

Status: U

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

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

by tyner.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 175YeR1V23Nl3rs0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 9 May 2002 20:26:25 -0400 (EDT)

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

id <KN5RMFQR>; Thu, 9 May 2002 20:25:32 -0400

Message-ID: <619BD1E95646D311B69D0008C79FE32D9447AD@church2.umc-gbcs.org>

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

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

Subject: RE: Web site and GBCS

Date: Thu, 9 May 2002 20:25:30 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Thanks, Howard:

When I return to the office on Monday I'll forward those to you.

Our URL will remain the same - we're just getting a much-needed facelift.

It is:

[www.umc-gbcs.org](http://www.umc-gbcs.org)

If you're referring to U-MPower, it will be:

[www.umc-gbcs.org/umpower](http://www.umc-gbcs.org/umpower)

All the best,

Vince

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

From: Howard W. Hallman

To: Vince Isner

Sent: 5/9/02 4:03 PM

Subject: Web site and GBCS

Vince,

Thanks for your comments. I shared them with Marie. She in turn referred me to a couple of "how to write for the web sites", which were helpful. She assured me that our site will be easy to keep updated.

I looked at your new site. I'm looking forward to see it develop.

For our purposes it would be helpful if you had at least two more items on it: (1) the bishops' pastoral letter from In Defense of Creation (1986) and

(2) the General Conference resolution on "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence".

I have the latter in Word if it would be useful to you for adaptation.

For

our purposes the Disarmament section of the resolution on "The United Methodist Church and Peace" would also be useful, though you may want the

whole resolution on line for broader purposes. If you have these on your

site, I'll link with them. Otherwise I'll put them on our site.

For our home page, what URL shall I use to connect with GBCS?

I'll keep in touch.

Howard

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <afong@jps.net>  
Subject: MUPJ National Advisory Committee  
Date: Fri, 10 May 2002 15:37:50 -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 Adrienne,

At the P/J retreat I invited you to be a member of our National Advisory Committee. I never got a definite answer. I want to re-extend the invitation.

It does not entail attending any meeting. Rather we communicate with NAC members from time and place their names on our letterhead and membership flyer. This helps to establish our legitimacy. Members include several UM bishops (Dale White, Felton May, Joseph Sprague, and a couple other pending), Bob Edgar from the National Council of Churches, Richard Deats of the FOR, a couple of theologians, Carol Windrum and Brenda Hardt from the P/J network. Because you are well known on the West Coast we would like you to join this group -- even though you may no longer be your conference P/J coordinator.

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: <Murraylou2@cs.com>  
Subject: Re: Last Call for articles  
Date: Fri, 10 May 2002 15:40:48 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_0044\_01C1F839.0EE1FC00"  
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\_0044\_01C1F839.0EE1FC00  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Murray,

I've been too busy to write the article on nuclear posture review that I =  
proposed. Sorry.

Howard

-----\_NextPart\_000\_0044\_01C1F839.0EE1FC00  
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>Murray,</FONT></DIV>

<DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>

<DIV><FONT size=3D2>I've been too busy to write the article on nuclear =  
posture=20

review that I proposed.&nbsp;</FONT></DIV>

<DIV><FONT size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>

<DIV><FONT size=3D2>Howard</FONT></DIV>

<BLOCKQUOTE=20

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

<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV></BLOCKQUOTE></BODY></HTML>

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0044\_01C1F839.0EE1FC00--

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "James & Char Hipkins" <debate44646@yahoo.com>  
Cc: "Phillip H. Miller" <millerph@att.net>  
Subject: Fw: Uncleared Check  
Date: Fri, 10 May 2002 15:42:46 -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

Jim,

Do you know anything about this?

Howard

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

From: millerph@att.net <millerph@att.net>  
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Tuesday, May 07, 2002 3:07 PM  
Subject: Uncleared Check

>I've just reconciled bank statements for both MUPJ  
>accounts. I notice that a check written from the  
>general fund on December 17, 2001 to the East Ohio  
>Conference/UMC for \$128 has never cleared. I believe it  
>was for mailing a Peace Leaf. Do you have any info?  
>  
>Phil

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <millerph@att.net>  
Subject: payment request  
Date: Fri, 10 May 2002 17:45:53 -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

Phil,

Part of the grant from the GBCS can be used to compensate me for some of my time in developing and running the web site. Therefore, I request payment as a consultant for March and April @ \$500/month, or a total of \$1,000. It should come from the General Fund.

Have I given you the URL for the sampler of our home page? It is [www.twotonedeyes.org/zero-nukes](http://www.twotonedeyes.org/zero-nukes). It also shows the beginning of our page on Religious Statements. I hope you like it.

Howard

Status: U

Return-Path: <rutledge@indiana.edu>

Received: from igcb.igc.apc.org ([192.82.108.46])

by kendall.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 176xrR3h63Nl3pM0 for <mupj@igc.org>; Sat, 11 May 2002 10:02:10 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from plounts.uits.indiana.edu (plounts.uits.indiana.edu [129.79.1.73])

by igcb.igc.apc.org (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id HAA07140 for <mupj@igc.apc.org>; Sat, 11 May 2002 07:00:27 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from maryland.exchange.indiana.edu (maryland.exchange.indiana.edu [129.79.6.163])

by plounts.uits.indiana.edu (8.12.1/8.12.1/IUPO) with ESMTTP id g4BE1XwG023771; Sat, 11 May 2002 09:01:33 -0500 (EST)

Received: by maryland.exchange.indiana.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <JHYCT1XZ>; Sat, 11 May 2002 09:01:34 -0500

Message-ID: <875F4BFEEB4CD21192D300805F65BBC00F352769@pennsylvania.exchange.indiana.edu>

From: "Rutledge, Philip" <rutledge@indiana.edu>

To: "Rutledge, Philip" <rutledge@indiana.edu>

Subject: 2002 Working Groups & Committees

Date: Sat, 11 May 2002 09:00:38 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="----\_=\_NextPart\_001\_01C1F8F4.3B11DE60"

This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

-----\_=\_NextPart\_001\_01C1F8F4.3B11DE60

Content-Type: text/plain

To: Social Equity Panel Dialogue Group

There was not time to discuss this fully at the Panel meeting last Thursday evening, but I did want to give each of you a chance to comment on the item below. I also want to give anyone interested, whether a Fellow or Associate Member, to join either of the Committees or Working Groups listed. The Charter of each will be fleshed out further cooperatively. Also, if I were not able to contact you to confirm your acceptance to serve as indicated - and you wish to decline - just let me know.

Phil

## PROPOSED SOCIAL EQUITY PANEL COMMITTEES AND WORKING GROUPS 2002

Strategic Purpose: Carry Out the 2002 Work Plan

(Committees are appointed to perform specific tasks and report regularly; Working Groups generate new ideas and opportunities, reports irregularly.)

### 1. Committee on Leadership Transition

Generate recommendations for submission to NAPA Board Chair for Panel Chair, Vice Chairs, Secretary for 2003-2005, and

facilitate smooth transition in November. Enid Beaumont, Valerie Lemmie, Co-Chairs; Cora Beebe, Bruce McDowell, Herb Jasper.

2. Committee on Social Equity Measurements and Indicators

Explore feasibility of developing measurements, indicators, and benchmarks for generating resources to produce a Report on Social Equity in the U.S. George Frederickson, Jim Svava, Co-Chairs; Rick Hug, Norman Johnson, Dale Krane, Dan Skoler, Charles Washington, Harvey White, Joe Wholey.

3. Working Group on International Opportunities and Linkages

Explore opportunities for NAPA to engage public administration and management issues in Africa. Sy Murray, Frank Reeder, Co-Chairs; Mary Hamilton, Harriett Jenkins, Ed Perkins, Mitch Rice, Costis Toregas.

4. Working Group on Publications and Documentation

Develop materials and processes for documenting work or Social Equity Panel, and communicating with others on findings and recommendations. Elaine Orr, Herb Jasper, Co-Chairs; and others to be named

5. Working Group on Environmental Justice Project Implementation strategies

Explore ways and means of implementing Social Equity Panel's environmental project recommendations. Phil Rutledge, Jonathon Howes, Co-Chairs; Members of the Environmental Justice Project Panel and others to be named

6. Working Group on DC Area Initiatives

Explore ways DC area Fellows might cooperate on local projects or studies. John Kelley and others to be named.

7. Executive Committee: To be composed of above co-chairs, and one or two at large members.

Serves as a Steering Committee for Panel.

-----\_=\_NextPart\_001\_01C1F8F4.3B11DE60

Content-Type: text/html

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 3.2//EN">

<HTML>

<HEAD>

<META HTTP-EQUIV=3D"Content-Type" CONTENT=3D"text/html; charset=3DUS-ASCII">

<META NAME=3D"Generator" CONTENT=3D"MS Exchange Server version =



Generate recommendations for submission to NAPA = Board Chair for Panel Chair, Vice Chairs, Secretary for 2003-2005, = and facilitate smooth transition in November. Enid = Beaumont, Valerie Lemmie, Co-Chairs; Cora Beebe, Bruce McDowell, Herb = Jasper.

2. Committee on Social = Equity Measurements and Indicators

Explore feasibility of developing measurements, = indicators, and benchmarks for generating resources to produce a Report = on Social Equity in the U.S. George Frederickson, Jim Svara, = Co-Chairs; Rick Hug, Norman Johnson, Dale Krane, Dan Skoler, Charles = Washington, Harvey White, Joe Wholey.

3. Working Group on = International Opportunities and Linkages

Explore opportunities for NAPA to engage public = administration and management issues in Africa. Sy Murray, Frank = Reeder, Co-Chairs; Mary Hamilton, Harriett Jenkins, Ed Perkins, Mitch = Rice, Costis Toregas.

4. Working Group on = Publications and Documentation

Develop materials and processes for documenting = work or Social Equity Panel, and communicating with others on findings = and recommendations. Elaine Orr, Herb Jasper, Co-Chairs; and = others to be named

5. Working Group on = Environmental Justice Project Implementation strategies

Explore ways and means of implementing Social = Equity Panel's environmental project recommendations. Phil Rutledge, = Jonathon Howes, Co-Chairs; Members of the Environmental Justice Project = Panel and others to be named

6. Working Group on DC = Area Initiatives

Explore ways DC area Fellows might cooperate on = local projects or studies. John Kelley and others to be =



Status: U  
Return-Path: <JFNORTH@aol.com>  
Received: from imo-r01.mx.aol.com ([152.163.225.97])  
by tyner.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 176xAC4IP3NI3rs0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Sat, 11 May 2002 10:11:14 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from JFNORTH@aol.com  
by imo-r01.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v32.5.) id a.13e.e36d88e (25099);  
Sat, 11 May 2002 10:11:09 -0400 (EDT)  
From: JFNORTH@aol.com  
Message-ID: <13e.e36d88e.2a0e807c@aol.com>  
Date: Sat, 11 May 2002 10:11:08 EDT  
Subject: September series  
To: andrewsa@saic.com, beverly@erols.com, dosmith6@juno.com,  
gene.vincent@starpower.net, HolRonFost@aol.com, jcm@duncanallen.com,  
kiki@wizard.net, mupj@igc.org  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="UTF-8"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-Language: en  
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Mac sub 39

Dear Outreach Committee,

We agreed last Wednesday that I would work out a plan for our September=20 series on Homelessness and Mental Health Services in Montgomery County.

On thinking it through, it seems to me that we may want four Sundays rather=20 than three since they are only 45 minutes each. On the other hand, after w= e=20

get responses from presenters, we may learn that we can consolidate these=20 themes into three sessions substituting for a speaker with info sheets or=20 short film. Kelly said that four sessions will be OK. Also, I asked if we=20 could start on September 15 to give us a chance to publicize the series. Sh= e=20

agreed, but said that since Sunday School resumes on the 8th, =E2=80=9Cperha= ps we can=20 do a one-session class=E2=80=9D then.

I have laid out a proposal as follows and have talked with only one proposed= =20 speakers. Let me know what you think.

First Session : Speaker: Sharon London, Director, Collision for the Homeles= s  
(Overall picture of homelessness in Montgomery: causes, extent, survival=20 practices; solutions). She has accepted. She would speak on causes are=20 multiple but untreated mental illness is prominent among them.

Second Session: Kevin Dwyer: Until recently, Director Montgomery County=20 Society for Mental Health; and chair, Blue Ribbon Task Force, County =20 appointed task for to assess system of care for mentally ill and to propose=20 strategies to address failure. (Describe conclusions of Blue Ribbon Task=20 Force with particular reference to homelessness).

Third Session: Biological nature of severe and persistent mental illnesses;=20  
current knowledge of effective treatment -- in relation to treatment=20  
available to non-working patients in Montgomery County. Psychiatrist from=20  
NIMH or, perhaps =E2=80=9Cour=E2=80=9D Bob Creveling, pharmacologist whose c=  
areer focused on=20  
discoveries in chemical interactions in mental illnesses or short, simple=20  
film made by NIMH available from NAMI.

Fourth Session: =E2=80=9CUp-beat=E2=80=9D what can be done -- is being done=20=  
-- to address=20  
situation, through personal service, funding and advocacy. Session needs pre=  
s  
entation but also discussion time to point to action by BUMC group. Needs=20  
good planning. Priscilla Fox Morrill, director shelter services and/or Beck=  
y=20  
Wagner, director, Community Ministry; perhaps Sue Kirk, Bethesda Cares.=20

Jeanne

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

To: <JFNORTH@aol.com>,  
<andrewsa@saic.com>,  
<beverly@erols.com>,  
<dosmith6@juno.com>,  
<gene.vincent@starpower.net>,  
<HolRonFost@aol.com>,  
<jcm@duncanallen.com>,  
<kiki@wizard.net>

Subject: Re: September series

Date: Sat, 11 May 2002 16:31:39 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="UTF-8"

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

Jeanne,

I like your outline. Four sessions sound fine. We could start on September 8 with advanced publicity through the Messenger and the BUMC list serve, which has 130 subscribers. If we get co-sponsorship by the Faith and Life Class, and possibly the Hartwell Class, we would have a strong base to begin with. If there is a mailing to Sunday School parents, it could mention the class. Also, the class can be publicized at the 8:45 service on the 8th.

Thanks for your efforts.

Howard

Status: U

Return-Path: <rutledge@indiana.edu>

Received: from igcb.igc.apc.org ([192.82.108.46])

by payne.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 176xLxKc3Nl3p40  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Sat, 11 May 2002 10:22:30 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from rockridge.uits.indiana.edu (rockridge.uits.indiana.edu [129.79.1.74])

by igcb.igc.apc.org (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id HAA10688  
for <mupj@igc.apc.org>; Sat, 11 May 2002 07:20:14 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from maryland.exchange.indiana.edu (maryland.exchange.indiana.edu [129.79.6.163])

by rockridge.uits.indiana.edu (8.12.1/8.12.1/IUPO) with ESMTP id g4BELNr5017191;  
Sat, 11 May 2002 09:21:24 -0500 (EST)

Received: by maryland.exchange.indiana.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <JHYCTFBW>; Sat, 11 May 2002 09:21:25 -0500

Message-ID: <875F4BFEEB4CD21192D300805F65BBC00F35276A@pennsylvania.exchange.indiana.edu>

From: "Rutledge, Philip" <rutledge@indiana.edu>

To: "DSkoler@aol.com" <DSkoler@aol.com>

Subject: RE: RE: FW: EJ and SE--Skoler Thoughts

Date: Sat, 11 May 2002 09:20:48 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

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

Dan:

I thought your ideas below deserved a broader audience, so I'm sharing your e-mail with the Panel's Dialogue Group for information and/or comment.

Phil

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

From: DSkoler@aol.com [mailto:DSkoler@aol.com]

Sent: Saturday, May 11, 2002 9:10 AM

To: gfred@ukans.edu; rutledge@indiana.edu; Joewholey@aol.com;  
svara@ncsu.edu; hugr@iun.edu; hlw@pitt.edu; herbjasper@hotmail.com;  
dkrane@mail.unomaha.edu; DSkoler@aol.com

Cc: elaineorr55@prodigy.net; wholey@usc.edu

Subject: Re: RE: FW: EJ and SE--Skoler Thoughts

Hi Colleagues--This will respond to (1) George F's call for suggestions as to

"a theme or broad subject for the general meeting of the full Panel at Charlottesville" and (2) leader Phil R's requests for comments on the future

and next steps for Social Equity. The exchange thus far has been impressive and I hope my "two cents" doesn't take it down a notch. Actually, the scope of my input will be quite limited

I do have a broad subject or theme but am not sure how to characterize it. This would in no way be meant to replace the several concrete initiatives

(e.g., NAPA/SE as "social indicator" scorecard-keeper and analyst for the nation or SE flexing its international muscle by framing and taking on a

major African nation assistance thrust) but might be useful as a subsidiary agenda item at Charlottesville. It's a bit of "back to the basics", i.e.,

why NAPA in this field? I consider it quite important and it may have become muted over the months in our quest (which I fully support) for concrete efforts to jump start some needed influence and accomplishment.

