN

Rabbi Stephen Booth=20
Denver, Colorado

Rabbi Marcelo Bronstein
* B'nai Jeshurun, NYC

Cherie Brown
Break the Silence

Rabbi Michael M. Cohen
Rabbi Emeritus, Israel Congregation, Manchester Center, VT

Rabbi Andrea Cohen-Kiener
West Hartford CT=20

Rabbi Hillel Cohn
San Bernardino, CA

Jeffrey Dekro
* The Shefa Fund

Rabbi Fred Scherlinder Dobb
Adat Shalom Reconstructionist Cong., Bethesda MD

Rabbi Amy Eilberg
Palo Alto, California

Rabbi Sue Fendrick

Rabbi Everett Gendler
Massachusetts

Rabbi Jonathan H. Gerard

* Temple Covenant of Peace, Easton, PA=20

Rabbi Dan Goldblatt
* Beth Chaim Congregation, Danville, CA

Rabbi Roberto D. Graetz
* Temple Isaiah, Lafayette, CA

Professor Susannah Heschel
* Dartmouth College

Rabbi Margaret Holub
* Mendocino Coast Jewish Community

Rabbi Shaya Isenberg, Chair,=20
* Department of Religion, University of Florida

Rabbi Steven B. Jacobs

* Kol Tikvah, California

Rabbi Douglas E. Krantz

* Congregation B'nai Yisrael, Armonk, NY

Rabbi Mordechai Liebling

Break the Silence

Rabbi Rebecca Lillian

Jewish Peace Forum=20

Brit Tzedek V'Shalom

Rabbi Jeffrey Marker

* St. Vincent's Catholic Medical Center, NYC

Rabbi Rolando Matalon

*B'nai Jeshurun, NYC

Rabbi David Mivasair

(US citizen resident in Vancouver, BC)

Marge Piercy, poet, novelist, memoirist

Letty Cottin Pogrebin, writer

Rabbi Barry L. Schwartz

Cherry Hill, NJ=20

Rabbi Sid Schwarz

Rockville, MD

Mark Seal

Break the Silence

Evely Laser Shlensky

* U.S. Interreligious Committee for Peace in the Middle East

Rabbi Gerry Serotta

Chevy Chase, MD

Rabbi Judy Shanks

* Temple Isaiah, Lafayette, CA

Rabbi David Shneyer

* Am Kolel Social Action Committee.

Rabbi Toba Spitzer

* Congregation Dorshei Tzedek, Newton Mass

Rabbi Brian Walt

* Mishkan Shalom, Philadelphia=20

Rabbi Arthur Waskow
Break the Silence

Rabbi Sheila Weinberg
* Jewish Community of Amherst

* Organization noted for identification only

With Christian and Muslim signers and those of other spiritual paths as well, we seek to publish this statement in a leading American newspaper. Please PRINT or copy this coupon to send as much money as you can. -- The recipient is a tax-exempt Jewish religious organization, so contributions are tax-deductible . Please make out the check to "Break the Silence" and send it to:
Am Kolel Social Action Committee
15 W. Montgomery Ave.
Rockville, MD 20850

____ Please add my name to the signers of the call for US action for peace in the Middle East.

I enclose my (tax-deductible) peace-offering to support publication of this statement:

___ \$1,800; ___ \$720; ___ \$360; ___ \$180; ___ \$72; ___ Other

Name/s _____

Affiliation (optional; will be listed as "ID only") _____

Address _____

Email address (very important) _____

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

Buy Stock for \$4

and no minimums.

FREE Money 2002.

<http://us.click.yahoo.com/orkH0C/n97DAA/ySSFAA/x3XolB/TM>

----->
To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:

FAVAN-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

=20

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to =
<http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>=20

Status: U

Return-Path: <sentto-4736742-54-1019758842-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com>

Received: from n16.grp.scd.yahoo.com ([66.218.66.71])

by nils.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 170NS64F23N13pm0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 25 Apr 2002 14:21:34 -0400 (EDT)

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-4736742-54-1019758842-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com

Received: from [66.218.67.192] by n16.grp.scd.yahoo.com with NNFP; 25 Apr 2002 18:20:42 -0000

X-Sender: wstarman@wesleysem.edu

X-Apparently-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

Received: (EGP: mail-8_0_3_1); 25 Apr 2002 18:20:41 -0000

Received: (qmail 93088 invoked from network); 25 Apr 2002 18:05:48 -0000

Received: from unknown (66.218.66.218)

by m10.grp.scd.yahoo.com with QMQP; 25 Apr 2002 18:05:48 -0000

Received: from unknown (HELO wesley-exch1.wesleysem.edu) (63.124.223.7)

by mta3.grp.scd.yahoo.com with SMTP; 25 Apr 2002 18:05:48 -0000

Received: by wesley-exch1.wesleysem.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <1J874YMJ>; Thu, 25 Apr 2002 13:57:30 -0400

Message-ID: <DC1977460103D311B0DE0060943F439FADD0C4@wesley-exch1.wesleysem.edu>

To: "'interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com'" <interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com>

Cc: CCTPP <cctpp@wesleysem.edu>

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

From: STARMAN WENDY <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Delivered-To: mailing list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

Precedence: bulk

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

Date: Thu, 25 Apr 2002 13:57:29 -0400 Subject: [interfaithnd] Invitation: The 2002 Cynthia Wedel Lecture on "Nuclear Weapons and

New Security Challenges."

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

INVITATION TO COLLEAGUES OF THE INTERFAITH COMMITTEE FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

The Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy invites you to The 2002 Cynthia Wedel Lecture, featuring Dr. Nancy Gallagher, who will speak on "Nuclear Weapons and New Security Challenges." It will take place on Thursday, May 30, 2002, just days after the May 23-25 Bush-Putin summit in Moscow. Dr. Gallagher will provide timely in-depth analysis of the issues behind the headlines. The location of the event is Wesley Theological Seminary, 4500 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20016. There will be a reception at 6:00 p.m. in Elderdice Hall, followed by a dinner at 6:30 p.m. in the dining hall. The cost is \$30.00 per person. An R.S.V.P. is required in advance, but attendees are welcome to pay at the door. Please R.S.V.P.

to The Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy via phone 202/885-8648) or e-mail (cctpp@wesleysem.edu).

Dr. Nancy Gallagher is Associate Director for Research at the Center for International and Security Studies, University of Maryland. Before coming to the University of Maryland, she was the Executive Director of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Task Force and worked closely with the Special

Advisor to the President and Secretary of State on recommendations to build bipartisan support for U.S. ratification. From 1998-1999, she served as an arms control specialist in the State Department and a Foster Fellow in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. She is the author of *The Politics of Verification* (1999) and the editor of *Arms Control: New Approaches to Theory and Policy* (1998).

The Lectureship honors the memory of Dr. Cynthia Clark Wedel (1908-1986) and her commitment to bringing moral values to bear on public policy. A renowned ecumenist and advocate, and one of the co-founders of the Churches' Center, Dr. Wedel was also president of the World Council of Churches and National Council of Churches.

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

Buy Stock for \$4
and no minimums.

FREE Money 2002.

<http://us.click.yahoo.com/k6cvND/n97DAA/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: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <gpowers@nccbuscc.org>
Subject: Information for web site
Date: Fri, 26 Apr 2002 08:50:24 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Dear Jerry,

We are making progress in creation of the new web site, www.zero-nukes.org.

On the page on Religious Statements we will have a Catholic section that will include statements by the Holy See representatives to the United Nations, including the latest which contains a quote from Pope John Paul II.

We will have a section on the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. For a short introductory paragraph could you help me with some data. Specifically how many Catholics are there in the United States, how many dioceses, how many local churches, how many bishops?

In that section I would like to include on our site an extract from *The Harvest of Peace Is Sown in Justice*, specifically the section on "Unfinished Business: Nuclear Disarmament and Proliferation". May I have your permission? (Even though this section is on your web site, it is part of a much longer document and not easy to find for an inexperienced user.)

I would also like to have the "Summary" from *The Challenge of Peace* (1983), for it offers the essence of what the Catholic Bishops said then. We would want permission to do so. Is it available anywhere in digital format that we could have access to? This would avoid our having to copy it afresh.

Thanks for your assistance.

Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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.

Status: U

Return-Path: <GPowers@uscbb.org>

Received: from peter.nccbuscc.org ([207.32.122.194])

by strange.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTMP id 171acHiY3Nl3oW0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 26 Apr 2002 14:12:18 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from peter.nccbuscc.org (peter [207.32.122.194])

by peter.nccbuscc.org (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id OAA11447
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 26 Apr 2002 14:05:44 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from NCCB-Message_Server by uscbb.org

with Novell_GroupWise; Fri, 26 Apr 2002 13:09:34 -0400

Message-Id: <sc9518e.068@uscbb.org>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5.2

Date: Fri, 26 Apr 2002 14:09:54 -0400

From: "Gerard Powers" <GPowers@uscbb.org>

To: <mupj@igc.org>

Subject: Information for web site -Reply

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

Howard:

Thanks for compiling information for your web site. It's very helpful in =
getting the word out on our positions.

1) I have asked our copyright person about what is needed for permissions,=
so I'll have to wait for her response.

2) Regarding the Catholic Church: The U.S. Conference of Catholic =
Bishops represents the 300 active and about 100 retired Roman Catholic =
bishops of the United States. There are an estimated 60 million Catholics =
in 194 dioceses and some 19,000 parishes. =20

Hope this helps.

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Subject: Home page
Date: Fri, 26 Apr 2002 12:55:00 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Marie,

We had a good session yesterday and arrived at a better focus for our home page. My only after thought is that the second line of the navigational buttons might be dark brown, like the shade used on your last draft, rather than black. That would provide contrast without adding another tone.

Howard
Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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.

Status: U

Return-Path: <Murraylou2@cs.com>

Received: from imo-d07.mx.aol.com ([205.188.157.39])

by tyner.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 1715RZzE3N13rs0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 26 Apr 2002 09:34:39 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from Murraylou2@cs.com

by imo-d07.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v32.5.) id c.ff.170d7085 (2519);
Fri, 26 Apr 2002 09:34:07 -0400 (EDT)

From: Murraylou2@cs.com

Message-ID: <ff.170d7085.29fab14f@cs.com>

Date: Fri, 26 Apr 2002 09:34:07 EDT

Subject: Our Book, Part 2

To: lew@lewrockwell.com

CC: rockwell@mises.org, Margolis@jamiesonvitamins.com,

Margolis@foreigncorrespondent.com, info@independent.org,

Berriganf@newschool.edu, hartung@newschool.edu, jGerson@afsc.org,

ChessSet@aol.com, mupj@igc.org, john@irc-online.org, SZAMUELY@aol.com,

BConry@porternovelli.com, Woodst@sunysuffolk.edu,

Kevinpclements@aol.com, jackacole@attbi.com

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="part1_ff.170d7085.29fab14f_boundary"

X-Mailer: CompuServe 2000 6.0 for Windows US sub 10511

--part1_ff.170d7085.29fab14f_boundary

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear Friends:

Just a gentle reminder that I am eagerly awaiting your essay/article for our anthology, "Dissent, American Style." I now have 25 articles and yours will help that number grow.

I need to have your articles no later than May 8th. The entire package will be handed to my literary agent the week of May 20th and has to be packaged for prospective publishers to read and appreciate.

Please--If for any reason you have decided to withdraw from this cooperative project, I would greatly appreciate your notifying me immediately.

Otherwise, I look forward to your article.

Finally, one more small request. Please tell me how you wish to be identified but on a separate stand-alone page.

Sincerely,

Murray Polner

516-487-3758

--part1_ff.170d7085.29fab14f_boundary

Content-Type: text/html; charset="US-ASCII"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

<HTML>Dear Friends:

Just a gentle reminder that I am eagerly awaiting your essay/article for our anthology, "Dissent, American Style." I now have 25 articles and yours will help that number grow.

I need to have your articles no later than May 8th. The entire package will be handed to my literary agent the week of May 20th and has to be packaged for prospective publishers to read and appreciate.

Please--If for any reason you have decided to withdraw from this cooperative project, I would greatly appreciate your notifying me immediately.

Otherwise, I look forward to your article.

Finally, one more small request. Please tell me how you wish to be identified but on a separate stand-alone page.

Sincerely,

Murray Polner

516-487-3758</HTML>

--part1_ff.170d7085.29fab14f_boundary--

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>
Subject: 2001 sign-on letters
Date: Fri, 26 Apr 2002 16:45:42 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
boundary="-----=_NextPart_000_0006_01C1ED41.CE29FD40"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Catherine,

It's taken me a month to get around to it, but finally I'm sending as Word attachments the three sign-on letters the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament did in 2001. I hope this meets your needs.

Shalom,
Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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 6, 2001

The Honorable Pete V. Domenici
SH-328 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510-3101

Similar letter to all other senators
and all representatives

Re: National Missile Defense: Attn: Elizabeth Turpen

Dear Senator:

We the undersigned representatives of faith-based organizations share the desire to keep God's people everywhere, including those in the U.S. homeland, safe from nuclear attack. However, we are deeply concerned about the haste to make a commitment to deploy unproven technology for national missile defense. We ask you to share our concerns with President Bush.

First, the real and present danger for nuclear attack on the United States comes from the several thousand Russian missiles now on hair trigger alert and thousands of

Russian nuclear weapons in reserve with inadequate security. The best remedies are mutual de-alerting, strategic arms reduction, and stable control of fissile material. These opportunities could be jeopardized if the United States withdraws from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty to erect a national missile defense. Russia might then withdraw from other arms control treaties and retain multi-warhead missiles now scheduled for elimination under START II. Also, China might increase its nuclear arsenal. This would pose far greater danger to U.S. homeland security than the remote threat of a few missiles a small nation might develop years from now.

Second, heavy emphasis on unproven anti-missile technology to counter a speculative future threat from a few small nations neglects other elements of a comprehensive non-proliferation strategy. More promising methods include international monitoring of nuclear test explosions, rigorous fissile material control, stringent missile technology control, diplomacy, financial assistance to nations cooperating in nuclear non-proliferation, and countering social, economic, and political instability that provides the breeding ground for terrorist groups

Third, we are seriously concerned about budgetary implications. Since 1983 the United States has spent \$69 billion on national missile defense, enriching major defense contractors but producing no effective system. President Clinton's plan, which President Bush has criticized as inadequate, would cost \$60 billion. Indications are that the layered approach President Bush favors could cost more than \$100 billion. A budgetary commitment of this magnitude along with the tax cut now working its way through Congress would preclude achieving the goal of "Leave No Child Behind" and dealing with other urgent domestic needs.

For these reasons we ask you to urge President Bush to pull back from the dangerous rush to a premature decision on national missile defense and withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

Respectfully yours

Rev. Dr. Stan Hastey, Executive
Director
Alliance of Baptists
(organization listed for identification
only)

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

Ken Sehested, Executive Director
Baptist Peace Fellowship of North
America

David Radcliff
Director of Brethren Witness
Church of the Brethren General Board

Greg Laszakovits
Director, Washington Office
Church of the Brethren General Board

Tiffany Heath
Interim Legislative Director
Church Women United

Gary Baldrige
Global Missions Coordinator
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship

Rev. Lonnie Turner
Washington Office
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship

Joel Heim, Moderator
Disciples Peace Fellowship

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

Rev. Mark Brown, Assistant Director
International Affairs and Human Rights
Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Ronald J. Sider, President
Evangelicals for Social Action

Mary H. Miller, Executive Director
Episcopal Peace Fellowship

Murray Polner, President
Jewish Peace Fellowship

Rev. Carroll Houle
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns

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

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

Rabia Terri Harris, Coordinator
Muslim Peace Fellowship

Brenda Girton-Mitchell, JD
Assoc. General Secretary for Public
Policy
& Director of the Washington Office
National Council of Churches

Nancy Small, National Coordinator
Pax Christi, USA

Rev. Elenora Giddings Ivory
Director, Washington Office
Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.

L. William Yolton
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship

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

Rev. Meg A. Riley
Washington Office for Faith in Action
Unitarian Universalist Association

Ron Stief
Justice and Witness Ministries
United Church of Christ

Jim Winkler, General Secretary
General Board of Church and Society
United Methodist Church

William J. Price
World Peacemaker

This letter was facilitated by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC Phone/fax: 301 896-0013 mupj@igc.org

July 23, 2001

The Honorable Carl Levin

269 Russell Senate Office Building

Washington, D.C. 20510

Similar letter to all members of Senate
and House Armed Services and
Appropriations Committees

Dear Senator Levin:

Attn: Richard Fieldhouse

In the defense authorization bill for the 2002 fiscal year, President Bush is asking for \$8.3 billion for national missile defense, a 57 percent increase over the current fiscal year. We the undersigned representatives of faith-based organizations ask you to consider this request not only as a budgetary issue but also as a matter of justice and peace.

Over the centuries prophets of religion have posed the question: what does justice require? In this instance, one of the clearest answers comes from a five-star general who rose to the highest civilian office of the land, President Dwight D. Eisenhower. In an address before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 16, 1953 he stated: "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed." This statement is so important to the Eisenhower legacy that these words are engraved on the walls by his tomb in Abilene, Kansas.

The vast spending increase now proposed for national missile constitutes a theft of this nature. Since 1983 the United States has spent \$63 billion on this endeavor without technological success. Pouring more funds into this venture would in effect steal money from efforts to "Leave No Child Behind", to provide adequate health care for millions of Americans, to deal with the global HIV/AIDS crisis, and to meet other urgent social needs. This is clearly wrong and immoral.

It is doubly wrong because there is no credible threat to the American homeland from long-range missiles. Only Russia, China, the United Kingdom, and France have missiles of that range, but they are not on the danger list offered by missile defense proponents. Of the so-called "rogue" states that are said to be a threat, only North Korea has tried to develop a long-range missile. Flight testing is now suspended, and the program could be permanently terminated through diplomacy and selective financial assistance. Moreover, it is not credible that North Korea would attack the United States because of the assurance of massive retaliation. No other potentially hostile state has an effective missile program that would endanger the United States. There are numerous nonproliferation measures that can prevent them from developing one.

The beneficiaries of the national missile defense program are not the American people but rather large defense contractors. They are spending millions every year in political campaign contributions and lobbying operations to promote missile defense. This calls to mind President Eisenhower's warning in his farewell address to the American people: "In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex." You who serve on the Senate Armed Services Committee should be our guardians.

For these reasons, we ask you to cut back on authorization for national missile defense and to redirect these resources to programs that meet important human and community needs.

Sincerely yours,

Signers on next page.

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

James Matlack
Director, Washington Office
American Friends Service Committee

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

Greg Laszakovits, Coordinator
Church of the Brethren Washington
Office

Stan De Boe, OSST, Director
Office of Justice and Peace
Conference of Major Superiors of Men

Rev. Lonnie Turner
Washington Office
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship

Joel J. Heim, Moderator
Disciples Peace Fellowship.

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

David Culp
Legislative Representative
Friends Committee on National
Legislation

Ken Giles, D.C. Representative
Jewish Peace Fellowship

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

Bill Price
World Peacemakers

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

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

Bishop Walter Sullivan, President
Pax Christi USA

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

Karen M. Donahue, RSM
Issues Coordinator
Institute Justice Team
Sisters of Mercy of the Americas

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

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

Ron Stief
Justice and Witness Ministries
United Church of Christ

Bishop Melvin G. Talbert
Ecumenical Officer, Council of Bishops
United Methodist Church

James Winkler, General Secretary
General Board of Church and Society
United Methodist Church

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.

October 23, 2001

The Honorable George W. Bush
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

The campaign against terrorism is raising new and important questions about the role and future of nuclear weapons in the global security framework of the 21st century. We would like to share with you our thinking on this matter.

First, we note that some of your advisors inside and outside of government favor using nuclear weapons against terrorist enclaves and against states that possess no nuclear weapons. Some advocate use of nuclear weapons in response to attacks by chemical and biological weapons. This would reverse the long-standing U.S. policy of using nuclear weapons primarily as a tool to deter other nuclear-weapon states. We believe that the policy of the United States should be no first use of nuclear weapons against any state, nuclear or non-nuclear, or against any other adversary at any time under any circumstance. We believe that such first use would be immoral and would constitute a crime against humanity. We also believe that nuclear weapons should never be used in response to an attack by biological and chemical weapons.

Second, we note that in January 2001 the Russia Task Force chaired by Howard Baker and Lloyd Cutler stated: "The most urgent unmet national security threat to the United States today is the danger that weapons of mass destruction or weapons-usable material in Russia could be stolen and sold to terrorists or hostile nation states and used against American troops or citizens at home." The September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States emphasize the importance of this finding. Therefore, we believe that a substantial portion of anti-terrorist funds should go for full implementation of the Baker-Cutler report. In terms of relative priority, we suggest that funds be transferred from the missile defense budget to this and other urgent non-proliferation initiatives.

Third, we believe that the improved relationship between the United States and Russia because of mutual concern over terrorism should be treated as an opportunity to make substantial progress in improving the security of deployed nuclear weapons and dismantling the nuclear arsenals still in place more than a decade after the Cold War ended. Specifically we ask you to implement your campaign promise to work with Russia to de-alert and stand down the respective nuclear arsenals and to achieve deep cuts in strategic nuclear weapons. Not only will this enhance the security of the United States and Russia by lowering the possibility of accidental launch, it will also reduce the danger that a renegade group could gain control of nuclear weapon delivery vehicles and use them for terrorist attack on the United States.

We urge you to carry out these recommendations as a means of achieving a safer and more peaceful world in the 21st century.

Sincerely yours,

Representatives of religious organizations listed on next page.