Why are we in this game if not to bring to the public manager arena (every public manager--fed, state and local) a deeper appreciation and commitment to social equity in our every-day, every-year activity on the job

and, more important, a realization of the propriety, importance, moral correctness, and power we have to discern concrete needs and actually push toward achievement in the programs and agencies we run of a greater measure of that "social equity stuff". The broad topic would be, then,--I guess--NAPA

as sensitizer and activist in the public administration community of a sea change in public administration (--that may be overdoing it) to accord social fairness considerations an up-front place, appropriately framed, defined, and explained, to that traditional engine and standard known as "efficiency". This is no easy job (and I see it as probably more important than NAPA's role as a national expert and advocate for "the right social equity" substantive positions in health, housing, social insurance, environmental well being etc.

The fact is that the executive branch (those like us who do not frame but

whose cross is to carry out the law) have tremendous power to affect, reinforce and instill values and that this process goes on whether we consciously take up the cudgel or act like it doesn't exist, i.e., tell ourselves that we simply carry out legislation given us by legislators and leave adjudication of disputes strictly to the courts. Ain't true in this day and age and we all know it.

As I used to tease students at GIPA, quoting Steven Cann's ad law text:

"How democratic would you think our government was if it were true that 90% of the laws that regulate everyday life were made by nonelected, politically insulated, job-secure career bureaucrats? What if it were true that the policy making branch of government (at any level--federal state, county, or city) passed only broad and vague legislation and then delegated the power to agencies to adopt standards, rules, and policies to fill in the

gaps and holes, leaving those agencies with a tremendous amount of discretion? The notion of policy making by agencies and bureaucracies rather

than be popularly elected (and accountable) representatives is referred to as the "administrative state" or the fourth branch of government. (Cann thinks this is true and, to a large extent, so do I--unavoidably true for all governments, democracy included, in today's complex social structure).

Isn't the big job, then, "calling a spade a spade" and, as an important basic agenda for our panel, tackling the job of sharpening, preparing and sensitizing our field--each and every manager-- to understand and accept their responsibility to deal in "social equity" and not try to say "this stuff is beyond my power and mandate in the things I do and the

implementation policies I formulate and administer since all is given to me".

It ain't and it's time social equity took a place at the table and our managers accept that this cannot be denied or hidden--to be sure a responsible seat fully respecting the role of the other branches--lawgivers and adjudicators-- but one accepting that the seat will always be there and won't go away.

Given the foregoing (and forgiving, I hope, its patronizing ring before a group like you characters), I guess the general topic might be--What is needed and how might NAPA go about preparing "bureaucrats" (the p.a. community) to be sensitive to, make the difficult judgments, and adopt techniques, processes and methods needed to discern and introduce solidly grounded social equity considerations in the programs and agencies they administer--at least, a lot more more than at present.

I see this general mission as the one we are now trying to lend particularity to in our specific action thrusts (e.g. educating and assisting zoning boards, their towns and cities, and their state oversight authorities

on assuring fair treatment and voices, within agency proper powers and discretion, in the EPA permitting process for "high risk" communities). Actually, we can't advance the "general mission" much without these concrete

thrusts, n'est-ce pas? But that doesn't mean we shouldn't keep our eye on the basic target and how it might be broadly addressed by discourse, training, and dialogue in the profession--including, possibly, a bit of this on the Charlottesville menu.

I do see this general mission as different than NAPA studying various technical areas (health, Social Security, education, etc. )and then taking "social equity" policy and advocacy stands as an organization--just like the

American Bar Association where in past incarnations, I have formulated approved resolutions on Medicare coverage for kids, adoption of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, and tighter Social Security monitoring of organizations that manage benefits for mentally handicapped individuals. Indeed, this kind of thing may prove to be touchier business for NAPA than our attention to the goal and processes of a greater place at the table for social equity in the nation's public management apparatus.

God, but I'm exhausted. What do ya think?

P.S. As for the other inputs Phil called for, I shall second and defer to Joe

Wholey, Herb Jasper, Phil himself and that radical, Elaine Orr for their wise

counsel and take a rest at this time. (By the bye, the "social indicators" project seems to fit in as a major instrument for the broad p.a. community sensitization mission that we might talk further about)

Status: U  
Return-Path: <debate44646@yahoo.com>  
Received: from web10704.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.130.212])  
by hazard.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 176JCLBx3NkYBY0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Sat, 11 May 2002 23:02:15 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-ID: <20020512030214.95884.qmail@web10704.mail.yahoo.com>  
Received: from [24.140.23.16] by web10704.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Sat, 11 May 2002 20:02:14 PDT  
Date: Sat, 11 May 2002 20:02:14 -0700 (PDT)  
From: hipkins james <debate44646@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Re: Fw: Uncleared Check  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
In-Reply-To: <006e01c1f85b\$13b313a0\$715af7a5@default>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

I'll check it out on Monday.

Jim

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

> Jim,

>

> Do you know anything about this?

>

> Howard

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: millerph@att.net <millerph@att.net>

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

> Date: Tuesday, May 07, 2002 3:07 PM

> Subject: Uncleared Check

>

>

> >I've just reconciled bank statements for both MUPJ  
> >accounts. I notice that a check written from the  
> >general fund on December 17, 2001 to the East Ohio  
> >Conference/UMC for \$128 has never cleared. I  
> believe it

> >was for mailing a Peace Leaf. Do you have any  
> info?

> >

> >Phil

>

---

Do You Yahoo!?

LAUNCH - Your Yahoo! Music Experience

<http://launch.yahoo.com>

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Myungsun Han" <mhan624@hotmail.com>  
Subject: Re: Thank you! but I have three more questions...  
Date: Mon, 13 May 2002 10:00:09 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="-----=\_NextPart\_000\_003B\_01C1FA64.F72427E0"  
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\_003B\_01C1FA64.F72427E0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I've been too busy the last ten days to reply to your three questions. =  
It may be too late for your paper, but here is a brief response.

First, I want to know about the situation of 1996 General Conference =  
when "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence." was adopted to the Book of =  
Resolution. What was your main purpose of submitting that document to =  
the Gerneral Conference?

To update the 1992 resolution.

If you have the information about the committee which handled your =  
bill and about date, I can find out related documents at Drew Archive =  
center. =20

The Church and Society Legislative Committee

And also, I want to know about the effectiveness of Peach with =  
Justice Breakfast at 1996 General Conference. How many General =  
Conference members were participate in your breakfast? As a =  
chair-person, how do you evaluate the effectiveness of breakfast as a =  
channel to express your opinion?

The purposes of the Peace with Justice Breakfast is, early in the =  
General Conference, to bring together persons with peace with justice =  
concerns and to demonstrate that there is considerable interest in this =  
subjective. We believe that we succeeded, but there is no objective =  
measure of effectiveness. Information on participation is not =  
available.

Secondly, I want to know about the situation of 2000 General =  
Conference? What was your intention to revise "Saying No to Nuclear =  
Deterrence?" Was it just update or implication of change in your =  
concern?=20

It was to update the resolution.

and I want to know about breakfast at General Conference 2000. How many delegates were present at your breakfast in 2000 Conference? and, again do you think the breakfast plays an important role to express the concern of your caucus to the public?

Information on participation is not available. Yes, it helps to visualize peace with justice issues, especially in 2000 the need to preserve Peace with Justice Sunday and the special offering.

Thirdly, I need your personal and professional opinion, sir. While I was reading your history, I got an impression that as time goes by, your caucus are reaching out your hand out of United Methodist Church. I guess, as your participation in interfaith partnership with the other religious groups is getting bigger, the participation within United Methodist Church is getting smaller. I understand that your caucus does not have any legislative relationship with UMC. But, I assume that this phenomenon is partially because your concern and work for peace and justice is duplicated with the Peace with Justice Special Program managed by GBCS. I know, your caucus and GBCS have a very supportive relationship with each other, but, I guess, the existence of two programs on the same matter or issue could reduce the participation of one program... especially, when one of these programs is managed by a bigger and institutionalized agency like UMC. just a thought... just a thought... I wonder how you think of my thought. What do you think of my opinion?

When we first organized, the GBCS staff person assigned to nuclear disarmament issues, based in New York, did not support the viewpoint of the bishops in In Defense of Creation. I heard him tell a 1998 General Conference subcommittee that the bishops were "naive". Consequently we picked up the slack. Gradually Washington staff of GBCS took more interest in nuclear disarmament issues, so we had to do less -- filling gaps and getting out action alerts quicker than GBCS could. As this was happening, I was assuming a leadership role in interfaith activities for nuclear disarmament. Consequently I spent less time working solely within the United Methodist Church. The partnership relationship between MUPJ and GBCS continues. For instance, I attend the annual retreats of conference peace with justice coordinators. I am frequently in touch with Janet Horman and Jaydee Hanson. I wrote an article on Nuclear Disarmament for Christian Social Action. Several of their web site entries on this subject come from me.

Howard Hallman

-----  
--- =20

-----=\_NextPart\_000\_003B\_01C1FA64.F72427E0

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><FONT color="#000000" size="2">I've been too busy the last ten days =  
to reply to=20

your three questions. It may be too late for your paper, but here is a =  
brief=20

response.</FONT></DIV>

<BLOCKQUOTE=20

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

<DIV>

<P></P>

<P>First, I want to know about the situation of 1996 General =  
Conference when=20

&quot;Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence.&quot; was adopted to the Book =  
of=20

Resolution. What was your main purpose of submitting that document =  
to the=20

General Conference?</P>

<P><FONT size="2">To update the 1992 resolution.</FONT></P>

<P>&nbsp;If you have the information about the committee which =  
handled your=20

bill and about date, I can find out related documents at Drew =  
Archive=20

center.&nbsp;</P>

<P><FONT color="#000000" size="2">The Church and Society Legislative =

Committee</FONT></P>

<P>And also, I want to know about the effectiveness of Peace with =  
Justice=20

Breakfast at 1996 General Conference. How many General Conference =  
members=20

were participate in your breakfast? As a chair-person, how do you =  
evaluate=20

the effectiveness of breakfast as a channel to express your =  
opinion?</P>

<P><FONT size="2">The purposes of the Peace with Justice Breakfast =  
is, early=20

in the General Conference, to bring together persons with peace with =  
justice=20

concerns and to demonstrate that there is considerable interest in =  
this=20

subjective.&nbsp;We believe that we succeeded, but there is no =  
objective=20

measure of effectiveness.&nbsp;Information on participation is not=20  
available.</FONT></P>

<P>Secondly, I want to know about the situation of 2000 General = Conference? =20

What was your intention to revise &quot;Saying No to Nuclear = Deterrence?&quot; Was it just update or implication of change in = your =20 concern? </P>

<P><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2>It was to update the = resolution.</FONT></P>

<P>and I want to know about breakfast at General Conference 2000. = How many =20

delegate were present at your breakfast in 2000 Conference? and, = again do =20

you think the breakfast play a important role to express the concern = of your =20

caucus to the public?</P>

<P>Information on participation is not available.&nbsp; Yes, it = helps to =20

visualize peace with justice issues, especially in 2000 the need to = preserve =20

Peace with Justice Sunday and the special offering.</P>

<P>Thidly, I need your personal and professional opinion, sir. While = I was =20

reading your history, I got an impression that as time goes by, your = caucus =20

are reaching out your hand out of United Methodist Church. I guess, = as your =20

participation in iterfaith partnership with the other religious = groups is =20

getting bigger, the participation within United Methodist Church is = getting =20

smaller. I understand that your caucus does not have any legislative =

relationship with UMC.&nbsp; But, I assume that this phenomenon is = partially =20

because your concern and work for peace and justice is duplicated = with the =20

Peace with Justice Special Program managed by GBCS. I know, your = caucus and =20

GBCS have a very supportive relationship with each other, but, I = guess, the =20

existence of two programs on the same matter or issue could reduce = the =20

participation of one program... especially, when one of these = programs is =20

managed by bigger and instutionized agency like UMC.&nbsp; just a =20 thought.... just a thought... I wonder how you think of my thought. =

What do =20

you think of my opinion?</P>

<P><FONT size=3D2>When we first organized, the GBCS staff person = assigned to =20

nuclear disarmament issues, based in New York, did not support the = viewpoint =20

of the bishops in In Defense of Creation.&nbsp; I heard him tell a = 1998 =20

General Conference subcommittee that the bishops were "naive"; Consequently we picked up the slack. Gradually Washington staff of GBCS took more interest in nuclear disarmament issues, so we had to do less -- filling gaps and getting out action alerts quicker than GBCS could. As this was happening, I was assuming a leadership role in interfaith activities for nuclear disarmament. Consequently I spent less time working solely within the United Methodist Church. The partnership relationship between MUPJ and GBCS continues. For instance, I attend the annual retreats of peace with justice coordinators. I am frequently in touch with Janet Horman and Jaydee Hanson. I wrote an article on Nuclear Disarmament for Christian Social Action. Several of their web entries on this subject come from me.

Howard Hallman

---

-----\_NextPart\_000\_003B\_01C1FA64.F72427E0--

Status: U

Return-Path: <kentkathyb@earthlink.net>

Received: from swan.prod.itd.earthlink.net ([207.217.120.123])

by runyon.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 176Ymh1KX3Nl3sj0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Sun, 12 May 2002 14:46:13 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from sdn-ap-003watacop0484.dialsprint.net ([63.187.209.230])

by swan.prod.itd.earthlink.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #2)  
id 176yM9-00011E-00

for mupj@igc.org; Sun, 12 May 2002 11:46:05 -0700

User-Agent: Microsoft-Outlook-Express-Macintosh-Edition/5.02.2022

Date: Sun, 12 May 2002 11:49:59 -0700

Subject: Nuclear Posture Review

From: Kent/Kathy Barton <kentkathyb@earthlink.net>

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

Message-ID: <B9040767.2862%kentkathyb@earthlink.net>

Mime-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="MS\_Mac\_OE\_3104048999\_6023661\_MIME\_Part"

> This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand  
this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

--MS\_Mac\_OE\_3104048999\_6023661\_MIME\_Part

Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Howard: I would like to refer and circulate the March 15th letter from the  
Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament at the forum. I wanted to know  
if this would be okay and if you had any additional talking points I might  
add or if you had any ideas of how to challenge people the lift up the  
concerns expresses in the letter.

Thanks, Kathy Campbell-Barton  
503:399-1584

## INTERNATIONAL FORUM: THE ROLE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Date: Monday, May 20, 7 p.m., Loucks Auditorium at Salem Pulic Library

Sponsors: League of Women Voters U.S., League of Women Voters of Marion &  
Polk Counties, American Association of University Women, Friends of the  
Library, Oregon Peaceworks and Salem City Club.

Purpose: To give the public the opportunity to hear differing views  
concerning the use of nuclear weapons as part of our nation's foreign policy  
and actions, so that they may have the information and perspective to make  
intelligent choices both as voters and activists in affecting national  
policy. The LWVUS and the US Dept. of State have agreed to offer these  
forums free of cost to local leagues that submit proposals for international  
forums and are accepted. This is sponsored by the Education Fund branch of  
the LWV , and does not fall under the League's advocacy role.

Forum Panelists:

1. Dr. Kerry Kartchner, Ph.D., U.S. Dept. of State.
2. Peter Bergel, Executive Director / Oregon Peaceworks
3. Dr. Joe Bowersox, History professor, Willamette University
4. Kathy Campbell Barton, United Methodist Church peace activist

MODERATOR: Sandra Gangle, attorney, Pres. of Salem City Club.

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Kent/Kathy Barton" <kentkathyb@earthlink.net>  
Subject: Re: Nuclear Posture Review  
Date: Mon, 13 May 2002 10:33:31 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;  
    boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_0036\_01C1FA69.A247A940"  
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

Kathy,

You're welcome to use the letter on the Nuclear Posture Review. Also, you may be interested in an article I wrote for Peace Leaf, which will be published soon. I'm attaching a copy. You can use it with proper credit.

Shalom,  
Howard

**-----Original Message-----**

**From:** Kent/Kathy Barton <[kentkathyb@earthlink.net](mailto:kentkathyb@earthlink.net)>  
**To:** Howard W. Hallman <[mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)>  
**Date:** Sunday, May 12, 2002 2:46 PM  
**Subject:** Nuclear Posture Review

Howard: I would like to refer and circulate the March 15th letter from the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament at the forum. I wanted to know if this would be okay and if you had any additional talking points I might add or if you had any ideas of how to challenge people the lift up the concerns expresses in the letter.

Thanks, Kathy Campbell-Barton  
503:399-1584

**INTERNATIONAL FORUM: THE ROLE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY**

Date: Monday, May 20, 7 p.m., Loucks Auditorium at Salem Pulic Library

Sponsors: League of Women Voters U.S., League of Women Voters of Marion & Polk Counties, American Association of University Women, Friends of the Library, Oregon Peaceworks and Salem City Club.