James Matlack, Director
Washington Office
American Friends Service Committee

Ken Sehested, Executive Director
Baptist Peace Fellowship of North
America

Greg Davidson Laszakovits, Coordinator
Church of the Brethren Washington
Office

Tiffany Heath
Washington, D.C. Legislative Office
Church Women United

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

David Culp, Legislative Representative
Friends Committee on National
Legislation

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

Stan De Boe, OSST, Director
Office of Justice and Peace
Conference of Major Superiors of Men

Brenda Girton-Mitchell,
Associate General Secretary for Public
Witness
National Council of the Churches of
Christ in the USA

Marie Dennis
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns

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

(Ms.) Rabia Terri Harris, Coordinator
Muslim Peace Fellowship

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

Bishop Walter Sullivan, President
Bishop Tom Gumbleton, Former
President
Dave Robinson, National Coordinator
Pax Christi USA

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

Mark J. Pelavin, Associate Director
Religious Action Center of Reform
Judaism

Andrew Greenblatt, Coordinator
Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities

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

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

James Winkler, General Secretary
General Board of Church and Society
United Methodist Church

*This letter was facilitated by Howard W.
Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for
Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street,
NW, Washington, DC. Phone/fax: 301
896-0013. E-mail: mupj@igc.org*

Status: U

Return-Path: <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>

Received: from halak.pcusa.org ([65.173.210.8])

by runyon.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 171cHR1ZV3Nl3sj0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 26 Apr 2002 16:52:39 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from fire1.pcusa.org ([65.173.210.2]) by halak.pcusa.org

(Post.Office MTA v3.5.3 release 223 ID# 0-69934U100L100S0V35)

with SMTP id org for <mupj@igc.org>;

Fri, 26 Apr 2002 16:50:05 -0400

Received: from CTR-Message_Server by gerizim.ctr.lan

with Novell_GroupWise; Fri, 26 Apr 2002 17:03:00 -0400

Message-Id: <fcc98844.058@gerizim.ctr.lan>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 5.5.6.1

Date: Fri, 26 Apr 2002 16:52:20 -0400

From: "Catherine Gordon" <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>

To: <mupj@igc.org>

Subject: Re: 2001 sign-on letters

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

Thanks Howard

>>> "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> 04/26/02 04:45PM >>>

Catherine,

It's taken me a month to get around to it, but finally I'm sending as Word
attachments the three sign-on letters the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear
Disarmament did in 2001. I hope this meets your needs.

Shalom,

Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org=20

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

Status: U
Return-Path: <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Received: from web13901.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.27])
by hazard.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 171T1j6IR3NkYBY0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Sun, 28 Apr 2002 14:03:33 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <20020428180332.26848.qmail@web13901.mail.yahoo.com>
Received: from [63.208.164.39] by web13901.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Sun, 28 Apr 2002 11:03:32 PDT
Date: Sun, 28 Apr 2002 11:03:32 -0700 (PDT)
From: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Subject: Update
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
In-Reply-To: <001a01c1eb09\$020b1bc0\$1b60f7a5@default>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-71326280-1020017012=:26682"

--0-71326280-1020017012=:26682
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Howard,
I revised the site based on the changes you gave me last Thursday. I put the "Feedback" button up on top to balance the row. Without the "Feedback" button on the top row, it looks like something was missing or off-balance.

<http://www.twotonedeyes.com/zero-nukes>

I also added 2 new pages. To view them, click on the following area from the homepage:

1. The Story behind our Masthead (bottom of homepage)
2. Religious Statements (click on the button, top row of homepage)

Thanks,
Marie

Marie

Do You Yahoo!?
Yahoo! Health - your guide to health and wellness
--0-71326280-1020017012=:26682
Content-Type: text/html; charset=us-ascii

<P> Howard,
<P>I revised the site based on the changes you gave me last Thursday. I put the "Feedback" button up on top to balance the row. Without the "Feedback" button on the top row, it looks like something was missing or off-balance.
<P>http://www.twotonedeyes.com/zero-nukes
<P>I also added 2 new pages. To view them, click on the following area from the homepage:
<P>1. The Story behind our Masthead (bottom of homepage)
2. Religious Statements (click on the button, top row of homepage)
<P>Thanks,
Marie</P>

Marie

<p>
<hr size=1>Do You Yahoo!?!

Yahoo! Health - your guide to health and

wellness

--0-71326280-1020017012=:26682--

From: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
To: "Marie Kayser" marie_kayser@yahoo.com
Subject: Your Update
Date: Mon, 29 Apr 2002 16:26:23 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----
=_NextPart_000_004F_01C1EF9A.9C3C8AE0"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Marie,

I like your new masthead. We're almost there. I do, though, have some details to refine and some questions to ask. Please bear with me, for it is the details that make the site what we want it to be.

1. The colors are about right, but could the brown over the sponsors be lighter so that the printing can show clearer?
2. On my server the brown covered the sponsors only as far they showed on the screen on first viewing. In scrolling down the brown didn't continue. Also, colors of the masthead broke up as a scrolled horizontally and vertically. Is this just a peculiarity of this draft?
3. I have a 13" screen on my monitor, measured diagonally. The whole page doesn't appear horizontally and doesn't print in its total width. You said that screens are wider now and hold your total page width. You also said the page could be adjusted to the narrower width. How common are screens like mine compared to the wider ones, which I guess people are buying now. Should our page accommodate the narrow screen? This becomes important in reading text on pages with statements and reports. I'm open on this but want to talk it through.
4. On the masthead "zero-nukes" is enough without the ".org"
5. Putting "Your Feedback" on the top row of buttons is okay. However, if we should narrow the masthead it could go on the second row, arranged as: Home - Site Index - space - What's New- Your Feedback.
6. The globe. I don't like your present version. I liked the one that showed North and South America, Europe and Africa. Can you return to it but without clouds over the Atlantic Ocean?
7. Under Moderator you need an "s" in Methodists.

8. In the photo reference you have an extra space in the sunflower before the "e".

9. On the story of the masthead page I like the hands with the seedling. The photo comes out well and is effective.

10. I have re-written the text by editing what is there now and writing a new section. I am sending it as an attachment. For example, in the picture caption I want to eliminate the sentence, "All 160 should be dismantled within the next two years." That's out of date.

11. Is it necessary to carry the sponsors onto that page? I doubt it.

12. Do we need to carry the link to the Pentagon's main site? I don't think so, but I'm willing to hear a reason for doing so.

13. On the "Religious Statements" page you have a good basic layout. We can work from there.

14. I'm not sure about the picture, such as what it signifies rather than being a just design element. Maybe we should have a box with a hand plow and a pruning hook and the text:

And they shall beat their swords into plowshares,

and their spears into pruning hooks.

Nation shall not lift up sword against nation,

neither shall they learn war any more.

-- Micah 4:3.

This comes from the Hebrew Bible, which is the Christian Old Testament, and is widely known.

15. For all the pages except Home Page I would like Times Roman for the text, although you can use Arial for headings and accent pieces, such as "And they shall beat their swords...." I'm stilling thinking about what I want for The Story of Our Masthead.

I hope you don't think I'm too picky. You're doing a great job. On many of these items I don't know what I want in advance and can only react to your draft.

Shalom,

Howard

Revision of 4-28-02

The Story behind Our Masthead [note capitalization for here and home page]

When the Soviet Union dissolved, three newly independent republics, Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine, inherited an arsenal of nuclear weapons. All three chose to send the missiles and nuclear warheads to Russia and become non-nuclear states.

In January 1996 U.S. Secretary of Defense William Perry was present at the Pervomaysk missile base in Ukraine when an empty missile silo was blown up. After the hole was filled in, Secretary Perry returned and joined Ukraine and Russian defense officials in planting sunflower seeds at former missile site. After the sunflowers grew and were harvested, Perry received a bottle of sunflower oil produced from the site.

Since then the sunflower has become a symbol of the movement to abolish nuclear weapons.

[photo]

U.S. Secretary of Defense William J. Perry (right) Ukraine Minister of Defense Valeriy Shmarov (center) and Russian Federation Minister of Defense General of the Army Pavel Grachev (left) celebrate the completed dismantlement of Silo 110 by planting sunflowers in the field where the missile silo used to be near Pervomaysk, Ukraine, June 4, 1996. Silo 110 was one of 160 Ukrainian missile silos being dismantled under the Nunn-Lugar/Cooperative Threat Reduction Program. DoD photo by Petty Officer 1st Class Todd P. Cichonowicz, U.S. Navy.

[new]

Commentary

Ukraine is now safer without nuclear weapons than with them. The same with Belarus and Kazakhstan. They threaten no one, and no one threatens them. We believe that the United States and Russia would likewise be safer without nuclear weapons than they now are with their massive nuclear arsenals.

[graph: "no nukes" symbol from previous draft of masthead] President Reagan's secretary of state, George Schultz, observed that states design policy not on the basis of intentions of other states but rather on their capabilities. Even though the United

States and Russia are now said to be friends, each retains the capability of launching a massive nuclear attack on the other. Therefore, each retains its capability to retaliate. That means the cold war doctrine of mutual assured destruction remains in effect. The solution for achieving true national security for both the United States and Russia would be to mutually reduce nuclear capability to zero.

We will know that we are on our way to that goal when U.S. and Russian defense officials plant sunflower seeds on each others' former missile sites.

[Note: On the "no nukes" graphic, the line of the circle and slash might be a little thicker.]

Status: U
Return-Path: <MSperry@usccb.org>
Received: from peter.nccbuscc.org ([207.32.122.194])
by tyner.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 172dqh8dy3Nl3rs0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 29 Apr 2002 11:50:41 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from peter.nccbuscc.org (peter [207.32.122.194])
by peter.nccbuscc.org (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id LAA17704
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 29 Apr 2002 11:44:13 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from NCCB-Message_Server by usccb.org
with Novell_GroupWise; Mon, 29 Apr 2002 10:50:10 -0400
Message-Id: <scdd2562.075@usccb.org>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5.2
Date: Mon, 29 Apr 2002 11:50:49 -0400
From: "Mary Sperry" <MSperry@usccb.org>
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Cc: <Gpowers@usccb.org>
Subject: Information for web site -Reply
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Disposition: inline

Dear Mr. Hallman:

We would be happy to grant the permission you seek.

If you could send me the URL of the beta site, I will review the excerpts, =
grant the requested permission, and send you the appropriate acknowledgment=
language.

Alternatively, you can fax me mock pages at 202-541-3089.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of any assistance.

Sincerely,
Mary Elizabeth Sperry
Associate Director, Permissions
USCCB Publishing
202-541-3098
msperry@usccb.org

>>> "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> 04/26/02 08:50am >>>
Dear Jerry,

We are making progress in creation of the new web site, www.zero-nukes.org. =

On the page on Religious Statements we will have a Catholic section that
will include statements by the Holy See representatives to the United
Nations, including the latest which contains a quote from Pope John Paul =
II.

We will have a section on the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. For a

short introductory paragraph could you help me with some data. Specifically how many Catholics are there in the United States, how many dioceses, how many local churches, how many bishops?

In that section I would like to include on our site an extract from The Harvest of Peace Is Sown in Justice, specifically the section on "Unfinished Business: Nuclear Disarmament and Proliferation". May I have your permission? (Even though this section is on your web site, it is part of a much longer document and not easy to find for an inexperienced user.)

I would also like to have the "Summary" from The Challenge of Peace (1983), for it offers the essence of what the Catholic Bishops said then. We would want permission to do so. Is it available anywhere in digital format that we could have access to? This would avoid our having to copy it afresh.

Thanks for your assistance.

Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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.

Return-Path: <jbelmore@cox.net>

Received: from rly-zd05.mx.aol.com (rly-zd05.mail.aol.com [172.31.33.229]) by air-zd02.mail.aol.com (v84.16) with ESMTP id MAILINZD24-0429140508; Mon, 29 Apr 2002 14:05:08 -0400

Received: from fed1mtao04.cox.net (fed1mtao04.cox.net [68.6.19.241]) by rly-zd05.mx.aol.com (v85.3) with ESMTP id MAILRELAYINZD510-0429140440; Mon, 29 Apr 2002 14:04:40 -0400

Received: from cx974133-a ([68.7.16.56]) by fed1mtao04.cox.net (InterMail vM.5.01.04.05 201-253-122-122-105-20011231) with ESMTP id <20020429180434.SCJQ1366.fed1mtao04.cox.net@cx974133-a>; Mon, 29 Apr 2002 14:04:34 -0400

Message-Id: <4.2.2.20020429110330.00a7a4a0@pop.west.cox.net>

X-Sender: jbelmore@pop.west.cox.net

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.2.2

Date: Mon, 29 Apr 2002 11:04:59 -0700

To: slynnelmore@yahoo.com

From: Joe & Billye Elmore <jbelmore@cox.net>

Subject: Piece by Desmond Tutu

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

>

>Apartheid in the Holy Land

>Desmond Tutu

>Monday April 29, 2002

>The Guardian

>

>In our struggle against apartheid, the great supporters were Jewish people.

>They almost instinctively had to be on the side of the disenfranchised, of

>the voiceless ones, fighting injustice, oppression and evil. I have

>continued to feel strongly with the Jews. I am patron of a Holocaust centre

>in South Africa. I believe Israel has a right to secure borders.

>What is not so understandable, not justified, is what it did to another

>people to guarantee its existence. I've been very deeply distressed in my

>visit to the Holy Land; it reminded me so much of what happened to us black

>people in South Africa. I have seen the humiliation of the Palestinians at

>checkpoints and roadblocks, suffering like us when young white police

>officers prevented us from moving about.

>

>On one of my visits to the Holy Land I drove to a church with the Anglican

>bishop in Jerusalem. I could hear tears in his voice as he pointed to Jewish

>settlements. I thought of the desire of Israelis for security. But what of

>the Palestinians who have lost their land and homes?

>

>I have experienced Palestinians pointing to what were their homes, now

>occupied by Jewish Israelis. I was walking with Canon Naim Ateek (the head

>of the Sabeel Ecumenical Centre) in Jerusalem. He pointed and said: "Our

>home was over there. We were driven out of our home; it is now occupied by

>Israeli Jews."

>

>My heart aches. I say why are our memories so short. Have our Jewish sisters

>and brothers forgotten their humiliation? Have they forgotten the collective

>punishment, the home demolitions, in their own history so soon? Have they

>turned their backs on their profound and noble religious traditions? Have

>they forgotten that God cares deeply about the downtrodden?

>

>Israel will never get true security and safety through oppressing another
>people. A true peace can ultimately be built only on justice. We condemn the
>violence of suicide bombers, and we condemn the corruption of young minds
>taught hatred; but we also condemn the violence of military incursions in
>the occupied lands, and the inhumanity that won't let ambulances reach the
>injured.

>

>The military action of recent days, I predict with certainty, will not
>provide the security and peace Israelis want; it will only intensify the
>hatred.

>

>Israel has three options: revert to the previous stalemated situation;
>exterminate all Palestinians; or - I hope - to strive for peace based on
>justice, based on withdrawal from all the occupied territories, and the
>establishment of a viable Palestinian state on those territories side by
>side with Israel, both with secure borders.

>

>We in South Africa had a relatively peaceful transition. If our madness
>could end as it did, it must be possible to do the same everywhere else in
>the world. If peace could come to South Africa, surely it can come to the
>Holy Land?

>

>My brother Naim Ateek has said what we used to say: "I am not pro- this
>people or that. I am pro-justice, pro-freedom. I am anti- injustice,
>anti-oppression."

>

>But you know as well as I do that, somehow, the Israeli government is placed
>on a pedestal [in the US], and to criticise it is to be immediately dubbed
>anti-semitic, as if the Palestinians were not semitic. I am not even
>anti-white, despite the madness of that group. And how did it come about
>that Israel was collaborating with the apartheid government on security
>measures?

>

>People are scared in this country [the US], to say wrong is wrong because
>the Jewish lobby is powerful - very powerful. Well, so what? For goodness
>sake, this is God's world! We live in a moral universe. The apartheid
>government was very powerful, but today it no longer exists. Hitler,
>Mussolini, Stalin, Pinochet, Milosevic, and Idi Amin were all powerful, but
>in the end they bit the dust.

>

>Injustice and oppression will never prevail. Those who are powerful have to
>remember the litmus test that God gives to the powerful: what is your
>treatment of the poor, the hungry, the voiceless? And on the basis of that,
>God passes judgment.

>

>We should put out a clarion call to the government of the people of Israel,
>to the Palestinian people and say: peace is possible, peace based on justice
>is possible. We will do all we can to assist you to achieve this peace,
>because it is God's dream, and you will be able to live amicably together as
>sisters and brothers.

>

>Desmond Tutu is the former Archbishop of Cape Town and chairman of South

>Africa's truth and reconciliation commission. This address was given at a
>conference on Ending the Occupation held in Boston, Massachusetts, earlier
>this month. A longer version appears in the current edition of Church Times.

>
>
>
>

Status: U

Return-Path: <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Received: from web13904.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.67])

by strange.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 172hY83bR3NI3oW0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 29 Apr 2002 16:41:56 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020429204157.60244.qmail@web13904.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [63.215.154.82] by web13904.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Mon, 29 Apr 2002 13:41:57 PDT

Date: Mon, 29 Apr 2002 13:41:57 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: Your Update

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

In-Reply-To: <005301c1efbc\$34434b00\$9261f7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-1528242153-1020112917=:56630"

--0-1528242153-1020112917=:56630

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Hi,

Don't worry about the making suggestions or changes. I am looking to you for direction so the more feedback I get, the better and easier it is for me.

I will respond to your questions later and make the necessary changes.

Best,

Marie

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

Marie,

I like your new masthead. We're almost there. I do, though, have some details to refine and some questions to ask. Please bear with me, for it is the details that make the site what we want it to be.

1. The colors are about right, but could the brown over the sponsors be lighter so that the printing can show clearer?
2. On my server the brown covered the sponsors only as far they showed on the screen on first viewing. In scrolling down the brown didn't continue. Also, colors of the masthead broke up as a scrolled horizontally and vertically. Is this just a peculiarity of this draft?
3. I have a 13" screen on my monitor, measured diagonally. The whole page doesn't appear horizontally and doesn't print in its total width. You said that screens are wider now and hold your total page width. You also said the page could be adjusted to the narrower width. How common are screens like mine compared to the wider ones, which I guess people are buying now. Should our page accommodate the narrow screen? This becomes important in reading text on pages with statements and reports. I'm open on this but want to talk it through.
4. On the masthead "zero-nukes" is enough without the ".org"
5. Putting "Your Feedback" on the top row of buttons is okay. However, if we should narrow the masthead it could go on the second row, arranged as: Home - Site Index - space - What's New- Your Feedback.
6. The globe. I don't like your present version. I liked the one that showed North and South America, Europe and Africa. Can you return to it but without clouds over the Atlantic Ocean?
7. Under Moderator you need an "s" in Methodists.

8. In the photo reference you have an extra space in the sunflower before the "e".
9. On the story of the masthead page I like the hands with the seedling. The photo comes out well and is effective.
10. I have re-written the text by editing what is there now and writing a new section. I am sending it as an attachment. For example, in the picture caption I want to eliminate the sentence, "All 160 should be dismantled within the next two years." That's out of date.
11. Is it necessary to carry the sponsors onto that page? I doubt it.
12. Do we need to carry the link to the Pentagon's main site? I don't think so, but I'm willing to hear a reason for doing so.
13. On the "Religious Statements" page you have a good basic layout. We can work from there.
14. I'm not sure about the picture, such as what it signifies rather than being a just design element. Maybe we should have a box with a hand plow and a pruning hook and the text:

And they shall beat their swords into plowshares,

and their spears into pruning hooks.

Nation shall not lift up sword against nation,

neither shall they learn war any more.

-- Micah 4:3.

This comes from the Hebrew Bible, which is the Christian Old Testament, and is widely known.

15. For all the pages except Home Page I would like Times Roman for the text, although you can use Arial for headings and accent pieces, such as "And they shall beat their swords...." I'm stilling thinking about what I want for The Story of Our Masthead.

I hope you don't think I'm too picky. You're doing a great job. On many of these items I don't know what I want in advance and can only react to your draft.

Shalom,

Howard

> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword name=The Story behind Our Masthead.doc i

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Health - your guide to health and wellness

--0-1528242153-1020112917=:56630

Content-Type: text/html; charset=us-ascii

<P> Hi,
<P>Don't worry about the making suggestions or changes. I am looking to you for direction so the more feedback I get, the better and easier it is for me.

<P>I will respond to your questions later and make the necessary changes.

<P>Best,
Marie

<P> <I>"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org></I>
wrote:

<BLOCKQUOTE style="BORDER-LEFT: #1010ff 2px solid; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px"><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN">

<META content="MSHTML 4.72.3110.7" name=GENERATOR>

<DIV>

<P>Marie,</P>

<P>I like your new masthead. We're almost there. I do, though, have some details to refine and some questions to ask. Please bear with me, for it is the details that make the site what we want it to be.</P>

<P>1. The colors are about right, but could the brown over the sponsors be lighter so that the printing can show clearer?</P>

<P>2. On my server the brown covered the sponsors only as far they showed on the screen on first viewing. In scrolling down the brown didn't continue. Also, colors of the masthead broke up as a scrolled horizontally and vertically. Is this just a peculiarity of this draft?</P>

<P>3. I have a 13" screen on my monitor, measured diagonally. The whole page doesn't appear horizontally and doesn't print in its total width. You said that screens are wider now and hold your total page width. You also said the page could be adjusted to the narrower width. How common are screens like mine compared to the wider ones, which I guess people are buying now. Should our page accommodate the narrow screen? This becomes important in reading text on pages with statements and reports. I'm open on this but want to talk it through.</P>

<P>4. On the masthead "zero-nukes" is enough without the ".org"</P>

<P>5. Putting "Your Feedback" on the top row of buttons is okay. However, if we should narrow the masthead it could go on the second row, arranged as: Home - Site Index - space - What's New- Your Feedback.</P>

<P>6. The globe. I don't like your present version. I liked the one that showed North and South America, Europe and Africa. Can you return to it but without clouds over the Atlantic Ocean?</P>

<P>7. Under Moderator you need an "s" in Methodists.</P>

<P>8. In the photo reference you have an extra space in the sunflower before the "e".</P>

<P>9. On the story of the masthead page I like the hands with the seedling. The photo comes out well and is effective.</P>

<P>10. I have re-written the text by editing what is there now and writing a new section. I am sending it as an attachment. For example, in the picture caption I want to eliminate the sentence, "All 160 should be dismantled within the next two years." That's out of date. </P>

<P>11. Is it necessary to carry the sponsors onto that page? I doubt it.</P>

<P>12. Do we need to carry the link to the Pentagon's main site? I don't think so, but I'm willing to hear a reason for doing so.</P>

<P>13. On the "Religious Statements" page you have a good basic layout. We can work from there.</P>

<P>14. I'm not sure about the picture, such as what it signifies rather than being a just design element. Maybe we should have a box with a hand plow and a pruning hook and the text:</P>

<P>And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, </P>

<P>and their spears into pruning hooks.</P>

<P>Nation shall not lift up sword against nation,</P>

<P>neither shall they learn war any more.</P>

<P>-- Micah 4:3.</P>

<P>This comes from the Hebrew Bible, which is the Christian Old Testament, and is widely known.</P>

<P>15. For all the pages except Home Page I would like Times Roman for the text, although you can use Arial for headings and accent pieces, such as "And they shall beat their swords...." I'm stilling thinking about what I want for The Story of Our Masthead.</P>

<P>I hope you don't think I'm too picky. You're doing a great job. On many of these items I don't know what I want in advance and can only react to your draft.</P>

<P>Shalom,</P>

<P>Howard</P>

<P></P></DIV>

<BLOCKQUOTE style="BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px">

<DIV> </DIV></BLOCKQUOTE>> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword name=The Story behind Our Masthead.doc </BLOCKQUOTE>
<p>
<hr size=1>Do You Yahoo!?!