Purpose: To give the public the opportunity to hear differing views concerning the use of nuclear weapons as part of our nation's foreign policy

and actions, so that they may have the information and perspective to make intelligent choices both as voters and activists in affecting national policy. The LWVUS and the US Dept. of State have agreed to offer these forums free of cost to local leagues that submit proposals for international forums and are accepted. This is sponsored by the Education Fund branch of the LWV , and does not fall under the League's advocacy role.

Forum Panelists:

1. Dr. Kerry Kartchner, Ph.D., U.S. Dept. of State.
2. Peter Bergel, Executive Director / Oregon Peaceworks
3. Dr. Joe Bowersox, History professor, Willamette University
4. Kathy Campbell Barton, United Methodist Church peace activist

MODERATOR: Sandra Gangle, attorney, Pres. of Salem City Club.

# **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.

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Religious Statements  
Date: Mon, 13 May 2002 12:08:34 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0082\_01C1FA76.E7C7CB00"  
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\_0082\_01C1FA76.E7C7CB00  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Marie,

The Religious Statements page is looking good. You're doing a terrific =  
job!

This page will continue to grow. I know that you're charging \$80/page =  
for set up. Some pages, such as What's New and Your Feedback won't have =  
much material. Others will have quite a bit. Perhaps it averages out. =  
But is there a point, in fairness to you, that we should pay extra =  
compensation for the heavy volume of Religious Statements? For example, =  
your hourly rate for site maintenance? If so, let me know.

Here are some specific comments on the Religious Statements page.

1.The top of the page needs better spacing. "Religious Statements" is =  
crammed too close to "Nuclear Weapons A Moral Issue". Did you receive =  
in the mail my previous artwork for the latter?

2. For the listing under "Catholic" it would be helpful to have buttons =  
for the four sub-items with linkage. Each of them is fairly long. =  
Users should be able to go to each directly without scrolling through =  
all Catholic entries.

3. For World Council of Churches, did you receive the logo I sent by =  
mail?

4. For WCC the PDF file for "Nuclear Arms, Doctrines and Disarmament" =  
should include the introductory paragraph. Otherwise users won't know =  
the context.

5. Under "Religious Statements for 1998 Preparatory Committee", should =  
the two references to presentations have a click on linkage for the texts =  
presented below?

6. I couldn't locate the PDF for "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition".

7. Nice job of getting a pix of Pope John Paul II and Archbishop Martino =  
(I assume that is he). How did you get the latter? Should we try to =  
get one for Monsignor Chullikat?  
=20

8. At the beginning of the section under Holy See the second sentence of =  
the introduction was omitted. It reads as follows:

"In recent years policy statements coming from the Holy See on nuclear =  
disarmament have been made by Vatican delegation to the United Nations =  
in New York. Thus, April 2002 Monsignor Francis Chullikat, deputy head =  
of the delegation, told delegates of the NPT Preparatory Committee:"

9. Under U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops" I wasn't able to bring up =  
the PDF for the excerpt from The Harvest of Justice.

10. At the very end after Jewish are endnotes and permission to use =  
from The Harvest of Justice. This probably comes from what I sent you, =  
which for some reason has these items there as well as in the proper =  
place. Can you eliminate them?

Keep up the good work.

Howard

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Kent/Kathy Barton" <kentkathyb@earthlink.net>  
Subject: Re: Nuclear Posture Review  
Date: Mon, 13 May 2002 13:13:53 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;  
          boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_0017\_01C1FA80.07CFC7A0"  
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

Kathy,

The letter is attached.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is a coalition of religious demoninations and religious associations working together for the global elimination of nuclear weapons. It is chaired by Howard W. Hallman, who is chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

Shalom,  
Howard

**-----Original Message-----**

**From:** Kent/Kathy Barton <[kentkathyb@earthlink.net](mailto:kentkathyb@earthlink.net)>  
**To:** Howard W. Hallman <[mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)>  
**Date:** Monday, May 13, 2002 12:11 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Nuclear Posture Review

Thanks so much Howard. I have a copy of the letter on the NPR that you handed out at the PWJ meeting. Do you have it on computer? If so, could you Email it to me?

Also, do you have a brief description of the Interfaith group? I'd like to be able to give some info about the group. Thanks again!!!! Kathy

on 5/13/02 7:33 AM, Howard W. Hallman at [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org) wrote:

Kathy,

You're welcome to use the letter on the Nuclear Posture Review. Also, you may be interested in an article I wrote for Peace Leaf, which will be published soon. I'm attaching a copy. You can use it with proper credit.

Shalom,  
Howard

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

**From:** Kent/Kathy Barton <kentkathyb@earthlink.net>

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

**Date:** Sunday, May 12, 2002 2:46 PM

**Subject:** Nuclear Posture Review

Howard: I would like to refer and circulate the March 15th letter from the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament at the forum. I wanted to know if this would be okay and if you had any additional talking points I might add or if you had any ideas of how to challenge people the lift up the concerns expresses in the letter.

Thanks, Kathy Campbell-Barton  
503:399-1584

INTERNATIONAL FORUM: THE ROLE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Date: Monday, May 20, 7 p.m., Loucks Auditorium at Salem Pulic Library

Sponsors: League of Women Voters U.S., League of Women Voters of Marion & Polk Counties, American Association of University Women, Friends of the Library, Oregon Peaceworks and Salem City Club.

Purpose: To give the public the opportunity to hear differing views concerning the use of nuclear weapons as part of our nation's foreign policy and actions, so that they may have the information and perspective to make intelligent choices both as voters and activists in affecting national policy. The LWVUS and the US Dept. of State have agreed to offer these forums free of cost to local leagues that submit proposals for international forums and are accepted. This is sponsored by the Education Fund branch of the LWV , and does not fall under the League's advocacy role.

Forum Panelists:

1. Dr. Kerry Kartchner, Ph.D., U.S. Dept. of State.
2. Peter Bergel, Executive Director / Oregon Peaceworks
3. Dr. Joe Bowersox, History professor, Willamette University
4. Kathy Campbell Barton, United Methodist Church peace activist

MODERATOR: Sandra Gangle, attorney, Pres. of Salem City Club.

March 15, 2002

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

Dear Mr. President:

Re: Nuclear Posture Review

We the undersigned representatives of religious organizations were encouraged by the meetings you and Russian President Vladimir Putin held last November in Washington and Texas. Together you told the world that the United States and Russia are now friends rather than military rivals. You each promised to make substantial reductions in strategic nuclear weapons. This follows through on your desire to move beyond the Cold War and its doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD). We look forward to your signing a specific agreement on strategic arms reductions when you meet in Moscow in May.

This gives us hope that substantial progress can be made toward the global elimination of nuclear weapons. This is the desire of numerous religious leaders and religious organizations in the United States and elsewhere. For example, 21 top religious leaders in the United States, joined by 18 military professionals, in a statement issued at the Washington National Cathedral in June 2000, proclaimed: **"We deeply believe that the long-term reliance on nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable....National security imperatives and ethical demands have converged to bring us to the necessity of outlawing and prohibiting nuclear weapons worldwide."**

From this perspective we are discouraged by what Pentagon planners have produced in the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). We have several concerns we would like to share with you.

**(1) Reductions.** We commend the NPR commitment to reduce strategic nuclear weapons to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads along with the Russia commitment to reduce theirs to 1,500. This is a positive step in the right direction. Yet, we wonder why it should take ten years to accomplish. We ask that standing down of these warheads and their delivery vehicles be completed by 2004.

**(2) Warhead reserve and the terrorist threat.** The reduction in strategic weapons is compromised by the NPR plan to keep an estimated 1,500 warheads in an active reserve with their delivery systems intact for uploading. If the United States keeps so many warheads in reserve, Russia is likely to do the same. The more warheads that Russia has in reserve the greater the risk of some of them falling into the hands of terrorist organizations. The United States would be much better off to forgo a large warhead reserve and instead enter into a binding, verifiable agreement with Russia that requires elimination of both delivery vehicles and nuclear warheads taken out of service. This would follow the example of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed by President Ronald Reagan, and START I, signed by your father, President George H.W. Bush, both of which provided for the destruction of the delivery vehicles taken out of service.

The Honorable George W. Bush

March 15, 2002

Page two.

**(3) Mutual assured destruction.** We are especially disappointed that the doctrine of mutual assured destruction remains intact in the Pentagon's Nuclear Posture Review. The NPR specifies that "preplanning is essential for immediate and potential contingencies". It indicates that "a contingency involving Russia, while plausible, is not expected." Nevertheless, the approximately 3,500 strategic warheads in active deployment and reserve are of sufficient magnitude to cover hundreds of targets in Russia, as they now do under the single integrated operational plan (SIOP). Thus, in actuality the MAD doctrine prevails.

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

**(5) Expanded role.** The Pentagon plan expands the role of nuclear weapons beyond the primary role of deterring nuclear-weapon states from attacking the United States and its allies.

The Nuclear Posture Review speaks of flexibility for a range of contingencies. This includes immediate, potential, or unexpected contingencies involving North Korea, Iraq,

Iran, Syria, and Libya. The NPR indicates that nuclear weapons could be employed against targets able to withstand non-nuclear attack or in retaliation for use of biological or chemical weapons. In contrast, previous U.S. policy specified no first use of nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapons state not allied with a nuclear-weapon state. We are greatly disturbed that your administration wants to expand rather than contract the role of nuclear weapons in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

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

**Therefore, Mr. President, we ask you to send the Nuclear Posture Review back to the drawing boards and have the Pentagon planners come up with a plan that will truly end the MAD doctrine and will steadily reduce the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. military and foreign policy.** We propose that nuclear disarmament objectives be incorporated into the Nuclear Posture Review in accordance to the U.S. obligation under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), signed originally by President Richard Nixon. As a point of

The Honorable George W. Bush

March 15, 2002

Page three.

departure, we call your attention to the practical steps contained in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference. Among other things these practical steps set forth the principle of irreversibility and call for "an unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals".

A revised Nuclear Posture Review along these lines would more nearly fulfill your goal of ending Cold War confrontation and achieving true friendship between the United States and Russia. **We urge you to exercise your presidential leadership in the direction of diminishing the role of nuclear weapons and eventually eliminating**

**them from Earth.** As you do, we will do what we can to help build support with the American people.

With best regards,

Jeanette Holt, Associate Director  
Alliance of Baptists

James Matlack, Director  
Washington Office  
American Friends Service Committee

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

Greg Davidson Laszakovits  
Church of the Brethren  
Washington Office

Tiffany Heath, Legislative Officer  
Washington Office,  
Church Women United

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

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

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

Ronald J. Sider, President  
Evangelicals for Social Action.

Joe Volk, Executive Secretary  
Friends Committee on National  
Legislation

Murray Polner, Chair  
Jewish Peace Fellowship

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

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

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

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

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

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 16<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036 Phone/fax: 301 896-0013*

*E-mail: [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)*

Status: U

Return-Path: <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>

Received: from web13901.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.27])

by strange.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 177ghH4IJ3Nl3oW0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 13 May 2002 09:54:41 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020513135441.9404.qmail@web13901.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [205.188.195.26] by web13901.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Mon, 13 May 2002 06:54:41 PDT

Date: Mon, 13 May 2002 06:54:41 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: Revised How to Get To Zero

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

In-Reply-To: <001501c1f77b\$d72be220\$915df7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-125579573-1021298081=:6672"

--0-125579573-1021298081=:6672

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

Hi,

I did more work on the religious statements page and started on the How to get to zero page.

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

My scanner at home is acting weird so I may have to go to kinko's and scan all your pictures.

Thanks,

Marie

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

Your two references on how to write for the web were helpful. Accordingly, I have revised the page on How to Get Zero to apply this guidance. It is sent as a Word attachment. This replaces what I sent yesterday.

I have eliminated some verbiage, added more summary information at the top, and added subheadings to clarify the structure. My instructions on graphics are suggestions, but you have artistic discretion.

It is formatted with block indentation and bold type. I hope that comes through in transmission.

I am going to review the Religious Statements page in light of my new insights on web writing.

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.

> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword name=HOW TO GET TO ZERO.doc

Status: U

Return-Path: <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>

Received: from web13901.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.27])

by strange.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 177ghH4IJ3Nl3oW0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 13 May 2002 09:54:41 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020513135441.9404.qmail@web13901.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [205.188.195.26] by web13901.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Mon, 13 May 2002 06:54:41 PDT

Date: Mon, 13 May 2002 06:54:41 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: Revised How to Get To Zero

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

In-Reply-To: <001501c1f77b\$d72be220\$915df7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-125579573-1021298081=:6672"

--0-125579573-1021298081=:6672

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

Hi,

I did more work on the religious statements page and started on the How to get to zero page.

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

My scanner at home is acting weird so I may have to go to kinko's and scan all your pictures.

Thanks,

Marie

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

Your two references on how to write for the web were helpful. Accordingly, I have revised the page on How to Get Zero to apply this guidance. It is sent as a Word attachment. This replaces what I sent yesterday.

I have eliminated some verbiage, added more summary information at the top, and added subheadings to clarify the structure. My instructions on graphics are suggestions, but you have artistic discretion.

It is formatted with block indentation and bold type. I hope that comes through in transmission.

I am going to review the Religious Statements page in light of my new insights on web writing.

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.

> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword name=HOW TO GET TO ZERO.doc

Status: U  
Return-Path: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
Received: from albatross.prod.itd.earthlink.net ([207.217.120.120])  
by nils.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id  
177gUq8i3NI3pm0  
Mon, 13 May 2002 10:34:42 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from user-2ivel2f.dialup.mindspring.com ([165.247.84.79] helo=esther)  
by albatross.prod.itd.earthlink.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #2)  
id 177Ggz-0000Vo-00; Mon, 13 May 2002 07:20:50 -0700  
Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
Subject: IT'S SUMMIT TIME--TIME TO ACT!!!  
Date: Mon, 13 May 2002 10:25:57 -0400  
Message-ID: <NEBBKJHCMLACLOPKCPPBGEEJCIAA.prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;  
boundary="----=\_NextPart\_000\_000B\_01C1FA68.92079DC0"  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 9.0, Build 9.0.2910.0  
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600  
Importance: Normal

Dear Brink Allies,

FYI Attached is an article by Charles Ferguson, of the Monterey Institute of International Studies' Center for Nonproliferation Studies, published in Defense News, April 22,2002 entitled "Loosen the Fingers on Nuclear Trigger." It can be found on our website at <http://backfromthebrink.org/newsroom/defensenews.html>

\*\*\*\*\*

The U.S. Russian Summit is scheduled for later this month. It appears that there will be an agreement of some sort signed at that summit. We are urging all organizations to continue to send messages about the kind of agreement necessary to actually reduce the nuclear dangers.

As you know, the Brink Campaign is facilitating sending faxes to both President Bush and President Putin. If you have not already done so, this is the perfect time to forward the message below to your constiutents and urge them to send their faxes today.

Thanks,  
Esther

PLEASE FORWARD the message below to your contact lists and members

\*\*\*\*\*

To all those who support taking nuclear weapons off full alert,

Current news reports make it appear there will be an agreement of some type signed by President Bush and President Putin at the May Summit. BUT WHAT KIND OF AGREEMENT?

If you have not already done so, this is your chance to urge President Bush and President Putin to sign a binding agreement to:(1) Take ALL nuclear weapons off high alert (full alert) status immediately (2)RAPIDLY remove warheads slated to be eliminated, temporarily storing them securely with verification processes in place; and,(3)AGREE TO DISMANTLE all nuclear weapons slated for elimination so that reductions in arsenals are irreversible.

Send your message by FAX today. It's easy. There are three ways you can send this message:

(1) Go to <http://backfromthebrink.policy.net/>, click on Action Center and we will send your fax to President Bush for you.

(2) Click <http://backfromthebrink.org/new/faxC.pdf> and download a reprintable FAX that you can copy and give to your friends and contacts to fax TODAY.

(3) Mail either the fax described above or the text version attached to Back From the Brink Campaign at 6856 Eastern Avenue, NW, Washington DC 20012, and we will send the fax from our office.

And finally,PLEASE FORWARD THIS MESSAGE TO AT LEAST 5 FRIENDS AND CONTACTS.

More is even better!

Please let the Brink Campaign know when you have sent your fax.

Whichever method you choose, ACT TODAY! Together we can make a difference.

Ira Shorr

Esther Pank

\*\*\*\*\*

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](mailto:prgrm@backfromthebrink.net)

CHECK OUT OUR NEW WEBSITE AT [www.backfromthebrink.org](http://www.backfromthebrink.org) AND TAKE ACTION TODAY!

---

Defense News  
April 22 2002  
By Charles Ferguson

## **Loosen the Fingers on Nuclear Triggers**

In a 1964 movie satire, American leaders, having just learned from the Soviet ambassador about a doomsday device, watch helplessly as a one U.S. nuclear-armed bomber initiated a chain reaction of nuclear explosions.