Yahoo! Health - your guide to health and wellness
--0-1528242153-1020112917=:56630--

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Mary Sperry" <MSperry@usccb.org>
Subject: Re: Information for web site -Reply
Date: Tue, 30 Apr 2002 15:22:20 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_000F_01C1F05A.D3F5AAA0"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Dear Ms. Sperry,

Dear

Thanks for your offer to help us work out permission to use excerpts from statements by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops on our new web site, www.zero-nukes.org. I'm new at web site design and don't know all the terminology yet. For instance, I don't know what a beta site is.

Therefore, I am sending you as a Word attachment what we want to use from USCCB. First, the summary pages from The Challenge of Peace (1983). Second, an excerpt from The Harvest of Justice (1993) that deals with nuclear disarmament. We will use whatever language of permission you supply.

The latter excerpt we have taken from your web site, to which we will refer for the entire document. For the former I'm wondering if it is available any place on a computer disk or hard drive where we could get a copy. That would help us avoid typing it afresh. However, we will do so if necessary because it is a landmark document.

We are still designing our web site. If you want a peek at the home page in its current form (it changes daily), you can see the draft prepared by our web designer at www.twotonedeyes.com/zero-nukes. It also has the beginning of the page on Religious Statements.

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

Shalom,
Howard Hallman

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

From: Mary Sperry <MSperry@usccb.org>
To: mupj@igc.org <mupj@igc.org>
Cc: Gpowers@usccb.org <Gpowers@usccb.org>
Date: Monday, April 29, 2002 11:50 AM

Subject: Information for web site -Reply

Dear Mr. Hallman:

We would be happy to grant the permission you seek.

If you could send me the URL of the beta site, I will review the excerpts, grant the requested permission, and send you the appropriate acknowledgment language.

Alternatively, you can fax me mock pages at 202-541-3089.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of any assistance.

Sincerely,
Mary Elizabeth Sperry
Associate Director, Permissions
USCCB Publishing
202-541-3098
msperry@usccb.org

"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> 04/26/02 08:50am >>>

Dear Jerry,

We are making progress in creation of the new web site, www.zero-nukes.org.

On the page on Religious Statements we will have a Catholic section that will include statements by the Holy See representatives to the United Nations, including the latest which contains a quote from Pope John Paul II.

We will have a section on the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. For a short introductory paragraph could you help me with some data. Specifically how many Catholics are there in the United States, how many dioceses, how many local churches, how many bishops?

In that section I would like to include on our site an extract from The Harvest of Peace Is Sown in Justice, specifically the section on "Unfinished Business: Nuclear Disarmament and Proliferation". May I have your permission? (Even though this section is on your web site, it is part of a much longer document and not easy to find for an inexperienced user.)

I would also like to have the "Summary" from The Challenge of Peace (1983), for it offers the essence of what the Catholic Bishops said then. We would want permission to do so. Is it available anywhere in digital format that we could have access to? This would avoid our having to copy it afresh.

Thanks for your assistance.

Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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.

U.S Conference of Catholic Bishops

[Import logo from web site: www.usccb.org]. The Catholic Church with 60 million members and 19,200 local parishes is the largest religious body in the United States. Oversight is provided by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), which represents 300 active and about 100 bishops, who are appointed by the pope. The bishops serve as the heads of 194 dioceses in the United States.

The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response

A Pastoral Letter on War and Peace

[PDF document]

In November 1980 the National Conference of Bishops (as it was then known) appointed a committee of bishops, chaired by Cardinal Joseph Bernardin, to draft a pastoral letter on war and peace. The bishops reviewed two drafts and adopted the third and final draft on May 3, 1983. A substantial part of this pastoral letter focuses on nuclear weapons. The summary is presented below. The complete pastoral letter, The Challenge of Peace, is available from USCCB at 800 235-8722, order number 863-0.

[Possibly a photo of Cardinal Bernardin or the drafting committee]

Summary

[pp. i-viii]

[Two side bars, say at one-third and two-thirds through the text.

"No *use* of nuclear weapons which would violate the principle of discrimination or proportionality may be *intended* in a strategy of deterrence."

"In the words of our Holy Father, we need a 'moral about-face.' The whole world must summon the moral courage and technical means to say no to nuclear conflict; no to weapons of mass destruction; no to an arms race which robs the poor and the vulnerable; and no to the moral danger of a nuclear age which places before humankind indefensible choices of constant terror or surrender."

The Harvest of Justice is Sown in Peace

A Reflection of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops

on the Tenth Anniversary of The Challenge of Peace

[PDF document]

Ten years after issuing The Challenge of Peace the National Conference of Catholic Bishops reviewed the findings of the 1983 pastoral letter and offered their reflections. The Harvest of Justice [<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/harvest.htm>] is available on the web site of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. The section dealing with nuclear disarmament is presented below with permission.

[Perhaps a photo of a wheat field inserted into the above paragraph.]

[At appropriate locations, two side bars:

"We must continue to say No to the very idea of nuclear war."
"The eventual elimination of nuclear weapons is more than a moral ideal; it should be a policy goal."

1.Unfinished Business: Nuclear Disarmament and Proliferation.

[change margins to be like above]

Our 1983 pastoral letter focused special attention on the morality of nuclear weapons at a time of widespread fear of nuclear war. Only ten years later, the threat of global nuclear war may seem more remote than at any time in the nuclear age, but we may be facing a different but still dangerous period in which the use of nuclear weapons remains a significant threat. We cannot address questions of war and peace today, therefore, without acknowledging that the nuclear question remains of vital political and moral significance.

The end of the Cold War has changed the nuclear question in three ways. First, nuclear weapons are still an integral component of U.S. security policies, but they are no longer at the center of these policies or of international relations. In 1983, a dominant concern was the ethics of nuclear weapons. Today, this concern, while still critically important, must be considered in the context of a more fundamental question of the ethical foundations of political order: How do we achieve *Pacem in Terris*' vision of a just and stable political order, so that nations will no longer rely on nuclear weapons for their security? Second, we have new opportunities to take steps toward progressive nuclear disarmament. In 1983, the first task was to stop the growth of already bloated nuclear arsenals; today, the moral task is to proceed with deep cuts and ultimately to abolish these weapons entirely. Third, the threat of global nuclear war has been replaced by a threat of global nuclear proliferation. In addition to the declared nuclear powers, a number of other countries have or could very quickly deploy nuclear weapons, and still other nations, or even

terrorist groups, might seek to obtain or develop nuclear weapons. Just as the nuclear powers must prevent nuclear war, so also they, with the rest of the international community, bear a heavy moral responsibility to stop the spread of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons.

a. The Moral Judgment on Deterrence. In 1983, we judged that nuclear deterrence may be morally acceptable as long as it is limited to deterring nuclear use by others; sufficiency, not nuclear superiority, is its goal; and it is used as a step on the way toward progressive disarmament.

Some believe that this judgment remains valid, since significant progress has been made in reducing nuclear weapons, including the most destabilizing ones, while at least some of those that remain are still necessary to deter existing nuclear threats. Others point to the end of the Soviet threat and the apparent unwillingness of the nuclear powers to accept the need to eliminate nuclear weapons as reasons for abandoning our strictly conditioned moral acceptance of nuclear deterrence. They also cite the double standard inherent in nonproliferation efforts: What is the moral basis for asking other nations to forego nuclear weapons if we continue to judge our own deterrent to be morally necessary?

We believe our judgment of 1983 that nuclear deterrence is morally acceptable only under certain strict conditions remains a useful guide for evaluating the continued moral status of nuclear weapons in a post-Cold War world. It is useful because it

acknowledges the fundamental moral dilemmas still posed by nuclear weapons, and it reflects the progress toward fulfilling the conditions we elaborated in 1983. At the same time, it highlights the new prospects — and thus the added moral urgency — of making even more dramatic progress in arms control and disarmament as the only basis for the continued moral legitimacy of deterrence.

b.A Post-Cold War Agenda For Nuclear Disarmament. While significant progress has been made in recent years, we believe additional steps are needed if nuclear policies and priorities are to keep up with the dramatic changes in world politics and if our nation is to move away from relying on nuclear deterrence as a basis for its security. Present challenges include the following:

The Role of Nuclear Weapons: We must continue to say No to the very idea of nuclear war. A minimal nuclear deterrent may be justified only to deter the use of nuclear weapons. The United States should commit itself never to use nuclear weapons first, should unequivocally reject proposals to use nuclear weapons to deter any nonnuclear threats, and should reinforce the fragile barrier against the use of these weapons. Indeed, we abhor any use of nuclear weapons.

Arms Control and Disarmament: Nuclear deterrence may be justified only as a step on the way toward progressive disarmament. The end of the Cold War, according to the

Holy See, "challenge[s] the world community to adopt a post-nuclear form of security. That security lies in the abolition of nuclear weapons and the strengthening of international law." A first step toward this goal would be prompt ratification and implementation of the START I and START II treaties. Even once these treaties are fully implemented, there will still be more than 10,000 nuclear weapons in the world, containing explosive power hundreds of thousands times greater than the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Therefore, much deeper cuts are both possible and necessary. The eventual elimination of nuclear weapons is more than a moral ideal; it should be a policy goal.

The negotiation of a verifiable comprehensive test ban treaty would not only demonstrate our commitment to this goal, but also would improve our moral credibility in urging nonnuclear nations to forego the development of nuclear weapons. We, therefore, support a halt to nuclear testing as our nation pursues an effective global test ban and renewal of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Also, steps must be taken to reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism. We must reverse the spread of nuclear technologies and materials. We welcome, therefore, U.S. efforts to achieve a global ban on the production of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons. Finally, one should not underestimate the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency as a forum for the

discussion of these issues and as a force encouraging nations to take the steps necessary in this area.