The movie camera then turns to a close up of Dr. Strangelove, who demands of the ambassador, "The entire point of a doomsday device is lost if you keep it a secret! Why didn't you tell the world, eh?" This famous bit piece of fiction caricatures the Cold War strategy of mutually assured destruction in which the United States and Russia feared nuclear war because it would destroy both nations. The deterrence of this war depended on both nations being fully informed about their destructive capabilities.

Today, the United States and Russia thankfully are entering a new world in which the likelihood of a deliberate nuclear war is highly remote. However, reality still could imitate fiction. As in the movie "Dr. Strangelove," the United States and Russia could stumble into an accidental nuclear war, because the doomsday device is still in place. Thousands of American and Russian nuclear warheads are currently ready to be launched within moments.

U.S. President George W. Bush and Russian President Vladimir Putin should seize their first opportunity to build an anti-doomsday device by removing the hair-trigger from their nuclear weapons. The next high-level opportunity will be the May presidential summit in Russia.

As a former State Department official, I know that it may be too late to add a new item to the agenda. But taking nuclear weapons off alert is really not a new item.

In 2000, presidential candidate Bush vowed "the United States should remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert status -another unnecessary vestige of Cold War confrontation. Today, for two nations at peace, keeping so many weapons on high alert may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch. So, as president, I will ask for an assessment of what we can safely do to lower the alert status of our forces."

The administration may have followed through on the president's campaign pledge. "U.S. forces are not on 'hair-trigger' alert," according to a leaked portion of the new Nuclear Posture Review. Unfortunately, the details are buried in the review like a Cold War secret. But the entire point of an anti-doomsday device is lost if you keep it a secret. The May summit will provide the ideal setting to achieve clarity on the alert status of nuclear weapons.

At the summit, Russia will seek a legally binding agreement to guarantee a ceiling of 1,700 to 2,200 strategic warheads by the end of the decade. The United States, on the other hand, is only willing to agree to limit the number of "operationally deployed" warheads.

Potentially, several thousand other U.S. warheads would be kept in reserve at much lower levels of alert. Ensuring that all nuclear weapons would be off alert could bridge the gap between the American and Russian proposals. If the United States could assure Russia that American warheads truly are off alert status and would remain so, Russia could be willing to accept a large U.S. reserve force.

Russia also would be more likely to take its nuclear weapons off hair-trigger alert if it was certain that the United States had already done so. To be effective, the anti-doomsday device would have to include mechanisms to ensure that off-alert nuclear weapons are safe from counterattack, and verification measures to guarantee that these weapons cannot be re-alerted within seconds or minutes, but rather would require at least hours or days.

This would give U.S. and Russian national leaders much more time to make national decisions during crises. American and Russian security analysts have developed or readily could develop techniques and technologies that can assure both nations their nuclear deterrents are secure. But the real barrier to building an anti-doomsday device is not technical know-how, but political resistance.

Striving for transparency about the true state of U.S. nuclear weapon readiness would be an important first step toward removing political roadblocks. Immediately following the November 2001 Crawford, Texas, presidential summit with Putin, Bush cast ambiguity about whether U.S. nuclear weapons really are placed on off-alert status. He said, "They're not on alert. However, it doesn't take them long to fire up, if we need them." But this posture fuels insecurity and instability, making accidental nuclear war more likely.

During the May summit, in Russia, Bush and Putin will need to devote much time to the fight against terrorism. Although we should be vigilant against terrorist attacks, such attacks for now cannot destroy our nation.

Only an accidental nuclear war between the United States and Russia could annihilate our civilizations. Preventing such a war should be high on the presidents' agendas.

*Charles Ferguson, scientist-in-residence, is based in the Washington office of the Monterey Institute of International Studies' Center for Nonproliferation Studies.*

# 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](http://www.backfromthebrink.org), 202-545-1001 202-545-1004 fax.

E-mail [pgrm@backfromthebrink.net](mailto:pgrm@backfromthebrink.net)

## Defense News

April 22 2002

By Charles Ferguson

### **Loosen the Fingers on Nuclear Triggers**

In a 1964 movie satire, American leaders, having just learned from the Soviet ambassador about a doomsday device, watch helplessly as a one U.S. nuclear-armed bomber initiated a chain reaction of nuclear explosions.

The movie camera then turns to a close up of Dr. Strangelove, who demands of the ambassador, "The entire point of a doomsday device is lost if you keep it a secret! Why didn't you tell the world, eh? This famous bit piece of fiction caricatures the Cold War strategy of mutually assured destruction in which the United States and Russia feared nuclear war because it would destroy both nations. The deterrence of this war depended on both nations being fully informed about their destructive capabilities.

Today, the United States and Russia thankfully are entering a new world in which the likelihood of a deliberate nuclear war is highly remote. However, reality still could imitate fiction. As in the movie "Dr. Strangelove," the United States and Russia could stumble into an accidental nuclear war, because the doomsday device is still in place. Thousands of American and Russian nuclear warheads are currently ready to be launched within moments.

U.S. President George W. Bush and Russian President Vladimir Putin should seize their first opportunity to build an anti-doomsday device by removing the hair-trigger from their nuclear weapons. The next high-level opportunity will be the May presidential summit in Russia.

As a former State Department official, I know that it may be too late to add a new item to the agenda. But taking nuclear weapons off alert is really not a new item.

In 2000, presidential candidate Bush vowed "the United States should remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert status -another unnecessary vestige of Cold War confrontation. Today, for two nations at peace, keeping so many weapons on high alert may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch. So, as president, I will ask for an assessment of what we can safely do to lower the alert status of our forces."

The administration may have followed through on the president's campaign pledge. "U.S. forces are not on 'hair-trigger' alert," according to a leaked portion of the new Nuclear Posture Review. Unfortunately, the details are buried in the review like a Cold War secret. But the entire point of an anti-doomsday device is lost if you keep it a secret. The May summit will provide the ideal setting to achieve clarity on the alert status of nuclear weapons.

At the summit, Russia will seek a legally binding agreement to guarantee a ceiling of 1,700 to 2,200 strategic warheads by the end of the decade. The United States, on the other hand, is only willing to agree to limit the number of "operationally deployed" warheads.

Potentially, several thousand other U.S. warheads would be kept in reserve at much lower levels of alert. Ensuring that all nuclear weapons would be off alert could bridge the gap between the American and Russian proposals. If the United States could assure Russia that American warheads truly are off alert status and would remain so, Russia could be willing to accept a large U.S. reserve force.

Russia also would be more likely to take its nuclear weapons off hair-trigger alert if it was certain that the United States had already done so. To be effective, the anti-doomsday device would have to include mechanisms to ensure that off-alert nuclear weapons are safe from counterattack, and verification measures to guarantee that these weapons cannot be re-alerted within seconds or minutes, but rather would require at least hours or days.

This would give U.S. and Russian national leaders much more time to make national decisions during crises. American and Russian security analysts have developed or readily could develop techniques and technologies that can assure both nations their nuclear deterrents are secure. But the real barrier to building an anti-doomsday device is not technical know-how, but political resistance.

Striving for transparency about the true state of U.S. nuclear weapon readiness would be an important first step toward removing political roadblocks. Immediately following the November 2001 Crawford, Texas, presidential summit with Putin, Bush cast ambiguity about whether U.S. nuclear weapons really are placed on off-alert status. He said, "They're not on alert. However, it doesn't take them long to fire up, if we need them." But this posture fuels insecurity and instability, making accidental nuclear war more likely.

During the May summit, in Russia, Bush and Putin will need to devote much time to the fight against terrorism. Although we should be vigilant against terrorist attacks, such attacks for now cannot destroy our nation.

Only an accidental nuclear war between the United States and Russia could annihilate our civilizations. Preventing such a war should be high on the presidents' agendas.

*Charles Ferguson, scientist-in-residence, is based in the Washington office of the Monterey Institute of International Studies' Center for Nonproliferation Studies.*

Status: U

Return-Path: <kentkathyb@earthlink.net>

Received: from goose.prod.itd.earthlink.net ([207.217.120.18])

by kendall.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 177ipS6xc3Nl3pM0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 13 May 2002 12:11:16 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from sdn-ap-002watacop1431.dialsprint.net ([63.187.205.161])

by goose.prod.itd.earthlink.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #2)  
id 177IPq-0005bG-00

for mupj@igc.org; Mon, 13 May 2002 09:11:15 -0700

User-Agent: Microsoft-Outlook-Express-Macintosh-Edition/5.02.2022

Date: Mon, 13 May 2002 09:15:08 -0700

Subject: Re: Nuclear Posture Review

From: Kent/Kathy Barton <kentkathyb@earthlink.net>

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

Message-ID: <B905349C.287F%kentkathyb@earthlink.net>

In-Reply-To: <005b01c1fa91\$1292d860\$a15bf7a5@default>

Mime-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="MS\_Mac\_OE\_3104126108\_10658219\_MIME\_Part"

> This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand  
this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

--MS\_Mac\_OE\_3104126108\_10658219\_MIME\_Part

Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Thanks so much Howard. I have a copy of the letter on the NPR that you  
handed out at the PWJ meeting. Do you have it on computer? If so, could  
you Email it to me?

Also, do you have a brief description of the Interfaith group? I'd like to  
be able to give some info about the group. Thanks again!!!! Kathy

on 5/13/02 7:33 AM, Howard W. Hallman at mupj@igc.org wrote:

Kathy,

You're welcome to use the letter on the Nuclear Posture Review. Also, you  
may be interested in an article I wrote for Peace Leaf, which will be  
published soon. I'm attaching a copy. You can use it with proper credit.

Shalom,  
Howard

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

From: Kent/Kathy Barton <kentkathyb@earthlink.net>

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

Date: Sunday, May 12, 2002 2:46 PM

Subject: Nuclear Posture Review

Howard: I would like to refer and circulate the March 15th letter from the  
Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament at the forum. I wanted to know

if this would be okay and if you had any additional talking points I might add or if you had any ideas of how to challenge people the lift up the concerns expresses in the letter.

Thanks, Kathy Campbell-Barton  
503:399-1584

## INTERNATIONAL FORUM: THE ROLE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Date: Monday, May 20, 7 p.m., Loucks Auditorium at Salem Pulic Library

Sponsors: League of Women Voters U.S., League of Women Voters of Marion & Polk Counties, American Association of University Women, Friends of the Library, Oregon Peaceworks and Salem City Club.

Purpose: To give the public the opportunity to hear differing views concerning the use of nuclear weapons as part of our nation's foreign policy and actions, so that they may have the information and perspective to make intelligent choices both as voters and activists in affecting national policy. The LWVUS and the US Dept. of State have agreed to offer these forums free of cost to local leagues that submit proposals for international forums and are accepted. This is sponsored by the Education Fund branch of the LWV , and does not fall under the League's advocacy role.

### Forum Panelists:

1. Dr. Kerry Kartchner, Ph.D., U.S. Dept. of State.
2. Peter Bergel, Executive Director / Oregon Peaceworks
3. Dr. Joe Bowersox, History professor, Willamette University
4. Kathy Campbell Barton, United Methodist Church peace activist

MODERATOR: Sandra Gangle, attorney, Pres. of Salem City Club.

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 177iFIywW3Nl3s70  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 13 May 2002 12:27:38 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020513162737.28346.qmail@web13907.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [205.188.192.52] by web13907.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Mon, 13 May 2002 09:27:37 PDT

Date: Mon, 13 May 2002 09:27:37 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: Religious Statements

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

In-Reply-To: <008701c1fa98\$a059d7a0\$a15bf7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-70854693-1021307257=:27303"

--0-70854693-1021307257=:27303

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

Hi Howard,

I think it will just average itself out in time. If you are satisfied and happy with the overall finished site, you can always give me a little bonus at the end :)

For now I am not adding the pdf files. I will do this once I know that the religious statements page is finished. It takes awhile to convert documents to pdf files.

See notes below...

"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote: Marie, The Religious Statements page is looking good. You're doing a terrific job! This page will continue to grow. I know that you're charging \$80/page for set up. Some pages, such as What's New and Your Feedback won't have much material. Others will have quite a bit. Perhaps it averages out. But is there a point, in fairness to you, that we should pay extra compensation for the heavy volume of Religious Statements? For example, your hourly rate for site maintenance? If so, let me know. Here are some specific comments on the Religious Statements page. 1. The top of the page needs better spacing. "Religious Statements" is crammed too close to "Nuclear Weapons A Moral Issue". Did you receive in the mail my previous artwork for the latter? Yes, I received the mail. I will try to find a good photo of a dove similar to the artwork. 2. For the listing under "Catholic" it would be helpful to have buttons for the four sub-items with linkage. Each of them is fairly long. Users should be able to go to each directly without scrolling through all Catholic entries. I thought I added individual buttons for the sub-items? If you click on "Pax International, it should link to the section. 3. For World Council of Churches, did you receive the logo I sent by mail? Yes, I just haven't had a chance to scan it. 4. For WCC the PDF file for "Nuclear Arms, Doctrines and Disarmament" should include the introductory paragraph. Otherwise users won't know the context. I will do this once I create all the pdf files for this page. 5. Under "Religious Statements for 1998 Preparatory Committee", should the two references to presentations have a click on linkage for the texts presented below? I can add something for users to click on and link to the section. 6. I couldn't locate the PDF for "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition". 7. Nice job of getting a pix of Pope John Paul II and Archbishop Martino (I assume that is he). How did you get the latter? Should we try to get one for Monsignor Chullikat? I search for Archbishop Martino in yahoo and found his photo. I can try to find one for Monsignor Chullikat. 8. At the beginning of the section under Holy See the second sentence of the introduction was omitted. It reads as follows: "In recent years policy statements coming from the Holy See on nuclear disarmament have been made by Vatican delegation to the United Nations in New York. Thus, April 2002 Monsignor Francis Chullikat, deputy head of the delegation, told delegates of the NPT Preparatory Committee: "Okay. I will fix. 9. Under U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops" I wasn't able to bring up the PDF for the excerpt from The Harvest of Justice. 10. At the very end after Jewish are endnotes and permission to use from The Harvest of Justice. This probably comes from what I sent you, which for some reason has these items there as well as in the proper place. Can you eliminate them? Okay. Keep up the good work. Will do :) Howard

Status: U  
Return-Path: <millerph@att.net>  
Received: from mtiwmhc25.worldnet.att.net ([204.127.131.50])  
by osgood.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 177jl47Z33Nl3pt0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 13 May 2002 13:10:22 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from webmail.worldnet.att.net ([204.127.135.57])  
by mtiwmhc25.worldnet.att.net  
(InterMail vM.4.01.03.27 201-229-121-127-20010626) with SMTP  
id <20020513171022.HVHG2855.mtiwmhc25.worldnet.att.net@webmail.worldnet.att.net>  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 13 May 2002 17:10:22 +0000  
Received: from [12.78.124.32] by webmail.worldnet.att.net;  
Mon, 13 May 2002 15:58:35 +0000  
From: millerph@att.net  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Fw: Important: Past Due Notice  
Date: Mon, 13 May 2002 15:58:35 +0000  
X-Mailer: AT&T Message Center Version 1 (May 7 2002)  
Message-Id: <20020513171022.HVHG2855.mtiwmhc25.worldnet.att.net@webmail.worldnet.att.net>

Howard,  
We've written four checks to EarthLink since 1 January,  
all in the amount of \$15.95, as follows:

#1309 1/15/02

#1312 2/18/02

#1316 3/18/02

#1319 4/5/02

> Phil,

>

> This must stem from my sending the check before the invoice arrived. Please  
> tell me the check numbers and dates of checks to EarthLink since January.

>

> Thanks,

>

> Howard

> -----Original Message-----

> From: pastdue@earthlink.net <pastdue@earthlink.net>

> To: mupj@igc.org <mupj@igc.org>

> Date: Sunday, May 12, 2002 1:06 AM

> Subject: Important: Past Due Notice

>

>

> >Dear Howard W. Hallman,

> >

> >EarthLink is sending this message to you because, according to our records,  
> your EarthLink account #2028691 is past due and has a balance of \$15.95.

> >

> >We send invoices monthly via email and/or the US Postal service. If you  
> are receiving this letter via the US Postal service and have not yet  
> received an invoice, please contact our Customer Service Department to

> ensure we have the correct method of invoicing for your account (2028691).  
> >  
> >If you believe you received this notice in error, please contact our  
> Customer Service Department and provide us with information that will help  
> us resolve this matter as soon as possible to avoid interruption of service.  
> >  
> >If you have just recently sent payment or provided current credit card  
> information to us, please disregard this message.  
> >  
> >To update your credit card information with us online, please access  
> EarthLink's secure web page link entitled  
> >"Change Billing Method/View Invoices" at:  
> <https://register.earthlink.net/cgi-bin/wsisa.dll/sf/login/index.html>  
> >If you prefer, EarthLink offers an alternative payment method. You may  
> authorize EarthLink to automatically draft from your checking account. To  
> request a change in payment method to Bank Draft, please contact our  
> Customer Service Department.  
> >  
> >EarthLink Customer Service hours are currently Monday-Friday from 7:00am to  
> 12:00 midnight and Saturday-Sunday from 8:00am to 10:00pm, EST at  
> 1-800-719-4660.  
> >  
> >We value you as a customer and would like to continue serving you.  
> >  
> >Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.  
> >  
> >Sincerely,  
> >  
> >The EarthLink Accounting Group  
> >  
> >  
> >Remit Payments to:  
> >EarthLink, Inc.  
> >PO Box 7645  
> >Atlanta, GA 30357-0645  
> >  
>

Status: U  
Return-Path: <kentkathyb@earthlink.net>  
Received: from pintail.mail.pas.earthlink.net ([207.217.120.122])  
by kendall.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 177kjk2eY3N13pM0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 13 May 2002 14:12:38 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from sdn-ap-001watacop1655.dialsprint.net ([63.187.198.131])  
by pintail.mail.pas.earthlink.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #2)  
id 177KJI-00078b-00  
for mupj@igc.org; Mon, 13 May 2002 11:12:37 -0700  
User-Agent: Microsoft-Outlook-Express-Macintosh-Edition/5.02.2022  
Date: Mon, 13 May 2002 11:16:30 -0700  
Subject: Re: Nuclear Posture Review  
From: Kent/Kathy Barton <kentkathyb@earthlink.net>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Message-ID: <B905510E.2884%kentkathyb@earthlink.net>  
In-Reply-To: <001b01c1faa1\$9bf09b00\$3a59f7a5@default>  
Mime-version: 1.0  
Content-type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="MS\_Mac\_OE\_3104133390\_38085\_MIME\_Part"

> This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand  
this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

--MS\_Mac\_OE\_3104133390\_38085\_MIME\_Part  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Thanks so much Howard. I'll let you know how it goes. This is a great help  
and I have a chance to share the work of the Interfaith Committee for  
Nuclear Disarmament as well!

Shalom, Kathy C-B

on 5/13/02 10:13 AM, Howard W. Hallman at mupj@igc.org wrote:

Kathy,

The letter is attached.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is a coalition of religious  
demoninations and religious associations working together for the global  
elimination of nuclear weapons. It is chaired by Howard W. Hallman, who is  
chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

Shalom,  
Howard

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

From: Kent/Kathy Barton <kentkathyb@earthlink.net>  
To: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.org>  
Date: Monday, May 13, 2002 12:11 PM  
Subject: Re: Nuclear Posture Review

Thanks so much Howard. I have a copy of the letter on the NPR that you

handed out at the PWJ meeting. Do you have it on computer? If so, could you Email it to me?

Also, do you have a brief description of the Interfaith group? I'd like to be able to give some info about the group. Thanks again!!!! Kathy

on 5/13/02 7:33 AM, Howard W. Hallman at mupj@igc.org wrote:

Kathy,

You're welcome to use the letter on the Nuclear Posture Review. Also, you may be interested in an article I wrote for Peace Leaf, which will be published soon. I'm attaching a copy. You can use it with proper credit.

Shalom,  
Howard

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

From: Kent/Kathy Barton <kentkathyb@earthlink.net>

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

Date: Sunday, May 12, 2002 2:46 PM

Subject: Nuclear Posture Review

Howard: I would like to refer and circulate the March 15th letter from the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament at the forum. I wanted to know if this would be okay and if you had any additional talking points I might add or if you had any ideas of how to challenge people the lift up the concerns expresses in the letter.

Thanks, Kathy Campbell-Barton  
503:399-1584

## INTERNATIONAL FORUM: THE ROLE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Date: Monday, May 20, 7 p.m., Loucks Auditorium at Salem Pulic Library

Sponsors: League of Women Voters U.S., League of Women Voters of Marion & Polk Counties, American Association of University Women, Friends of the Library, Oregon Peaceworks and Salem City Club.

Purpose: To give the public the opportunity to hear differing views concerning the use of nuclear weapons as part of our nation's foreign policy and actions, so that they may have the information and perspective to make intelligent choices both as voters and activists in affecting national policy. The LWVUS and the US Dept. of State have agreed to offer these forums free of cost to local leagues that submit proposals for international forums and are accepted. This is sponsored by the Education Fund branch of the LWV , and does not fall under the League's advocacy role.

Forum Panelists:

1. Dr. Kerry Kartchner, Ph.D., U.S. Dept. of State.
2. Peter Bergel, Executive Director / Oregon Peaceworks
3. Dr. Joe Bowersox, History professor, Willamette University

4. Kathy Campbell Barton, United Methodist Church peace activist

MODERATOR: Sandra Gangle, attorney, Pres. of Salem City Club.

Status: U  
Return-Path: <dan@clw.org>  
Received: from mail.clw.org ([63.106.26.66])  
by osgood.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 177kUw3mZ3Nl3pt0  
Mon, 13 May 2002 14:51:02 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from clw.clw.org ([63.106.26.96]) by mail.clw.org  
(Post.Office MTA v3.5.3 release 223 ID# 0-57746U100L2S100V35)  
with ESMTTP id org; Mon, 13 May 2002 14:05:05 -0400  
Message-Id: <4.3.1.1.20020513144752.00b4b100@mail.clw.org>  
X-Sender: dan@mail.clw.org  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.1  
Date: Mon, 13 May 2002 14:49:29 -0400  
To: dan@clw.org  
From: Dan Koslofsky <dan@clw.org>  
Subject: Senate Action on Defense Authorization Bill  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

May 13, 2002  
John Isaacs

**URGE YOUR SENATORS TO OPPOSE  
NEW MISSILE DEFENSE FUNDING AND NEW NUCLEAR WEAPONS**

The United States Senate may consider the fiscal year 2003 Defense Authorization bill the week of May 20 (although the debate could easily be deferred to June).

At that time, Senators may offer two amendments that should be opposed:

1. Missile defense: An amendment to restore some or all of the \$812 million the Senate Armed Services Committee cut from missile defense and to reduce oversight over the program.
2. New nuclear weapon: An amendment to restore the \$15.5 million the Committee cut for research into a new earth-penetrating nuclear weapon designed to target deeply buried underground bunkers and silos.

Key Senators to ask to oppose both amendments:

Democrats:

Breaux - Louisiana  
Graham - Florida  
Hollings - South Carolina  
Inouye - Hawaii  
Miller - Georgia  
Reid - Nevada

Republicans:

Chafee - Rhode Island  
Cochran - Mississippi  
Collins - Maine

Domenici - New Mexico  
Fitzgerald - Illinois  
Grassley - Iowa

Hagel - Nebraska  
Lugar - Indiana  
McCain - Arizona  
Smith - Oregon  
Snowe - Maine  
Specter - Pennsylvania  
Voinovich - Ohio

In addition, there could be an amendment on the Senate floor to reduce the time between an Administration decision to resume nuclear explosive testing and an actual test. The House adopted a provision in its version that would shorten the current 24 - 36 months down to 12 months. If Congress adopts this provision, it will move the United States closer to a resumption of nuclear explosive testing for the first time since 1992 C a disaster for American and international non-proliferation policy.

The Senate Armed Services Committee completed its consideration of the Defense Authorization bill the week of May 9. At that time, under the leadership of Chairman Levin (D-MI) and Strategic Subcommittee Chair Jack Reed (D-RI), the Committee made a number of positive changes to the Administration request for \$393.4 billion.

To read an analysis of what the committee did, check out  
<http://www.clw.org/nmd/senmarkup03.html>

To read the Armed Services Committee press release, check out  
[http://www.senate.gov/%7Earmed\\_services/press/03mark.pdf](http://www.senate.gov/%7Earmed_services/press/03mark.pdf)

The Committee cut the Administration request for missile defense from \$7.6 billion to \$6.8 billion, a net reduction of \$812 million. Most of the savings have been shifted to Navy ship building programs; some funding also went to improve security at U.S. nuclear facilities and other uses. Chairman Levin (MI) explained that the cuts were made because some missile defense programs were not adequately justified, others were duplicative and some money could not be spent in fiscal year 2003. Sen. Jack Reed (RI) explained: "Every dollar spent on missile defense is one less dollar used for the operational readiness of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines and protecting our borders and harbors. Before we fund deployment of a missile defense system, the Administration must address whether it will work."

Sen. Joseph Lieberman (CT), a missile defense supporter, said he had to weigh missile defense against other urgent priority needs in the defense budget, particularly shipbuilding.

The Committee approved a series of provisions to ensure that the missile defense programs are adequately overseen by Congress, the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the military services.

The Committee also cut the Administration's request for \$15.5 million to begin work on a new nuclear earth penetrating weapon (so-called bunker buster). Senators Bingaman (NM) and Reed took the lead on the move. The Committee explained its decision: As a result of growing uncertainty about the Administration's plans for the nuclear weapons employment policy and future nuclear weapons development, the Committee prohibited the use of any funds for the development of a Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator and directed the Secretary of Energy to clearly and specifically identify any funds requested in the future for new or modified nuclear weapons. Instead, the Committee required the Department of Energy to "clearly and specifically identify any funds requested in the future for new or modified nuclear weapons," and a report on the need and uses for any new nuclear weapons, with a comparison to conventional weapons.

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <interfaithnd@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Fw: Senate Action on Defense Authorization Bill  
Date: Mon, 13 May 2002 16:37:23 -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

For your information.

Howard

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

From: Dan Koslofsky <dan@clw.org>  
To: dan@clw.org <dan@clw.org>  
Date: Monday, May 13, 2002 2:05 PM  
Subject: Senate Action on Defense Authorization Bill

>May 13, 2002  
>John Isaacs  
>  
>URGE YOUR SENATORS TO OPPOSE  
>NEW MISSILE DEFENSE FUNDING AND NEW NUCLEAR WEAPONS  
>  
>  
>The United States Senate may consider the fiscal year 2003 Defense  
>Authorization bill the week of May 20 (although the debate could easily be  
>deferred to June).  
>  
>At that time, Senators may offer two amendments that should be opposed:  
>  
>1. Missile defense: An amendment to restore some or all of the \$812  
>million the Senate Armed Services Committee cut from missile defense and to  
>reduce oversight over the program.  
>  
>2. New nuclear weapon: An amendment to restore the \$15.5 million the  
>Committee cut for research into a new earth-penetrating nuclear weapon  
>designed to target deeply buried underground bunkers and silos.  
>  
>Key Senators to ask to oppose both amendments:  
>  
>Democrats:  
>Breaux - Louisiana  
>Graham - Florida  
>Hollings - South Carolina  
>Inouye - Hawaii  
>Miller - Georgia

>Reid - Nevada

>

>Republicans:

>Chafee - Rhode Island

>Cochran - Mississippi

>Collins - Maine

>Domenici - New Mexico

>Fitzgerald - Illinois

>Grassley - Iowa

>

>Hagel - Nebraska

>Lugar - Indiana

>McCain - Arizona

>Smith - Oregon

>Snowe - Maine

>Specter - Pennsylvania

>Voinovich - Ohio

>

>In addition, there could be an amendment on the Senate floor to reduce the  
>time between an Administration decision to resume nuclear explosive testing  
>and an actual test. The House adopted a provision in its version that  
>would shorten the current 24 - 36 months down to 12 months. If Congress  
>adopts this provision, it will move the United States closer to a  
>resumption of nuclear explosive testing for the first time since 1992 C a  
>disaster for American and international non-proliferation policy.

>

>The Senate Armed Services Committee completed its consideration of the  
>Defense Authorization bill the week of May 9. At that time, under the  
>leadership of Chairman Levin (D-MI) and Strategic Subcommittee Chair Jack  
>Reed (D-RI), the Committee made a number of positive changes to the  
>Administration request for \$393.4 billion.

>

>

>To read an analysis of what the committee did, check out  
><http://www.clw.org/nmd/senmarkup03.html>

>

>To read the Armed Services Committee press release, check out  
>[http://www.senate.gov/%7Earmed\\_services/press/03mark.pdf](http://www.senate.gov/%7Earmed_services/press/03mark.pdf)

>

>The Committee cut the Administration request for missile defense from \$7.6  
>billion to \$6.8 billion, a net reduction of \$812 million. Most of the  
>savings have been shifted to Navy ship building programs; some funding also  
>went to improve security at U.S. nuclear facilities and other  
>uses. Chairman Levin (MI) explained that the cuts were made because some  
>missile defense programs were not adequately justified, others were  
>duplicative and some money could not be spent in fiscal year 2003.  
>Sen. Jack Reed (RI) explained: "Every dollar spent on missile defense is  
>one less dollar used for the operational readiness of the Army, Navy, Air  
>Force, and Marines and protecting our borders and harbors. Before we fund  
>deployment of a missile defense system, the Administration must address  
>whether it will work."

>

>Sen. Joseph Lieberman (CT), a missile defense supporter, said he had to  
>weigh missile defense against other urgent priority needs in the defense

>budget, particularly shipbuilding.

>

>The Committee approved a series of provisions to ensure that the missile  
>defense programs are adequately overseen by Congress, the Office of the  
>Secretary of Defense and the military services.

>

> The Committee also cut the Administration's request for \$15.5 million to  
>begin work on a new nuclear earth penetrating weapon (so-called bunker  
>buster). Senators Bingaman (NM) and Reed took the lead on the move. The  
>Committee explained its decision: AAs a result of growing uncertainty about  
>the Administration=s plans for the nuclear weapons employment policy and  
>future nuclear weapons development, the Committee prohibited the use of any  
>funds for the development of a Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator and directed  
>the Secretary of Energy to clearly and specifically identify any funds  
>requested in the future for new or modified nuclear weapons.@ Instead, the  
>Committee required the Department of Energy to "clearly and specifically  
>identify any funds requested in the future for new or modified nuclear  
>weapons," and a report on the need and uses for any new nuclear weapons,  
>with a comparison to conventional weapons.

>

>

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Re: Revised How to Get To Zero  
Date: Mon, 13 May 2002 14:01:05 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
    boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_0056\_01C1FA86.9FFCEFC0"  
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\_0056\_01C1FA86.9FFCEFC0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Marie,

Here are a few corrections for How to Get to Zero.

- A. Please put introductory paragraph in italics.
- B. I left out "a" in "Where there's a will, there's a way."
- C. Add "Common Elements" to the listing of topics prior to Canberra = Commission.
- D. The seven common elements you used are from an earlier draft. The = revised draft has ten, as follows:
  1. De-alerting and standing down deployed nuclear weapons.
  2. Comprehensive test ban.
  3. Cease development and production of new nuclear weapons.
  4. Halt attempts to develop national missile defense.
  5. Commitment to no first use of nuclear weapons.
  6. Bilateral (U.S. and Russia) nuclear arms reduction.
  7. Bring other possessors of nuclear weapons into multilateral = reductions.
  8. Total dismantlement of nuclear weapons and delivery systems.=20
  9. International system for transparency and verification.=20
  10. International control of fissile materials.

E. Do you think we need PDF files for the NAS, New Agenda, and Tokyo = Forum reports? Each has a referral to the complete report. But if we = do, we should also have PDF files for Canberra and the PrepCom. I'm = open to either way.

F. You may not have gotten to it, but my revised How to Get to Zero had = the following markers for the rest of the page.

## Scenarios for Achieving Zero Nuclear Weapons

In this section we present scenarios for achieving zero nuclear weapons = as proposed by military professionals, civilian experts, and ordinary = citizens. Others who want to present their own scenarios can send them = to [proposals@zero-nukes.org](mailto:proposals@zero-nukes.org). To facilitate the process, please send them = as Word attachments or similar format. Persons who want to comment on = proposals of others can reach us through Your Feedback.

### Ideas of Military Professionals

### Ideas of Civilians

### Interim Measures

The elimination of nuclear weapons is most likely to occur through = sequential steps. (1) A frequent beginning step recommended by many = experts is de-alerting, that is, taking weapons off quick-launch alert. = (2) Some experts are uncertain about the final course to the total = elimination of nuclear weapons but want them reduced to low numbers = approaching zero. Their ideas are presented here.=20

### De-Alerting

### Reductions Approaching Zero

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: Zero-nukes web site

Date: Mon, 13 May 2002 14:27:09 -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 Colleagues,

We are making progress with setting up the web site, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org).  
Click if you want to see the home page. Other draft pages ready for viewing  
are;

<http://zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>

<http://zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

Each is a work in progress and will change from day to day.

If you are a sponsor, please check the listing on the home page. Let me  
know if that's how you want to be listed. Send me the URL you want to use  
to connect to your site.

If you are not a sponsor, you have an open invitation to join. If you do,  
provide me the same information.

Several of you indicated a willingness to make a financial contribution.  
You can make your check payable to "Methodists United for Peace with  
Justice" and send it to us at 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

The page on Religious Statements is a beginning. I would like similar  
material for other denominations. This should include a short introduction;  
summary of major statements with linkage to the whole statement, or the  
statement itself if it is short or not on your web site. If you have a logo  
or some other graphic that we can use, please send it to me. If any  
permission is required, please supply the proper language.