Cooperative Security and a Just International Order:

The nuclear powers may justify, and then only temporarily, their nuclear deterrents only if they use their power and resources to lead in the construction of a more just and stable international order. An essential part of this international order must be a collective security framework that reverses the proliferation of nuclear weapons, guarantees the security of nonnuclear states and ultimately seeks to make nuclear weapons and war itself obsolete. The United States and other nations should also make the investments necessary to help ensure the development of stable, democratic governments in nations which have nuclear weapons or might seek to obtain them.

An active commitment by the United States to nuclear disarmament and the strengthening of collective security is the only moral basis for temporarily retaining our deterrent and our insistence that other nations forego these weapons. We advocate disarmament by example: careful but clear steps to reduce and end our dependence on weapons of mass destruction.

In our five-year report on *The Challenge of Peace*, we said: "To contain the nuclear danger of our time is itself an awesome undertaking. To reshape the political fabric of an increasingly interdependent world is an

even larger and more complicated challenge." Now, on this tenth anniversary, we must be engaged in the difficult task of envisioning a future rooted in peace, with new institutions for resolving differences between nations, new global structures of mediation and conflict-resolution and a world order that has moved beyond nuclear weapons once and for all. We are committed to join in this struggle, to bring the Gospel message of justice and peace to this vital work.

Status: U
Return-Path: <todd@storyxchange.com>
Received: from server1.dataroad.net ([64.49.223.88])
by bissell.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 171hZs3ml3NI3rE0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 26 Apr 2002 22:31:09 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from Default (ca-hermosa4b-55.stmnca.adelphia.net [24.50.64.55]) (may be forged)
(authenticated (0 bits))
by server1.dataroad.net (8.11.3/8.11.3) with ESMTTP id g3R2V9V04416
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 26 Apr 2002 21:31:09 -0500
From: "Todd" <todd@storyxchange.com>
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: "Lead, Kindly Light"
Date: Fri, 26 Apr 2002 19:30:19 -0700
Message-ID: <NFBBJLMNKLDJHDMFAFKHPIEJKCGAA.todd@storyxchange.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_001B_01C1ED58.CD784200"
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 V5.00.2615.200

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_001B_01C1ED58.CD784200

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Mr. Howard Hallman

Dear Howard,

I wanted to let you know that I heard from Ellen Feig at Green/Epstein/Bacino regarding your screenplay, and she has received it. If you have any other questions or concerns, please let me know.

Thank you for using storyXchange!

Sincerely,

Todd Koerner
storyXchange

(310) 379-3014
www.storyxchange.com <<http://www.storyxchange.com/>>
"...because everyone has a story to tell."

-----_NextPart_000_001B_01C1ED58.CD784200

Content-Type: text/html;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```
<html xmlns:o=3D"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" =  
xmlns:w=3D"urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:word" =  
xmlns=3D"http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-html40">
```

```
<head>
```

```
<meta http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =  
charset=3Diso-8859-1">
```

```
<meta name=3DProgId content=3DWord.Document>
```

```
<meta name=3DGenerator content=3D"Microsoft Word 9">
```

```
<meta name=3DOriginator content=3D"Microsoft Word 9">
```

```
<link rel=3DFile-List href=3D"cid:filelist.xml@01C1ED58.C9046D20">
```

```
<!--[if gte mso 9]><xml>
```

```
<o:OfficeDocumentSettings>
```

```
<o:DoNotRelyOnCSS/>
```

```
</o:OfficeDocumentSettings>
```

```
</xml><![endif]--><!--[if gte mso 9]><xml>
```

```
<w:WordDocument>
```

```
<w:View>Normal</w:View>
```

```
<w:Zoom>0</w:Zoom>
```

```
<w:DocumentKind>DocumentEmail</w:DocumentKind>
```

```
<w:EnvelopeVis/>
```

```
</w:WordDocument>
```

```
</xml><![endif]-->
```

```
<style>
```

```
<!--
```

```
/* Style Definitions */
```

```
p.MsoNormal, li.MsoNormal, div.MsoNormal
```

```
{ mso-style-parent:"";
```

```
margin:0in;
```

```
margin-bottom:.0001pt;
```

```
mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
```

```
font-size:10.0pt;
```

```
font-family:Arial;
```

```
mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";
```

```
mso-bidi-font-family:"Times New Roman";}
```

```
a:link, span.MsoHyperlink
```

```
{ color:blue;
```

```
text-decoration:underline;
```

```
text-underline:single;}
```

```
a:visited, span.MsoHyperlinkFollowed
```

```
{ color:purple;
```

```
text-decoration:underline;
```

```
text-underline:single;}
```

```
p.MsoAutoSig, li.MsoAutoSig, div.MsoAutoSig
```

```
{ margin:0in;
```

```
margin-bottom:.0001pt;
```

```
mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
```

```
font-size:10.0pt;
```

```
font-family:Arial;
```

```
mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";
```

```
mso-bidi-font-family:"Times New Roman";}
```

```
span.EmailStyle15
```

```
{ mso-style-type:personal-compose;
mso-ansi-font-size:10.0pt;
mso-ascii-font-family:Arial;
mso-hansi-font-family:Arial;
mso-bidi-font-family:Arial;
color:black;}
```

```
@page Section1
```

```
{ size:8.5in 11.0in;
margin:1.0in 1.25in 1.0in 1.25in;
mso-header-margin:.5in;
mso-footer-margin:.5in;
mso-paper-source:0;}
```

```
div.Section1
```

```
{ page:Section1;}
```

```
-->
```

```
</style>
```

```
</head>
```

```
<body lang=3DEN-US link=3Dblue vlink=3Dpurple =
style=3D'tab-interval:.5in'>
```

```
<div class=3DSection1>
```

```
<p class=3DMsoNormal><span class=3DEmailStyle15><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span style=3D'font-size:10.0pt'>Mr. Howard =
Hallman<o:p></o:p></span></font></span></p>
```

```
<p class=3DMsoNormal><span class=3DEmailStyle15><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span style=3D'font-size:10.0pt'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]>&nbsp;<![endif]><o:p></o:p></span></font></span></p>
```

```
<p class=3DMsoNormal><span class=3DEmailStyle15><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span style=3D'font-size:10.0pt'>Dear =
Howard,<o:p></o:p></span></font></span></p>
```

```
<p class=3DMsoNormal><span class=3DEmailStyle15><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span style=3D'font-size:10.0pt'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas]>&nbsp;<![endif]><o:p></o:p></span></font></span></p>
```