I have in the works the beginning of Military Leaders Speak Out. I'm ready  
to start asking military leaders and civilian experts to provide scenarios

for How to Get to Zero. The Civil Statements page will take a lot of work. I hope to have it ready by the end of the month.

As noted, this web site is a work in progress. I will welcome your comments and suggestions about the draft material that is now posted.

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](mailto: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>,  
<Bpinguel@afsc.org>,  
<thart@episcopalchurch.org>,  
<david@fcnl.org>,  
<marsusab@aol.com>,  
<lisaw@nccusa.org>,  
<agreenblatt@nccusa.org>  
Subject: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Mon, 13 May 2002 16:08:06 -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

Dear Colleagues,

We are making progress with setting up the web site, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org).  
Click if you want to see the home page. Other draft pages ready for viewing  
are;

<http://zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>

<http://zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

Each is a work in progress and will change from day to day.

If you are a sponsor, please check the listing on the home page. Let me  
know if that's how you want to be listed. Send me the URL you want to use  
to connect to your site.

If you are not a sponsor, you have an open invitation to join. If you do,  
provide me the same information.

Several of you indicated a willingness to make a financial contribution.  
You can make your check payable to "Methodists United for Peace with  
Justice" and send it to us at 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

The page on Religious Statements is a beginning. I would like similar  
material for other denominations. This should include a short introduction;  
summary of major statements with linkage to the whole statement, or the  
statement itself if it is short or not on your web site. If you have a logo  
or some other graphic that we can use, please send it to me. If any  
permission is required, please supply the proper language.

I have in the works the beginning of Military Leaders Speak Out. I'm ready  
to start asking military leaders and civilian experts to provide scenarios  
for How to Get to Zero. The Civil Statements page will take a lot of work.

I hope to have it ready by the end of the month.

As noted, this web site is a work in progress. I will welcome your comments and suggestions about the draft material that is now posted.

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](mailto: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: <sferguson@bwcumc.org>  
Subject: Peace with justice grants  
Date: Tue, 14 May 2002 09:04:18 -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

Sandy,

I'll be speaking briefly to our congregation (Bethesda, UMC in Bethesda) on Peace with Justice Sunday. Would you please provide me information about what peace with justice grants in the Baltimore-Washington Conference are used for?

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: <david@fcnl.org>  
Received: from local.fcnl.org ([65.207.12.2])  
by tyner.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 177p8wcY3Nl3rs0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 13 May 2002 19:21:48 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: by local.fcnl.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
id <K6MNSJYM>; Mon, 13 May 2002 19:15:25 -0400  
Message-ID: <E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF6A85822@local.fcnl.org>  
From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>  
To: "'Howard W. Hallman'" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: RE: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Mon, 13 May 2002 19:15:24 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

I'm working on it (in between votes). More this week.

David

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2002 4:08 pm  
To: tony@paxchristiusa.org; tvpcusa1@prodigy.net; Bpinguel@afsc.org;  
thart@episcopalchurch.org; david@fcnl.org; marsusab@aol.com;  
lisaw@nccusa.org; agreenblatt@nccusa.org  
Subject: Zero-nukes web site

Dear Colleagues,

We are making progress with setting up the web site, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org).  
Click if you want to see the home page. Other draft pages ready for viewing  
are;

<http://zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>

<http://zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

Each is a work in progress and will change from day to day.

If you are a sponsor, please check the listing on the home page. Let me  
know if that's how you want to be listed. Send me the URL you want to use  
to connect to your site.

If you are not a sponsor, you have an open invitation to join. If you do,  
provide me the same information.

Several of you indicated a willingness to make a financial contribution.  
You can make your check payable to "Methodists United for Peace with  
Justice" and send it to us at 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

The page on Religious Statements is a beginning. I would like similar material for other denominations. This should include a short introduction; summary of major statements with linkage to the whole statement, or the statement itself if it is short or not on your web site. If you have a logo or some other graphic that we can use, please send it to me. If any permission is required, please supply the proper language.

I have in the works the beginning of Military Leaders Speak Out. I'm ready to start asking military leaders and civilian experts to provide scenarios for How to Get to Zero. The Civil Statements page will take a lot of work. I hope to have it ready by the end of the month.

As noted, this web site is a work in progress. I will welcome your comments and suggestions about the draft material that is now posted.

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: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
Received: from pintail.mail.pas.earthlink.net ([207.217.120.122])  
by bissell.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id  
177Kdw2G13NI3rE0  
Tue, 14 May 2002 17:52:22 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from user-2ivekl9.dialup.mindspring.com ([165.247.82.169] helo=esther)  
by pintail.mail.pas.earthlink.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #2)  
id 177k4W-0001AG-00; Tue, 14 May 2002 14:43:05 -0700  
Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
Subject: Summit Treaty More Show than Substance  
Date: Tue, 14 May 2002 17:48:08 -0400  
Message-ID: <NEBBKJHCMLACLOPKCPPBAEFOCIAA.prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;  
boundary="-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0000\_01C1FB6F.824FE420"  
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

To Brink Allies,

Please forward this UPDATED message urging letters-to-the-editor calling for  
Bush to continue discussions with Putin that can result in actual  
"liquidation" of the Cold War legacy.

The "FAX" message has also been updated. Please ask your constituents to  
send THIS UPDATED second fax, even if they have already sent the first one.

Thanks to all who have already supported this effort.

Esther

\*\*\*\*\*

Dear Brink Supporter,

President Bush has claimed that the arms reduction treaty he plans to sign  
with Putin  
at next week's Summit in Moscow will "liquidate the legacy of the Cold War."

He's wrong. For one thing, while he shakes hands with President Putin, the US Strategic Command is still targeting Putin's Moscow office with a nuclear bomb.

The treaty does not "liquidate the legacy of the Cold War." While the details of this 3-page document are sketchy at best, what is clear is that the proposed treaty does not address these legacies of the Cold War nuclear arms race:

- \* nuclear weapons will remain on full-alert;
- \* large numbers of U.S nuclear weapons will remain targeted at Russia;
- \* by not providing for the dismantlement of nuclear weapons and instead merely moving approximately 4,000 to the newly designated "responsive reserve force," the US can return these nuclear weapons to operational status at will;
- \* the treaty does nothing to enhance US support for securing and eliminating Russian nuclear weapons or materials;
- \* the treaty does not address or reduce the thousands of Russian tactical nuclear weapons.
- \* the treaty includes no provisions for verifying the status of U.S. or Russian nuclear weapons or materials.

## ACTIONS

1. Write a Letter-to-the-Editor. The release of the details (sketchy as they are) of the nuclear pact--and next weeks Summit meeting, provide an excellent opportunity to get our message out. Copied (AND ATTACHED) below you'll find a sample letter you can use.[Check out your local newspaper's website for their e-mail address. Many papers prefer that you send your letter by e-mail. ] Please send a copy to the Brink Campaign at 6856 Eastern Ave., NW, Suite 322, Washington DC 20012, or via FAX to 202-545-1004 if it is printed.

2. Tell President Bush how you feel about his arms "reduction" treaty. Go to our web site at <http://backfromthebrink.policy.net/> and send a free UPDATED fax urging President Bush to continue discussions with Putin that can result in actual "liquidation of the Cold War legacy."

Ira Shorr and Esther Pank

\*\*\*\*\*

## Sample Letter in Response to Summit Arms Reduction Agreement

President Bush has touted the nuclear weapons treaty he and President Putin plan to sign at their upcoming Moscow summit next week by declaring: "The treaty will liquidate the legacy of the Cold War." Well, not really.

While the US and Russia will reduce their number of operationally deployed warheads to between 1700 and 2000 each, the Bush administration wants to avoid dismantling a large number of these warheads so they can be put back on line if the US decides they need to go back to Cold War nuclear numbers.

And there's another legacy of the Cold war still firmly in place: the US and Russia still threaten to "liquidate" each other with scores of nuclear weapons on high-alert status—poised to be launched in minutes time.

A Summit of substance would result in dismantled weapons and irreversible arms reductions. It would also put an end to keeping nuclear weapons primed for a quick launch. Real friends don't threaten each other with nuclear weapons.

Your name

Address

\*\*\*\*\*

## **Sample Letter in Response to Summit Arms Reduction Agreement**

President Bush has touted the nuclear weapons treaty he and President Putin plan to sign at their upcoming Moscow summit next week by declaring: "The treaty will liquidate the legacy of the Cold War." Well, not really.

While the US and Russia will reduce their number of operationally deployed warheads to between 1700 and 2000 each, the Bush administration wants to avoid dismantling a large number of these warheads so they can be put back on line if the US decides they need to go back to Cold War nuclear numbers.

And there's another legacy of the Cold war still firmly in place: the US and Russia still threaten to "liquidate" each other with scores of nuclear weapons on high-alert status—poised to be launched in minutes time.

A Summit of substance would result in dismantled weapons and irreversible arms reductions. It would also put an end to keeping nuclear weapons primed for a quick launch. Real friends don't threaten each other with nuclear weapons.

Your name

Address

[Check out your local newspaper's website for their e-mail address. Many papers prefer that you send your letter by e-mail. ]

Send a copy to the Brink Campaign at 6856 Eastern Ave., NW, Suite 322, Washington DC 20012, or via FAX to 202-545-1004 if it is printed.

Good luck.

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Home page design  
Date: Wed, 15 May 2002 08:14:48 -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,

Now that I see how you are setting up the web pages, I'm wondering whether our masthead needs to be as wide as it is. On my monitor, which is ten inches wide, I have to scroll over to view 2+ inches on the right. I realize that many newer monitors are wider, but I imagine that many users have monitors the size of mine.

On the pages for Religious Statements and How to Get to Zero, all the text is contained within the ten inches. But if I want to click "Feedback", I have to scroll over. The only page with text for the wider screen is the home page.

Would it be possible to crop the masthead just to the right of the How to Get to Zero button? The "Feedback" button could move to the second row.

This somewhat narrower masthead would require shifting elements of the home page. I suggest (a) putting the quotes from the generals on the left, (b) having the section of "All nuclear weapons...." fill the space on the right, and (c) moving the sponsors to lower on the page, such as below the box that ends with "How to submit your ideas". Although I want sponsors to be fairly prominent, this move would be okay.

Incidentally we now have another sponsor: National Council of Churches. We may have five or six more, so your re-design needs to reserve some space.

Reorganizing the home page in this manner may require some vertical scrolling to see all the sponsors. This is acceptable. The "how to write for the web" material you referred me to indicated that users would rather scroll vertically than horizontally. The latter is the case with the wider home page for those without wide monitors.

If you want to discuss this, call me at 301 896-0013. Otherwise, go ahead with redesign along the lines I suggested -- with whatever creative input you want.

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](mailto: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: <interfaithnd@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Bush-Putin agreement  
Date: Wed, 15 May 2002 09:00:56 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
 charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
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 Colleagues:

You have seen the news reports that President Bush and President Putin are going to sign a three-page treaty specifying that the United States and Russia must have no more than 1,700 to 2,200 strategic warheads deployed at the end of 2012. This is a positive step in the right direction, but it has many shortcomings.

An intent to reduce the nuclear arsenal to this extent is highly desirable. President Clinton during his eight-year presidency did not achieve any nuclear weapons reduction, so it is good to renew a nuclear arms reduction process that has been in abeyance. It is also desirable to have the agreement in treaty form, binding on both parties and subject to Senate ratification.

That said, this new agreement falls far short of what is needed and desirable. I am forwarding to you an action alert from the Back from the Brink Campaign. They make the point that, contrary to what President Bush has said, this treaty does not "liquidate the legacy of the Cold War". The Brink analysis indicates that:

- \* nuclear weapons will remain on full-alert;
- \* large numbers of U.S nuclear weapons will remain targeted at Russia;
- \* by not providing for the dismantlement of nuclear weapons and instead merely moving approximately 4,000 to the newly designated "responsive reserve force," the US can return these nuclear weapons to operational status at will;
- \* the treaty does nothing to enhance US support for securing and eliminating Russian nuclear weapons or materials;
- \* the treaty does not address or reduce the thousands of Russian tactical nuclear weapons.
- \* the treaty includes no provisions for verifying the status of U.S. or Russian nuclear weapons or materials.

Another analysis is pasted below in the attached article from the New York

Times: "Treaty Offers Pentagon New Flexibility" by Michale R. Gordon. The title makes his point.

What should we do? We don't necessarily want to be carping at a popular president. We should be grateful that a large number of strategic weapons will be taken out of service. However, we should continue to express concerns we raised in our letter to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review. We should continue to press for much, much more in the quest to eliminate nuclear weapons. Some of you may want to pursue the suggestions of Back from the Brink.

We still have lots to do.

Shalom,  
Howard  
###

“Treaty Offers Pentagon New Flexibility”  
New York Times - May 14, 2002 - By Michael R. Gordon

WASHINGTON, May 13 — There is a reason the nuclear arms treaty President Bush plans to sign at the coming Moscow summit meeting is only three pages long. It is intended to provide maximum flexibility to the Pentagon.

The new accord does not require the destruction of a single missile launcher or warhead. Each side can carry out the reductions at its own pace, or even reverse them and temporarily build up its forces.

The only real constraint is that each side must have no more than 1,700 to 2,200 warheads at the end of 2012. At that point, the treaty is set to expire, leaving each side free to have as many weapons as it would like unless the accord is extended.

"What we have now agreed to do under the treaty is what we wanted to do anyway," a senior administration official said today. "That's our kind of treaty."

In other words, it is a fitting agreement for Pentagon planners who are more concerned about protecting the United States' nuclear options than constraining those of the Russians. It marks a break with traditional approaches to arms control.

While arms control can be a highly technical enterprise, the logic of the Bush administration's new approach to nuclear weapons treaties is fairly simple. Throughout the cold war, the United States saw arms control as a way to contain the Soviet nuclear threat and constrain Moscow's ability to carry out a first strike.

The Pentagon's big worry was that the Soviet Union would outpace the United States in an arms race in which each side rushed to deploy new missiles and warheads. American defense officials were especially anxious about the Soviets' heavy SS-18 land-based missile, which carries 10 warheads and was code-named Satan by NATO planners.

That ability gave Washington an enormous stake in arms agreements that had

strict provisions mandating weapons cuts and that forced the Russians to give up their most threatening weapons. Negotiating a ban on land-based missiles with multiple warheads like the SS-18 was a top priority for the first Bush administration.

With the end of the cold war and the collapse of the Soviet military, however, the Pentagon has a very different set of priorities. The Pentagon is counting on Russia's beleaguered economy to force a contraction in the Russian nuclear arsenal. Its primary goal now is not to constrain the Russian nuclear force but to maintain its own flexibility in planning the American one.

The Pentagon's new philosophy was spelled out in its classified Nuclear Posture Review. That study called for reducing the United States arsenal to the level of 1,700 to 2,200 — precisely the limit that the new treaty says the two sides must reach by the end of 2012. According to the study, the planned force will consist of 14 Trident missile-carrying submarines, 500 Minuteman III land-based missiles, 76 B-52H bombers and 21 B-2 bombers.

Even that force, the Pentagon says, may not be sufficient given an uncertain world or what the Pentagon prefers to call "potential contingencies." If relations with Russia or China worsen, administration officials say, the United States may need to expand its nuclear arsenal quickly.

President Bush may talk about building relations with a new Russia that is no longer an adversary, but the agreement he plans to sign is intended to keep open Washington's option to expand its nuclear arsenal if relations with Moscow sour.

Under the agreement, for example, the Pentagon expects to reduce its arsenal gradually so that it shrinks the strategic nuclear force from around 6,000 warheads today to 1,700 to 2,200 at the end of 2012, a significant cut. But if tensions rose with Moscow or China, the United States could suspend the reductions for a few years or even increase the arsenal without violating the treaty.

"In the event that U.S. relations with Russia significantly worsen in the future, the U.S. may need to revise its nuclear force level and posture," the Pentagon said in its nuclear review.

The United States is under no obligation to extend the treaty when it lapses after 10 years. The agreement also contains an escape hatch: each side can withdraw on three months' notice. That is half the amount of time required to withdrawn from the Antiballistic Missile Treaty of 1972.

Nor is there any link in the treaty to the issue of missile defenses, as Moscow once insisted.

To obtain such a degree of flexibility, the Bush administration had to make concessions. The accord will be legally binding, as the Russians have insisted. Bush administration hard-liners initially resisted doing even that, but Russia wanted a binding accord to make the nuclear balance more predictable and put some limits on the Americans.

"The Russians got a treaty, and the U.S. got its flexibility," said Ivo Daalder, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution. "The U.S. can go down when it wants to, and it can go back up when it needs to. That is what Bush set out to accomplish in his new nuclear policy."

Because the Bush administration insisted on maximum flexibility in planning its arsenal, it also had to allow Moscow the freedom to plan its strategic forces. As a result, the Russians will be free to deploy new land-based missiles with multiple warheads, such as the three-warhead version of the SS-27, and to keep old ones like the SS-18.

The ban on land-based missiles with multiple warheads, which President Bush's father so actively promoted as a way to eliminate the most destabilizing weapons, has essentially been cast aside.

It is cheaper to put several warheads on a missile than to build a missile for each warhead. So this gives Moscow a cost-effective way to maintain its nuclear arsenal — or expand it should the United States field an effective missile defense.

That point has not been lost on some of the skeptics. Mr. Daalder observed, "Maximum flexibility is a two-way street."

###

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: <interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com>  
Subject: Fw: Summit Treaty More Show than Substance  
Date: Wed, 15 May 2002 09:01:56 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
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  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;  
    boundary="-----=\_NextPart\_000\_001A\_01C1FBEF.2A373060"

I am forwarding this to you for your information and whatever response you choose.

Howard

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

From: Brink Campaign <[prgrm@backfromthebrink.net](mailto:prgrm@backfromthebrink.net)>  
To: [prgrm@backfromthebrink.net](mailto:prgrm@backfromthebrink.net) <[prgrm@backfromthebrink.net](mailto:prgrm@backfromthebrink.net)>  
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2002 5:43 PM  
Subject: Summit Treaty More Show than Substance

To Brink Allies,

Please forward this UPDATED message urging letters-to-the-editor calling for Bush to continue discussions with Putin that can result in actual "liquidation" of the Cold War legacy.

The "FAX" message has also been updated. Please ask your constituents to send THIS UPDATED second fax, even if they have already sent the first one.

Thanks to all who have already supported this effort.

Esther

\*\*\*\*\*

Dear Brink Supporter,

President Bush has claimed that the arms reduction treaty he plans to sign with Putin

at next week's Summit in Moscow will "liquidate the legacy of the Cold War."

He's wrong. For one thing, while he shakes hands with President Putin, the US Strategic Command is still targeting Putin's Moscow office with a nuclear bomb.

The treaty does not "liquidate the legacy of the Cold War." While the details of this 3-page document are sketchy at best, what is clear is that the proposed treaty does not address these legacies of the Cold War nuclear arms race:

- \* nuclear weapons will remain on full-alert;
- \* large numbers of U.S nuclear weapons will remain targeted at Russia;
- \* by not providing for the dismantlement of nuclear weapons and instead merely moving approximately 4,000 to the newly designated "responsive reserve force," the US can return these nuclear weapons to operational status at will;
- \* the treaty does nothing to enhance US support for securing and eliminating Russian nuclear weapons or materials;
- \* the treaty does not address or reduce the thousands of Russian tactical nuclear weapons.
- \* the treaty includes no provisions for verifying the status of U.S. or Russian nuclear weapons or materials.

## ACTIONS

1. Write a Letter-to-the-Editor. The release of the details (sketchy as they are) of the nuclear pact--and next weeks Summit meeting, provide an excellent opportunity to get our message out. Copied (AND ATTACHED) below you'll find a sample letter you can use.[Check out your local newspaper's website for their e-mail address. Many papers prefer that you send your letter by e-mail. ] Please send a copy to the Brink Campaign at 6856

Eastern Ave., NW, Suite 322, Washington DC 20012, or via FAX to 202-545-1004 if it is printed.

2. Tell President Bush how you feel about his arms "reduction" treaty. Go

to our web site at <http://backfromthebrink.policy.net/> and send a free UPDATED fax urging President Bush to continue discussions with Putin that can result in actual "liquidation of the Cold War legacy."

Ira Shorr and Esther Pank

\*\*\*\*\*

### Sample Letter in Response to Summit Arms Reduction Agreement

President Bush has touted the nuclear weapons treaty he and President Putin plan to sign at their upcoming Moscow summit next week by declaring: "The treaty will liquidate the legacy of the Cold War." Well, not really.

While the US and Russia will reduce their number of operationally deployed warheads to between 1700 and 2000 each, the Bush administration wants to avoid dismantling a large number of these warheads so they can be put back on line if the US decides they need to go back to Cold War nuclear numbers.

And there's another legacy of the Cold war still firmly in place: the US and Russia still threaten to "liquidate" each other with scores of nuclear weapons on high-alert status—poised to be launched in minutes time.

A Summit of substance would result in dismantled weapons and irreversible arms reductions. It would also put an end to keeping nuclear weapons primed for a quick launch. Real friends don't threaten each other with nuclear weapons.

Your name  
Address

\*\*\*\*\*

## **Sample Letter in Response to Summit Arms Reduction Agreement**

President Bush has touted the nuclear weapons treaty he and President Putin plan to sign at their upcoming Moscow summit next week by declaring: "The treaty will liquidate the legacy of the Cold War." Well, not really.

While the US and Russia will reduce their number of operationally deployed warheads to between 1700 and 2000 each, the Bush administration wants to avoid dismantling a large number of these warheads so they can be put back on line if the US decides they need to go back to Cold War nuclear numbers.

And there's another legacy of the Cold war still firmly in place: the US and Russia still threaten to "liquidate" each other with scores of nuclear weapons on high-alert status—poised to be launched in minutes time.

A Summit of substance would result in dismantled weapons and irreversible arms reductions. It would also put an end to keeping nuclear weapons primed for a quick launch. Real friends don't threaten each other with nuclear weapons.

Your name

Address

[Check out your local newspaper's website for their e-mail address. Many papers prefer that you send your letter by e-mail. ]

Send a copy to the Brink Campaign at 6856 Eastern Ave., NW, Suite 322, Washington DC 20012, or via FAX to 202-545-1004 if it is printed.

Good luck.

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
Subject: Re: Summit Treaty More Show than Substance  
Date: Wed, 15 May 2002 09:02:50 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
 charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
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 this message. I have forwarded it to participants in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

Howard

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

From: Brink Campaign <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
To: prgrm@backfromthebrink.net <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2002 5:43 PM  
Subject: Summit Treaty More Show than Substance

>To Brink Allies,

>

>Please forward this UPDATED message urging letters-to-the-editor calling for

>Bush to continue discussions with Putin that can result in actual  
>"liquidation" of the Cold War legacy.

>

>The "FAX" message has also been updated. Please ask your constituents to  
>send THIS UPDATED second fax, even if they have already sent the first one.

>

>Thanks to all who have already supported this effort.

>

>Esther

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

>

>Dear Brink Supporter,

>

>President Bush has claimed that the arms reduction treaty he plans to sign  
>with Putin

>at next week's Summit in Moscow will "liquidate the legacy of the Cold  
War."

>

>He's wrong. For one thing, while he shakes hands with President Putin, the  
>US Strategic Command is still targeting Putin's Moscow office with a  
nuclear  
>bomb.

>  
>The treaty does not "liquidate the legacy of the Cold War." While the  
>details of this 3-page document are sketchy at best, what is clear is that  
>the proposed treaty does not address these legacies of the Cold War nuclear  
>arms race:

>  
>\* nuclear weapons will remain on full-alert;  
>  
>\* large numbers of U.S nuclear weapons will remain targeted at Russia;  
>  
>\* by not providing for the dismantlement of nuclear weapons and instead  
>merely moving approximately 4,000 to the newly designated "responsive  
>reserve force," the US can return these nuclear weapons to operational  
>status at will;

>  
>\* the treaty does nothing to enhance US support for securing and  
eliminating  
>Russian nuclear weapons or materials;

>  
>\* the treaty does not address or reduce the thousands of Russian tactical  
>nuclear weapons.

>  
>\* the treaty includes no provisions for verifying the status of U.S. or  
>Russian nuclear weapons or materials.

>  
>ACTIONS

>  
>1. Write a Letter-to-the-Editor. The release of the details (sketchy as  
>they are) of the nuclear pact--and next weeks Summit meeting, provide an  
>excellent opportunity to get our message out. Copied (AND ATTACHED) below  
>you'll find a sample letter you can use.[Check out your local newspaper's  
>website for their e-mail address. Many papers prefer that you send your  
>letter by e-mail. ] Please send a copy to the Brink Campaign at 6856  
Eastern  
>Ave., NW, Suite 322, Washington DC 20012, or via FAX to 202-545-1004 if it  
>is printed.

>  
>2. Tell President Bush how you feel about his arms "reduction" treaty. Go  
>to our web site at <http://backfromthebrink.policy.net/> and send a free  
>UPDATED fax urging President Bush to continue discussions with Putin that  
>can result in actual "liquidation of the Cold War legacy."

>  
>Ira Shorr and Esther Pank

>  
>\*\*\*\*\*

>Sample Letter in Response to Summit Arms Reduction Agreement

>  
>President Bush has touted the nuclear weapons treaty he and President Putin  
>plan to signs at their upcoming Moscow summit next week by declaring: "The  
>treaty will liquidate the legacy of the Cold War." Well, not really.

>  
>While the US and Russia will reduce their number of operationally deployed  
>warheads to between 1700 and 2000 each, the Bush administration wants to  
>avoid dismantling a large number of these warheads so they can be put back



Status: U  
Return-Path: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
Received: from hawk.mail.pas.earthlink.net ([207.217.120.22])  
by pickering.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 177Zjj3zH3Nl3p20  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 15 May 2002 09:59:21 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from pool-63.49.129.127.bltn.grid.net ([63.49.129.127] helo=esther)  
by hawk.mail.pas.earthlink.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #2)  
id 177zJI-0002C1-00  
for mupj@igc.org; Wed, 15 May 2002 06:59:21 -0700  
Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: RE: Summit Treaty More Show than Substance  
Date: Wed, 15 May 2002 10:05:00 -0400  
Message-ID: <NEBBKJHCMLACLOPKCPPBGEGFCIAA.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  
In-Reply-To: <002401c1fc10\$e8d78800\$cc51f7a5@default>

Thanks Howard.  
Esther

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2002 9:03 AM  
To: prgrm@backfromthebrink.net  
Subject: Re: Summit Treaty More Show than Substance

Thanks for this message. I have forwarded it to participants in the  
Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

Howard

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

From: Brink Campaign <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
To: prgrm@backfromthebrink.net <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2002 5:43 PM  
Subject: Summit Treaty More Show than Substance

>To Brink Allies,

>

>Please forward this UPDATED message urging letters-to-the-editor calling  
for

>Bush to continue discussions with Putin that can result in actual

>"liquidation" of the Cold War legacy.  
>  
>The "FAX" message has also been updated. Please ask your constituents to  
>send THIS UPDATED second fax, even if they have already sent the first one.

>  
>Thanks to all who have already supported this effort.

>  
>Esther

>  
>\*\*\*\*\*

>  
>Dear Brink Supporter,

>  
>President Bush has claimed that the arms reduction treaty he plans to sign  
>with Putin  
>at next week's Summit in Moscow will "liquidate the legacy of the Cold  
War."

>  
>He's wrong. For one thing, while he shakes hands with President Putin, the  
>US Strategic Command is still targeting Putin's Moscow office with a  
nuclear  
>bomb.

>  
>The treaty does not "liquidate the legacy of the Cold War." While the  
>details of this 3-page document are sketchy at best, what is clear is that  
>the proposed treaty does not address these legacies of the Cold War nuclear  
>arms race:

>  
>\* nuclear weapons will remain on full-alert;

>  
>\* large numbers of U.S nuclear weapons will remain targeted at Russia;

>  
>\* by not providing for the dismantlement of nuclear weapons and instead  
>merely moving approximately 4,000 to the newly designated "responsive  
>reserve force," the US can return these nuclear weapons to operational  
>status at will;

>  
>\* the treaty does nothing to enhance US support for securing and  
eliminating

>Russian nuclear weapons or materials;

>  
>\* the treaty does not address or reduce the thousands of Russian tactical  
>nuclear weapons.

>  
>\* the treaty includes no provisions for verifying the status of U.S. or  
>Russian nuclear weapons or materials.

>  
>ACTIONS

>  
>1. Write a Letter-to-the-Editor. The release of the details (sketchy as  
>they are) of the nuclear pact--and next weeks Summit meeting, provide an  
>excellent opportunity to get our message out. Copied (AND ATTACHED) below  
>you'll find a sample letter you can use.[Check out your local newspaper's

>website for their e-mail address. Many papers prefer that you send your  
>letter by e-mail. ] Please send a copy to the Brink Campaign at 6856  
Eastern  
>Ave., NW, Suite 322, Washington DC 20012, or via FAX to 202-545-1004 if it  
>is printed.

>  
>2. Tell President Bush how you feel about his arms "reduction" treaty. Go  
>to our web site at <http://backfromthebrink.policy.net/> and send a free  
>UPDATED fax urging President Bush to continue discussions with Putin that  
>can result in actual "liquidation of the Cold War legacy."

>  
>Ira Shorr and Esther Pank

>  
>\*\*\*\*\*

>Sample Letter in Response to Summit Arms Reduction Agreement

>  
>President Bush has touted the nuclear weapons treaty he and President Putin  
>plan to signs at their upcoming Moscow summit next week by declaring: "The  
>treaty will liquidate the legacy of the Cold War." Well, not really.

>  
>While the US and Russia will reduce their number of operationally deployed  
>warheads to between 1700 and 2000 each, the Bush administration wants to  
>avoid dismantling a large number of these warheads so they can be put back  
>on line if the US decides they need to go back to Cold War nuclear numbers.

>  
>And there's another legacy of the Cold war still firmly in place: the US  
and  
>Russia still threaten to "liquidate" each other with scores of nuclear  
>weapons on high-alert status—poised to be launched in minutes time.

>  
>A Summit of substance would result in dismantled weapons and irreversible  
>arms reductions. It would also put an end to keeping nuclear weapons  
primed  
>for a quick launch. Real friends don't threaten each other with nuclear  
>weapons.

>  
>Your name

>Address

>  
>\*\*\*\*\*

>  
>  
>  
>  
>

Status: U

Return-Path: <dradcliff\_gb@brethren.org>

Received: from gwia.brethren.org ([216.145.233.29])

by payne.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 1781JG3Ri3Nl3p40  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 15 May 2002 12:34:44 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from DOM\_COB-MTA by gwia.brethren.org

with Novell\_GroupWise; Wed, 15 May 2002 11:31:40 -0500

Message-Id: <sce2471c.067@gwia.brethren.org>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 6.0.2

Date: Wed, 15 May 2002 11:31:31 -0500

From: "David Radcliff" <dradcliff\_gb@brethren.org>

To: <mupj@igc.org>

Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Fw: Summit Treaty More Show than Substance

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: inline

Howard, I really appreciate your providing analysis of the proposed treaty. It's very helpful to see what's really happening here.

David Radcliff

Status: U

Return-Path: <jim@newleafpress.net>

Received: from hbeark.com ([12.43.15.1])

by osgood.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 178rPl6Uz3Nl3pt0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 16 May 2002 16:26:19 -0400 (EDT)

Received: (qmail 26675 invoked from network); 16 May 2002 20:26:26 -0000

Received: from ts1-104.hbeark.com (HELO localhost) (12.43.15.104)

by hbeark.com with SMTP; 16 May 2002 20:26:26 -0000

Date: Thu, 16 May 2002 15:27:03 -0500

Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v480)

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; format=flowed

Subject: shootings

From: Jim Fletcher <jim@newleafpress.net>

To: mupj@igc.org

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Message-Id: <483B5AE4-690B-11D6-BAEE-00039309775C@newleafpress.net>

X-Mailer: Apple Mail (2.480)

X-AntiVirus: scanned for viruses by HBEARK.COM

I read on the Peace With Justice May 26, 2002 letter that Teddy Crum reported seeing Palestinian children shot on their way to school.

I'd like to investigate that. Can you put me in touch with Teddy Crum?

Thank you,  
Jim Fletcher

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "James & Char Hipkins" <debate44646@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Fw: shootings  
Date: Thu, 16 May 2002 16:58:35 -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

Do you know anything about this? Was there an article in Peace Leaf with this information. If so, please reply to the inquirer.

Is there a new Peace Leaf? I have received one, but I know that you were going away.

Peace,  
Howard

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

From: Jim Fletcher <jim@newleafpress.net>  
To: mupj@igc.org <mupj@igc.org>  
Date: Thursday, May 16, 2002 4:26 PM  
Subject: shootings

>I read on the Peace With Justice May 26, 2002 letter that Teddy Crum  
>reported seeing Palestinian children shot on their way to school.  
>  
>I'd like to investigate that. Can you put me in touch with Teddy Crum?  
>  
>Thank you,  
>Jim Fletcher  
>

Status: U

Return-Path: <debate44646@yahoo.com>

Received: from web10705.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.130.213])

by strange.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 178yMYhI3Nl3oW1  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 16 May 2002 23:52:20 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020517035221.61569.qmail@web10705.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [24.140.23.16] by web10705.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Thu, 16 May 2002 20:52:21 PDT

Date: Thu, 16 May 2002 20:52:21 -0700 (PDT)

From: hipkins james <debate44646@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: Fw: shootings

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

In-Reply-To: <000801c1fd1c\$74e71f20\$4954f7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

The next Peace Leaf will be out in two weeks. This is the April issue. We had no May 26 edition. I am having some trouble with the printing but it is worked out I hope.