```
<p class=3DMsoNormal><span class=3DEmailStyle15><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><span style=3D'font-size:10.0pt'>I wanted to let you know =
that I heard
from Ellen Feig at </span></font></span><font color=3Dblack><span
style=3D'mso-bidi-font-family:Arial;color:black'>Green/Epstein/Bacino =
regarding
your screenplay, and she has received it.<span style=3D"mso-spacerun: =
yes">&nbsp;</span>
</span>If you have any other questions or concerns, please let me =
know.</span></font><font
```

color=3Dblack><span =
style=3D'mso-bidi-font-family:Arial;color:black;mso-color-alt:
windowtext'><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><span =
style=3D'font-size:
10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-family:Arial;color:black'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas] <![endif]><font
color=3Dblack><span =
style=3D'mso-bidi-font-family:Arial;color:black;mso-color-alt:
windowtext'><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><span =
style=3D'font-size:
10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-family:Arial;color:black'>Thank you for using
storyXchange!<span =
style=3D'mso-bidi-font-family:
Arial;color:black;mso-color-alt:windowtext'><o:p></o:p></p>=

<p class=3DMsoNormal><span =
style=3D'font-size:
10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-family:Arial;color:black'><![if =
!supportEmptyParas] <![endif]><font
color=3Dblack><span =
style=3D'mso-bidi-font-family:Arial;color:black;mso-color-alt:
windowtext'><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><span =
style=3D'font-size:
10.0pt;mso-bidi-font-family:Arial;color:black'>Sincerely,<span
class=3DEmailStyle15><font =
color=3Dblack><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoNormal><font size=3D2 =
color=3Dblack
face=3DArial><![if =
!supportEmptyParas] <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig><!--[if supportFields]><span=20
style=3D'color:black'><span =
style=3D'mso-element:field-begin'><span=20
style=3D'mso-spacerun: yes"> AUTOTEXTLIST \s "E-mail=20
Signature" <span =
style=3D'mso-element:field-separator'><![endif]--><f=
ont
color=3Dblack><span =
style=3D'mso-bidi-font-family:Arial;color:black'>Todd =
Koerner<font
color=3Dblack><span =
style=3D'mso-bidi-font-family:Arial;color:black;mso-color-alt:
windowtext'><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig><i><font size=3D2 color=3Dblack =

face=3DArial>story</i>Xchange<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig><![if !supportEmptyParas] <![endif]><o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig>(310) = 379-3014<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig>www.storyxchange.com<o:p></o:p></p>

<p class=3DMsoAutoSig>"...because everyone has a story to tell."<o:p></o:p></p>=

<p class=3DMsoNormal><!--[if supportFields]><span=20 style=3D'color:black'><![endif]><![if !supportEmptyParas] <![endif]><o:p></o:p><= /p>

</div>

</body>

</html>

-----=_NextPart_000_001B_01C1ED58.CD784200--

Status: U

Return-Path: <david@fcnl.org>

Received: from local.fcnl.org ([65.207.12.2])

by nils.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 172DW71oV3Nl3pm0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 30 Apr 2002 16:09:17 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by local.fcnl.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <2LYPD0ZR>; Tue, 30 Apr 2002 16:03:28 -0400

Message-ID: <E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF6A856F6@local.fcnl.org>

From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>

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

Subject: Rhode Island Action Alert

Date: Tue, 30 Apr 2002 16:03:27 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

RHODE ISLAND: Legislative Action Alert

The following action items from the Friends Committee on National
Legislation (FCNL), a Quaker lobby based in Washington, D.C.

R.I. SEN. JACK REED TO DECIDE ON NEW NUCLEAR WARHEAD

In its FY 2003 budget request, the Bush administration is asking for
\$15.5 million for a study of the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP).
The RNEP would be designed to destroy hardened and deeply buried targets
such as bunkers containing chemical and biological weapons.

Because of its lower yield and earth penetrating capability, the RNEP is
considered to be a more "useable" nuclear weapon than large yield,
"strategic" nuclear weapons. However, reports by scientists indicate
that the RNEP is far from being a "clean" weapon. If detonated in an
urban setting, 10,000 to 50,000 people would receive a fatal dose of
radiation within the first 24 hrs. This does not take into account
traumatic injuries arising from the extreme pressures of the blast or
thermal injuries arising from the heat of the explosion. Nor does the
casualty estimate consider the consequences of fires and the collapse of
buildings from the seismic shock that the explosion would produce.

Moreover, proceeding with the production of RNEPs would significantly
undermine the global non-proliferation regime because the obvious
targets for these weapons are non-nuclear weapon states. The Nuclear
Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) prohibits the use of nuclear weapons
against such states.

The Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Strategic will be considering
the new nuclear weapon the week of May 6 as part of the defense
authorization bill. The chairman of the subcommittee is Sen. Jack Reed
of Rhode Island. He is likely to be the deciding Senator on the issue.

ACTION: Immediately contact Sen. Jack Reed (D-R.I.). Because of delays in the mail to the U.S. Capitol, messages must be sent by telephone or by fax to Sen. Reed's Washington office. His telephone number is (202) 224-4680. His fax number is (202) 224-4680. The message should be to the attention of his defense aide, Liz King.

BACKGROUND: The U.S. introduced an earth-penetrating nuclear weapon in 1997, the B61, modification 11. The B61-11 modified a nuclear explosive from an earlier bomb by putting it into a hardened steel casing with a new nose cone to provide ground penetration capability. The deployment was controversial because of official U.S. policy not to develop new nuclear weapons. The Department of Energy and the national weapons labs have consistently argued, however, that the B61-11 was merely a "modification" of an older delivery system because it used an existing warhead.

According to Dr. Rob Nelson of the Federation of American Scientists, "The earth-penetrating capability of the B61-11 is fairly limited...Tests show it penetrates only 20 feet or so into dry earth when dropped from an altitude of 40,000 feet. Even so, by burying itself into the ground before detonation, a much higher proportion of the explosion energy is transferred to ground shock compared to a surface bursts. Any attempt to use it in an urban environment, however, would result in massive civilian casualties. Even at the low end of its 0.3-300 kiloton yield range, the nuclear blast would simply blow out a huge crater of radioactive material, creating a lethal gamma-radiation field over a large area." (For more information, visit <<http://www.fas.org/faspir/2001/v54n1/weapons.htm>>.)

The development of a Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator would also have disastrous consequences for the international arms control regime. A nuclear weapon designed for battlefield use would increase the perception that nuclear weapons were as usable as any other part of the U.S. conventional weapons arsenal and that the U.S. was preparing to use them. If the U.S. proceeds with these weapons, other nations with far less conventional capability will seek to deter a U.S. attack by developing their own weapons of mass destruction, most likely chemical or biological weapons.

The U.S. and other nuclear weapon states pledged in 1995, not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapons states (with certain exceptions), as an inducement for those non-nuclear weapon states to agree to extend, indefinitely, the NPT. Therefore, the development or testing of these weapons would be a de facto repudiation of these assurances. To quote Rep. Markey in his letter, "the RNEPs may offer marginal military benefits at best while imposing major costs and risks."

P.S. Because the urgency of the message, we ask that you forward this e-mail to five (or more) of your friends in Rhode Island. Thanks!

###

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <dwhite12@earthlink.net>
Subject: Fw: Rhode Island Action Alert
Date: Wed, 1 May 2002 08:05:13 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Dale,

This may reach you at the time of the Council of Bishops meeting. But if you have a chance, please get in touch with Senator Reed and urge others in Rhode Island to do likewise.

Shalom,
Howard

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

From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>
To: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
Date: Tuesday, April 30, 2002 4:09 PM
Subject: Rhode Island Action Alert

>RHODE ISLAND: Legislative Action Alert

>

>

>The following action items from the Friends Committee on National
>Legislation (FCNL), a Quaker lobby based in Washington, D.C.

>

>

>R.I. SEN. JACK REED TO DECIDE ON NEW NUCLEAR WARHEAD

>

>

>In its FY 2003 budget request, the Bush administration is asking for
>\$15.5 million for a study of the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP).
>The RNEP would be designed to destroy hardened and deeply buried targets
>such as bunkers containing chemical and biological weapons.

>

>Because of its lower yield and earth penetrating capability, the RNEP is
>considered to be a more "useable" nuclear weapon than large yield,
>"strategic" nuclear weapons. However, reports by scientists indicate
>that the RNEP is far from being a "clean" weapon. If detonated in an
>urban setting, 10,000 to 50,000 people would receive a fatal dose of
>radiation within the first 24 hrs. This does not take into account
>traumatic injuries arising from the extreme pressures of the blast or
>thermal injuries arising from the heat of the explosion. Nor does the
>casualty estimate consider the consequences of fires and the collapse of

>buildings from the seismic shock that the explosion would produce.

>

>Moreover, proceeding with the production of RNEPs would significantly
>undermine the global non-proliferation regime because the obvious
>targets for these weapons are non-nuclear weapon states. The Nuclear
>Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) prohibits the use of nuclear weapons
>against such states.

>

>The Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Strategic will be considering
>the new nuclear weapon the week of May 6 as part of the defense
>authorization bill. The chairman of the subcommittee is Sen. Jack Reed
>of Rhode Island. He is likely to be the deciding Senator on the issue.

>

>

>ACTION: Immediately contact Sen. Jack Reed (D-R.I.). Because of
>delays in the mail to the U.S. Capitol, messages must be sent by
>telephone or by fax to Sen. Reed's Washington office. His
>telephone number is (202) 224-4680. His fax number is (202)
>224-4680. The message should be to the attention of his defense
>aide, Liz King.

>

>

>BACKGROUND: The U.S. introduced an earth-penetrating nuclear weapon in
>1997, the B61, modification 11. The B61-11 modified a nuclear explosive
>from an earlier bomb by putting it into a hardened steel casing with a
>new nose cone to provide ground penetration capability. The deployment
>was controversial because of official U.S. policy not to develop new
>nuclear weapons. The Department of Energy and the national weapons labs
>have consistently argued, however, that the B61-11 was merely a
>"modification" of an older delivery system because it used an existing
>warhead.

>

>According to Dr. Rob Nelson of the Federation of American
>Scientists, "The earth-penetrating capability of the B61-11 is
>fairly limited...Tests show it penetrates only 20 feet or so into
>dry earth when dropped from an altitude of 40,000 feet. Even so,
>by burying itself into the ground before detonation, a much
>higher proportion of the explosion energy is transferred to
>ground shock compared to a surface bursts. Any attempt to use it
>in an urban environment, however, would result in massive
>civilian casualties. Even at the low end of its 0.3-300 kiloton
>yield range, the nuclear blast would simply blow out a huge
>crater of radioactive material, creating a lethal gamma-radiation
>field over a large area." (For more information, visit
><<http://www.fas.org/faspir/2001/v54n1/weapons.htm>>.)

>

>The development of a Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator would also
>have disastrous consequences for the international arms control
>regime. A nuclear weapon designed for battlefield use would
>increase the perception that nuclear weapons were as usable as
>any other part of the U.S. conventional weapons arsenal and that
>the U.S. was preparing to use them. If the U.S. proceeds with
>these weapons, other nations with far less conventional
>capability will seek to deter a U.S. attack by developing their

>own weapons of mass destruction, most likely chemical or
>biological weapons.

>

>The U.S. and other nuclear weapon states pledged in 1995, not to use
>nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapons states (with certain
>exceptions), as an inducement for those non-nuclear weapon states to
>agree to extend, indefinitely, the NPT. Therefore, the development or
>testing of these weapons would be a de facto repudiation of these
>assurances. To quote Rep. Markey in his letter, "the RNEPs may offer
>marginal military benefits at best while imposing major costs and
>risks."

>

>P.S. Because the urgency of the message, we ask that you forward this
>e-mail to five (or more) of your friends in Rhode Island. Thanks!

>

>###

Status: U
Return-Path: mhan624@hotmail.com
Received: from hotmail.com ([64.4.15.50])
by payne.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id
172N6I3Bm3NI3p40
for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 1 May 2002 01:56:52 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from mail pickup service by hotmail.com with Microsoft SMTPSVC;
Tue, 30 Apr 2002 22:56:51 -0700
Received: from 199.95.168.107 by lw10fd.law10.hotmail.msn.com with HTTP;
Wed, 01 May 2002 05:56:51 GMT
X-Originating-IP: [199.95.168.107]
From: "Myungsun Han" mhan624@hotmail.com
To: mupj@igc.org
Cc: debate44646@yahoo.com
Subject: MU Peace with Justice
Date: Wed, 01 May 2002 01:56:51 -0400
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/html
Message-ID: F501hdQVDqL4e0KAO6g00005c17@hotmail.com
X-OriginalArrivalTime: 01 May 2002 05:56:51.0875 (UTC)
FILETIME=[FD6F5730:01C1F0D4]

Hello from NJ! Thank you for your help. I got the information about MUPJ that you sent to me long time ago. I am sorry for saying thank you so late! Anyway, the documents that you provided are really helpful. Now, I am digging up the history of your caucus and the current agenda related to UMC General Conferences. Due date for my paper is coming Friday, so I am little bit.. hurry. Fortunately, in my school, there is Methodist Archive center. And in there, there is collection of Peace Leaf. I spent last two days in reading whole bunch of those new letters! And I am very much impressed by your works! so impressive.

By the way, I have some questions about your caucus. I wish you can provide an answer... thank you in advance.

First, what was the main agenda of your caucus in General Conference 2000 of UMC? I know the ultimate and constant agenda of your caucus is to remove nuclear weapon. But as for the General Confernece 2000, did you, guys, have specific agenda which you were claiming?

Secondly, what is the biggest current issue of your caucus? Especially, facing tragic event at WTC and Middle East, how does your caucus respond to them? Did you issue any letter for UMC leader related to your response to those tragic events in NYC and Middle East?

Thirdly, Does your caucus have any wish petition for General Conference 2004? I mean, does your caucus have any issue to bring up to General Conference 2004 of UMC?

Fourthly, personal question, if I become a member of your caucus, in what way do I participate into your activities?

Thank you, so much! I am enjoying paper about your caucus. Thank you and hope to hear from you soon! thanks!

Best Wishes,
Myungsun Han

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Myungsun Han" <mhan624@hotmail.com>
Subject: Re: MU Peace with Justice
Date: Wed, 1 May 2002 08:18:58 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="-----_NextPart_000_000E_01C1F0E8.D7A3CE00"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_000E_01C1F0E8.D7A3CE00
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Here are answers to your questions.

First, what was the main agenda of your caucus in General Conference = 2000 of UMC? I know the ultimate and constant agenda of your caucus is = to remove nuclear weapon. But as for the General Confernece 2000, did = you, guys, have specific agenda which you were claiming?

We had two items on our agenda: revision of the resolution on = "Saying No to Deterrence" and keeping Peace with Justice as a separate = Sunday and offering. We were successful in both. We took the lead on = the first issue; I attended meetings of the subcommittee of the Church = and Society Legislative Committee that handled it; I talked with key = delegates and answered their questions; in other words, lobbied. On the = second issue we were supportive of efforts lead by the Peace with = Justice Program of the General Board of Church and Society. We also = cosponsored a Peace with Justice Breakfast with the conference peace = with justice coordinators. In 2000 GBCS staff took the lead on the = breakfast while we did it alone in 1988, 1992, and 1996.

Secondly, what is the biggest current issue of your caucus? = Especially, facing tragic event at WTC and Middle East, how does your = caucus respond to them? Did you issue any letter for UMC leader related = to your response to those tragic events in NYC and Middle East?

Our primary focus is nuclear disarmament and the leadership role I = play as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. We = had Peace Leaf articles on the aftermath of 9/11. Although we are = deeply concerned about the Middle East, we have decided to continue our = concentration on nuclear disarmament. No other Methodist organization = is doing as much as we are although the GBCS and the Council of Bishops = have this issue on their agenda.

Thirdly, Does your caucus have any wish petition for General = Conference 2004? I mean, does your caucus have any issue to bring up to = General Conference 2004 of UMC?

We will probably update the "Saying No to Deterrence" resolution. =
We will likely cosponsor another Peace with Justice Breakfast. Beyond =
that we haven't decided.

Fourthly, personal question, if I become a member of your caucus, in =
what way do I participate into your activities?

We have individual membership with a suggested contribution of \$15 =
or more. You will receive Peace Leaf and occasional Peace/Justice =
alerts. This will provide information that you can apply in your =
locality. You can send your membership check to MUPJ, 1500 16th Street, =
NW, Washington, DC 20036.

Good luck to you in your career.

Howard Hallman

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

To: <glaszakovits_gb@brethren.org>,
<turner@onebox.com>,
<J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org>,
<cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>,
<mweiner@rac.org>,
<egbert14pj@yahoo.com>,
<conoverp@ucc.org>,
<jhorman@umc-gbcs.org>,
<visner@umc-gbcs.org>

Subject: Web site sampler

Date: Wed, 1 May 2002 16:45:06 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

To: Web Site Steering Committee

I am now working with our web designer, Marie Kayser, on the design of www.zero-nukes.org. It is far enough along for me to share it with you. You can see it by going to her web site: www.twotonedeyes.com/zero-nukes. I would appreciate your comments and suggestions.

This sampler has the home page, which introduces the site, and a second page that tells "The Story behind Our Masthead".

You can also see the beginning of the page for "Religious Statements" by clicking on that button. The graphic on that page is hers and isn't final. The mode of presenting the World Council of Churches is how I propose to do this for various denominations. It will be a combination of linkage where key documents are available and direct posting where they are not.

I have on hand a mostly completed section for the Catholic Churches, which I have been constructing, and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, which they supplied.

Let this remind the rest of you that you need to provide me information for your denomination: a brief paragraph about who you are and the documents related to nuclear disarmament that you want to share, either through linkage or direct posting. We will add these as we get them, but I would like to have as many as possible by mid-May, even by Friday, May 10. A Word attachment would be the most convenient way for me to receive them and forward them to Marie Kayser.

Finally, some of you indicated a willingness to make a financial contribution. So far I have received \$2,000 from an anonymous member of the Rockefeller family and a donation from UAHC. The United Methodist General Board of Church and Society has approved a \$5,000 grant and will

make the payment in May. We want your donations, even small ones, both for the money and for the endorsement that financial assistance signifies. But that is not an absolute requirement for being a sponsor.

You can e-mail me your observations on the site design, or call me at 301 896-0013 if you want to.

Shalom,
Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <tony@paxchristiusa.org>,
<tvpusa1@prodigy.net>,
"\"Dave Robinson\"" <paxusa@earthlink.net>
Subject: Sampler of new web site
Date: Wed, 1 May 2002 16:55:56 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

To: Web Site Steering Committee

I am now working with our web designer, Marie Kayser, on the design of www.zero-nukes.org. It is far enough along for me to share it with you. You can see it by going to her web site: www.twotonedeyes.com/zero-nukes. I would appreciate your comments and suggestions.

This sampler has the home page, which introduces the site, and a second page that tells "The Story behind Our Masthead".

You can also see the beginning of the page for "Religious Statements" by clicking on that button. The graphic on that page is hers and isn't final. The mode of presenting the World Council of Churches is how I propose to do this for various denominations. It will be a combination of linkage where key documents are available and direct posting where they are not.

I have on hand a mostly completed section for the Catholic Churches, which I have been constructing, and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, which they supplied.

Let this remind the rest of you that you need to provide me information for your denomination: a brief paragraph about who you are and the documents related to nuclear disarmament that you want to share, either through linkage or direct posting. Dave, an URL for a pdf version of The Morality of Nuclear Deterrence would be great.

We will add these as we get them, but I would like to have as many as possible by mid-May, even by Friday, May 10. A Word attachment would be the most convenient way for me to receive them and forward them to Marie Kayser.

Finally, some of you indicated a willingness to make a financial contribution. So far I have received \$2,000 from an anonymous member of the Rockefeller family and a donation from UAHC. The United Methodist General Board of Church and Society has approved a \$5,000 grant and will make the payment in May. We want your donations, even small ones, both for the money and for the endorsement that financial assistance signifies. But that is not an absolute requirement for being a sponsor.

You can e-mail me your observations on the site design, or call me at 301 896-0013 if you want to.

Shalom,
Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <Bpinguel@afsc.org>,
<thart@episcopalchurch.org>,
<david@fcl.org>,
<marsusab@aol.com>,
<lisaw@nccusa.org>,
<agreenblatt@nccusa.org>
Subject: Invitation to join new web site
Date: Wed, 1 May 2002 16:55:11 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Dear Potential Sponsor of www.zero-nukes.org

I am now working with a web designer, Marie Kayser, on the design of www.zero-nukes.org. It is far enough along for me to share it with you. You can see it by going to her web site: www.twotonedeyes.com/zero-nukes. I hope that this will give you a better idea of what the site is about and will lead you to becoming a sponsor.

The obligations of a sponsor are to be listed as such on the home page and to be represented on the steering committee (which will probably never meet physically but members will advise me through e-mail and telephone). Making a financial contribution is desired but optional.

This sampler has the home page, which introduces the site, and a second page that tells "The Story behind Our Masthead".

You can also see the beginning of the page for "Religious Statements" by clicking on that button. The graphic on that page is hers and isn't final. The mode of presenting the World Council of Churches is how I propose to do this for various denominations. It will be a combination of linkage where key documents are available and direct posting where they are not.

I have on hand a mostly completed section for the Catholic Churches, which I have been constructing, and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, which they supplied.

I would like you to provide me information for your denomination or organization: a brief paragraph about who you are and the documents related to nuclear disarmament that you want to share, either through linkage or direct posting. We will add these as we get them, but I would like to have as many as possible by mid-May, even by Friday, May 10. A Word attachment would be the most convenient way for me to receive them and forward them to Marie Kayser.

As to finance, I have received \$2,000 from an anonymous member of the

Rockefeller family and a donation from UAHC. The United Methodist General Board of Church and Society has approved a \$5,000 grant and will make the payment in May. We want your donations, even small ones, both for the money and for the endorsement that financial assistance signifies.

Shalom,
Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Subject: More material
Date: Wed, 1 May 2002 15:08:55 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
 boundary="-----=_NextPart_000_0006_01C1F122.1E55B500"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.5
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Marie,

I looked at your revision of our home page, etc. on your web site. Thanks for taking my suggestions. It's looking good.

Several matters of further detail.

I would rather have the navigation buttons like you had them previously with "Your Feedback" on the first row and only three on the second row that the way you've done it now. The alternative would be to put "Your Feedback" under "How to Get to Zero", "What's New" under "Arsenals & Treaties", nothing under "Civil Sector Statements", and the others as now is. That was my last suggestion. In any case, it would be preferable to carry the color bands all the way to the right margin.

On Religious Statements, I now have the text of the first document for the World Council of Churches. I am sending it as a Word attachment. The introductory paragraph amends what you now have. The statement is new and should be added. It will be helpful to have it added soon because I want to use this page as a sampler along with the home page and "The Story behind Our Masthead" to show to my steering committee.

For the World Council of Churches I want to replace the colored strip you took off their web page with their logo. It is the word "OIKOUMENE" in a semi-circle over a cross on a boat. It is found on their web site, www.wcc-coe.org, but is somewhat indistinct. I am mailing you a better version which you can scan and incorporate.

I'm working on text for a couple of other pages. I'll get them to you by the end of the week.

Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
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.

Report of the Sixth Assembly (1983)

The most fully development statement on nuclear disarmament by the World Council of Churches occurred in "Gathered for Life: Official Report of the Sixth Assembly", which met in Vancouver, Canada. It is as follows:

"Nuclear Arms, Doctrines and Disarmament"

13. It would be an intolerably evil contradiction of the Sixth Assembly's theme, "Jesus Christ -- the Life of the World", to support the nuclear weapons and doctrines which threaten the survival of the world. We now affirm, as a declaration of this Assembly, the conviction expressed by the 1981 Amsterdam Public Hearing on Nuclear Weapons and Disarmament and commended to WCC member churches by the Central Committee in 1982:

We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds.

Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violations of international law.

14. Nuclear deterrence, as the strategic doctrine which has justified nuclear weapons in the name of security and war prevention, must now be categorically rejected as contrary to our faith in Jesus Christ who is our life and peace. Nuclear deterrence is morally unacceptable because it relies on the credibility of the *intention to use* nuclear weapons: we believe that any intention to use weapons of mass destruction is an utterly inhuman violation of the mind and spirit of Christ which should be in us. We know that many Christians and others sincerely believe that deterrence provides an interim assurance of peace and stability on the way to disarmament. We must work together with those advocates of interim deterrence who are earnestly committed to arms reduction. But the increasing probabilities of nuclear war and the spectre of an

arms race totally out of control have exposed the cruel illusions of such faith in deterrence.

15. Nuclear deterrence can never provide the foundation of genuine peace. It is the antithesis of an ultimate faith in that love which casts our fear. It escalates the arms race in a vain pursuit of stability. It ignores the economic, social and psychological dimensions of security, and frustrates justice by maintaining the status quo in world politics. It destroys the reality of self-determination for most nations in matters of their own safety and survival, and diverts resources from basic human needs. It is the contradiction of disarmament because it exalts the threat of force, rationalizes the development of new weapons of mass destruction, and acts as a spur to nuclear proliferation by persistently breaking the "good faith" pledge of disarmament in the Non-Proliferation Treaty, thus tempting other governments to become nuclear-weapon states. It is increasingly discredited by first-strike and war-fighting strategies which betray the doubts about its reliability.

16. We urge our member communions to educate their members in the urgency of delegitimizing nuclear weapons and demythologizing deterrence.

17. In the meantime we affirm our support for the following specific measures:

- a) a mutual and verifiable freeze on the development, testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles;
- b) completion of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty;
- c) early and successful completion of the Geneva negotiations between the US and USSR for substantial reductions in strategic nuclear weapons;
- d) non-deployment of Pershing II and ground-launched cruise missiles, major reductions of Soviet intermediate range missiles including SS-20s, and successful conclusion of intermediate nuclear forces (INF) negotiations in Geneva;
- e) creation of nuclear-free zones wherever possible;
- f) cessation of all nuclear weapons and missile tests in the Pacific and a programme of medical and environmental aid to promote the health of Pacific peoples affected by nuclear activities;
- g) the negotiation of a treaty providing for the total demilitarization of space, including the banning of all nuclear, anti-satellite and anti-missile systems in space;
- h) commitment by all nuclear-weapon states to a policy of no first use of nuclear weapons;
- i) independent, non-negotiated initiatives such as a moratorium on the testing or development of nuclear weapons, renunciation of a specific weapon system, cessation of production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes, or reductions in existing arsenals or projected military expenditures.