I am still checking on the check.

Jim

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

> Do you know anything about this? Was their an  
> article in Peace Leaf with  
> this information. If so, please reply to the  
> inquirer.

>  
> Is there a new Peace Leaf? I have received one, but  
> I know that you were  
> going away.

>  
> Peace,  
> Howard

>  
>  
> -----Original Message-----  
> From: Jim Fletcher <jim@newleafpress.net>  
> To: mupj@igc.org <mupj@igc.org>  
> Date: Thursday, May 16, 2002 4:26 PM  
> Subject: shootings

>  
>  
> >I read on the Peace With Justice May 26, 2002  
> letter that Teddy Crum  
> >reported seeing Palestinian children shot on their  
> way to school.

> >  
> >I'd like to investigate that. Can you put me in  
> touch with Teddy Crum?  
> >

> >Thank you,  
> >Jim Fletcher  
> >  
>

---

Do You Yahoo!?  
LAUNCH - Your Yahoo! Music Experience  
<http://launch.yahoo.com>

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Jim Fletcher" <jim@newleafpress.net>  
Subject: Re: shootings  
Date: Fri, 17 May 2002 08:43:55 -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

I have no information on this alleged incident.

Howard Hallman

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

From: Jim Fletcher <jim@newleafpress.net>  
To: mupj@igc.org <mupj@igc.org>  
Date: Thursday, May 16, 2002 4:26 PM  
Subject: shootings

>I read on the Peace With Justice May 26, 2002 letter that Teddy Crum  
>reported seeing Palestinian children shot on their way to school.  
>  
>I'd like to investigate that. Can you put me in touch with Teddy Crum?  
>  
>Thank you,  
>Jim Fletcher  
>

Status: U  
Return-Path: <jdi@clw.org>  
Received: from mail.clw.org ([63.106.26.66])  
by payne.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 178sSG7tv3Nl3p40  
Thu, 16 May 2002 17:33:50 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from clw.clw.org ([63.106.26.83]) by mail.clw.org  
(Post.Office MTA v3.5.3 release 223 ID# 0-57746U100L2S100V35)  
with ESMTTP id org; Thu, 16 May 2002 16:36:15 -0400  
Message-Id: <5.0.0.25.2.20020516171820.00a66210@[63.106.26.66]>  
X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0  
Date: Thu, 16 May 2002 17:23:18 -0400  
To: jdi@clw.org  
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>  
Subject: On-line Briefing Book on the Bush-Putin Summit  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

[apologies for any duplication]

NOW AVAILABLE: On-line Briefing Book on the Bush-Putin Summit

President Bush travels to Moscow on May 23 for a summit with Russian President Vladimir Putin at which the two leaders will sign a treaty on nuclear reductions and establish a "New Strategic Framework" marking a new era in U.S.-Russia relations. In addition to arms control, the two leaders will touch on a wide range of issues including economic ties and cooperation in the war against terrorism.

The Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation has released an online briefing book, available at [www.armscontrolcenter.org/2002summit](http://www.armscontrolcenter.org/2002summit), providing important background information and perspectives on major arms control and nonproliferation issues that will be discussed at the summit but left unaddressed by the new treaty. These issues include whether deactivated warheads will be stored or destroyed; how reductions will be monitored and verified; and U.S. plans to deploy ballistic missile defenses. The publication also addresses the Nuclear Posture Review, which forms the basis of the Bush administration's thinking on nuclear weapons and strategic security. Included in the briefing book are sections summarizing issues for Congress, talking points on the Nuclear Posture Review, and viewpoints expressed by U.S. and Russian officials, Members of Congress, and newspaper editorials. The on-line text will be continuously updated prior to, during, and after the summit.

For any questions, contact:  
Steve LaMontagne, 202-546-0795 x100  
Molly Dietz, 202-546-0795 x119

Briefing Book on the Bush-Putin Summit and the Nuclear Posture Review

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chap. 1 Introduction

Chap. 2 Major Issues for the Bush-Putin Summit

- Chap. 3 Key Issues for Congress
- Chap. 4 Talking Points on the Nuclear Posture Review
- Chap. 5 Summary of the Nuclear Posture Review
- Chap. 6 Comparison of 1994 Nuclear Posture Review and 2002 Nuclear Posture Review
- Chap. 7 The Bush-Putin Summit and the Nuclear Posture Review: What Bush Administration Officials are Saying
- Chap. 8 The Bush-Putin Summit and the Nuclear Posture Review: What Members of Congress are Saying
- Chap. 9 The Bush-Putin Summit and the Nuclear Posture Review: What Russian Officials are Saying
- Chap. 10 Editorials: Viewpoints on the Bush-Putin Summit and the Nuclear Posture Review
- Chap. 11 Useful Links

## APPENDICES

- Appendix I Transcript of White House Background Briefing Re: Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty
- Appendix II Excerpts from the Leaked Portions of the Nuclear Posture Review
- Appendix III U.S. and Russian Deployed Strategic Nuclear Weapons
- Appendix IV Summary of START I Treaty Verification and Transparency Measures
- Appendix V Douglas Feith Testimony, February 14, 2002
- Appendix VI Reed/Levin Letter to President Bush, April 4, 2002
- Appendix VII Biden/Helms Letter to President Bush, March 15, 2002
- Appendix VIII McNamara and Graham OpEd, March 14, 2002

\*\*\*\*\*

Steve LaMontagne  
Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation  
110 Maryland Avenue N.E., Suite 201  
Washington D.C. 20002  
(202) 546-0795 x100  
slamontagne@armscontrolcenter.org

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "\"Mary Sperry\"" <MSperry@usccb.org>  
Cc: <gpowers@usccb.org>  
Subject: Excerpt from The Challenge of Peace  
Date: Thu, 16 May 2002 16:02:48 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;  
          boundary="-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0007\_01C1FCF3.227AA500"  
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:

I have put the "Summary" in The Challenge of Peace into digital form, as shown in the attachment. We would like to have your permission to use it on our interfaith web site, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). It will go with the excerpt from The Harvest of Peace, which you have given us permission to use. I incorporated the permission language from the latter into the former, subject of course to your consent.

The attachment also has a new introductory paragraph for the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, using language drawn from your web site. I hope that it is acceptable.

We greatly appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

Shalom,  
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](mailto: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**

The Catholic Church with 60 million members and 19,200 local parishes is the largest religious body in the United States. Bishops appointed by the pope serve as spiritual and administrative leaders of 194 dioceses. The bishops join together as the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) to jointly exercise certain pastoral functions on behalf of the Christian faithful of 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.*

#### **Summary**

The Second Vatican Council opened its evaluation of modern warfare with the statement: "The whole human race faces a moment of supreme crisis in its advance toward maturity." We agree with the council's assessment; the crisis of the moment is embodied in the threat which nuclear weapons pose for the world and much that we hold dear in the world. We have seen and felt the effects of the crisis of the nuclear age in the lives of people we serve. Nuclear weaponry has drastically changed the nature of warfare, and the arms race poses a threat to human life and human civilization which is without precedent.

We write this letter from the perspective of Catholic faith. Faith does not insulate us from the daily challenges of life but intensifies our desire to address them precisely in light of the gospel which has come to us in the person of the risen Christ. Through the resources of faith and reason we desire in this letter to provide hope for people in our day and direction toward a world freed of nuclear threat.

As Catholic bishops we write this letter as an exercise of our teaching ministry. The Catholic tradition on war and peace is a long and complex one; it stretches from the Sermon on the Mount to the statements of Pope John Paul II. We wish to explore and explain the resources of the moral-religious teaching and to apply it to specific questions of our day. In doing this we realize, and we want readers of this letter to recognize, that not all statements in this letter have the same moral authority. At times we state universally binding moral principles found in the teachings of the Church; at other times the pastoral letter makes specific applications, observations and recommendations which allow for diversity of opinion on the part of those who assess the factual data of situations differently. However, we expect Catholics to give our moral judgements serious consideration when they are forming their own views on specific problems.

The experience of preparing this letter has manifested to us the range of strongly held opinion in the Catholic community on questions of fact and judgment concerning issues of war and peace. We urge mutual respect among individuals and groups in the Church as this letter is analyzed and discussed. Obviously, as bishops, we believe that such differences should be expressed within the framework of Catholic moral teaching. We need in the Church not only conviction and commitment but also civility and charity.

While this letter is addressed principally to the Catholic community, we want it to make a contribution to the wider public debate in our country on the dangers and dilemmas of the nuclear age. Our contribution will not be primarily technical or political, but we are convinced that there is no satisfactory answer to the human problems of the nuclear age which fails to consider the moral and religious dimensions of the questions we face.

Although we speak in our own name, as Catholic bishops of the Church in the United States, we have been conscious in the preparation of this letter of the consequences our teaching will have not only for the United States but for other nations as well. One important expression of this awareness has been the consultation we have had, by correspondence and in an important meeting at the Vatican (January 18-19, 1983), with representatives of European bishops' conferences. This consultation with bishops of other countries, and, of course, with the Holy See, has been very helpful to us.

Catholic teaching has always understood peace in positive terms. In the words of Pope John Paul II: "Peace is not just the absence of war. . . . Like a cathedral, peace must be constructed patiently and with unshakable faith." (Coventry, England, 1982) Peace is the fruit of order. Order in human society must be shaped on the basis of respect for the transcendence of God and the unique dignity of each person, understood in terms of freedom, justice, truth and love. To avoid war in our day we must be intent on building peace in an increasingly interdependent world. In Part III of

this letter we set forth a positive vision of peace and the demands such a vision makes on diplomacy, national policy, and personal choices.

While pursuing peace incessantly, it is also necessary to limit the use of force in a world comprised of nation states, faced with common problems but devoid of an adequate international political authority. Keeping the peace in the nuclear age is a moral and political imperative. In Parts I and II of this letter we set forth both the principles of Catholic teaching on war and a series of judgments, based on these principle, about concrete policies. In making these judgments we speak as moral teachers, not as technical experts.

## **I. Some Principles, Norms and Premises of Catholic Teaching**

### **A. On War**

1. Catholic teaching begins in every case with a presumption against war and for peaceful settlement of disputes. In exceptional cases, determined by the moral principles of the just-war tradition, some uses of force are permitted.

2. Every nation has a right and duty to defend itself against unjust aggression.

3. Offensive war of any kind is not morally justifiable.

4. It is never permitted to direct nuclear or conventional weapons to "the indiscriminate destruction of whole cities or vast areas with their populations. . . ." (*Pastoral Consultation, #80.*) The intentional killing of innocent civilians or non-combatants is always wrong.

5. Even defensive response to unjust attack can cause destruction which violates the principle of proportionality, going far beyond the limits of legitimate defense. The judgment is particularly important when assessing planned use of nuclear weapons. No defensive strategy, nuclear or conventional, which exceeds the limits of proportionality is morally permissible.

### **B. On Deterrence**

1. "In current conditions 'deterrence' based on balance, certainly not as an end in itself but as a step on the way toward progressive disarmament, may still be judged morally acceptable. Nonetheless, in order to ensure peace, it is indispensable not to be satisfied with this minimum which is always susceptible to the real danger of explosion." (Pope John Paul II, "Message to U.N. Special Session on Disarmament," #8, June 1982.)

2. No *use* of nuclear weapons which would violate the principles of discrimination or proportionality may be *intended* in a strategy of deterrence. The moral demands of Catholic teaching require resolute willingness not to intend or to do moral evil even to save our own lives or the lives of those we love.

3. Deterrence is not an adequate strategy as a long-term basis for peace; it is a transitional strategy justifiable only in conjunction with resolute determination to pursue arms control and disarmament. We are convinced that "the fundamental principle on which our present peace depends must be replaced by another, which declares the true and solid peace of nations consists not in equality of arms but in mutual trust alone". (Pope John XIII, *Peace on Earth*, #113.)

### **C. The Arms Race and Disarmament**

1. The arms race is one of the greatest curses on the human race; it is to be condemned as a danger, an act of aggression against the poor, and a folly which does not provide the security in promises. (Cf: *Pastoral Constitution*, #81; *Statement of the Holy See to the United Nations*, 1976).

2. Negotiations must be pursued in every reasonable form possible; they should be governed by the "demand that the arms race should cease; that the stockpiles which exist in various countries should be reduced equally and simultaneously by the parties concerned; that nuclear weapons should be banned; and that a general agreement should eventually be reached about progressive disarmament and an effective method of control." (Pope John XXIII, *Peace on Earth*, #112.)

### **D. On Personal Conscience**

1. **Military Service:** "All those who enter the military service in loyalty to their country should look upon themselves as the custodians of the security and freedom of

their fellow countrymen; and when they carry out their duty properly, they are contributing to the maintenance of peace." (*Pastoral Constitution*, #79.)

2. **Conscientious Objection:** "Moreover, it seems just that laws should make humane provisions for the case of conscientious objectors who refuse to carry arms, provided they accept some other form of community service." (*Pastoral Constitution*, #79.)

3. **Non-violence:** "In this same spirit we cannot but express our admiration for all who forego the use of violence to vindicate their rights and resort to other means of defense which are available to weaker parties, provided it can be done without harm to the rights and duties of others and of the community." (*Pastoral Constitution*, #78.)

4. **Citizens and Conscience:** "Once again we deem it opportune to remind our children of their duty to take an active part in public life, and to contribute towards the attainment of the common good of the entire human family as well as that of their own political community. . . . In other words, it is necessary that human beings, in the intimacy of their own consciences, should so live and act in their temporal lives as to create a synthesis between scientific, technical professional elements on the one hand, and spiritual values on the other." (Pope John XIII, *Peace on Earth*, #146, 150.)

## II. Moral Principles and Policy Choices

As bishops in the United States, assessing the concrete circumstances of our society, we have made a number of observations and recommendations in the process of applying moral principles to specific policy choices.

### A. On the Use of Nuclear Weapons

1. **Counter Population Use:** Under no circumstances may nuclear weapons or other instruments of mass slaughter be used for the purpose of destroying population centers or other predominantly civilian targets. Retaliatory action which would indiscriminately and disproportionately take many wholly innocent lives, lives of people who are in no way responsible for reckless action of their government, must also be condemned.

2. ***The Initiation of Nuclear War:*** We do not perceive any situation in which the deliberate initiation of nuclear war, on however restricted a scale, can be morally justified. Non-nuclear attacks by another state must be resisted by other than nuclear means. Therefore, a serious moral obligation exists to develop non-nuclear defensive strategies as rapidly as possible. In this letter we urge NATO to move rapidly toward the adoption of a "no first use" policy, but we recognize this will take time to implement and will require the development of an adequate alternative defense posture.

3. ***Limited Nuclear War:*** Our examination of the various arguments on this question makes us highly skeptical about the real meaning of "limited." One of the criteria of the just-war teaching is that there must be a reasonable hope of success in bringing about justice and peace. We must ask whether such a reasonable hope can exist once nuclear weapons have been exchanged. The burden of proof remains on those who assert that meaningful limitation is possible. In our view the first imperative is to prevent any use of nuclear weapons and we hope that leaders will resist the notion that nuclear conflict can be limited, contained or won in any traditional sense.

## **B. On Deterrence**

In concert with the evaluation provided by Pope John Paul II, we have arrived at a strictly conditional moral acceptance of deterrence. In this letter we have outlined criteria and recommendations which indicate the meaning of conditional acceptance of deterrence policy. We cannot consider such a policy adequate as a long-term basis for peace.

## **C. On Promoting Peace**

1. We support immediate, bilateral verifiable agreements to halt the testing, production and deployment of new nuclear weapons systems. This recommendation is not to be identified with any specific political initiative.

2. We support efforts to achieve deep cuts in the arsenals of both superpowers; efforts should concentrate first on systems which threaten the retaliatory forces of either major power.

3. We support early and successful conclusion of negotiations of a comprehensive test ban treaty.

4. We urge new efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons in the world, and to control the conventional arms race, particularly the conventional arms trade.

5. We support, in an increasingly interdependent world, political and economic policies designed to protect human dignity and to promote the human rights of every person, especially the least among us. In this regard, we call for the establishment of some form of global authority adequate to the needs of the international common good.

This letter includes many judgments from the perspective of ethics, politics and strategy needed to speak concretely and correctly to the "moment of supreme crisis" identified by Vatican II. We stress again that readers should be aware, as we have been, of the distinction between our statement of moral principles and of official Church teaching and our application of these to concrete issues. We urge that special care be taken not to use passages out of context; neither should brief portions of this document be cited to support positions it does not intend to convey or which are not truly in accord with the spirit of its teaching.

In concluding this summary we respond to two key questions often asked about this pastoral letter:

Why do we address these matters fraught with such complexity, controversy and passion? We speak as pastors, not politicians. We are teachers, not technicians. We cannot avoid our responsibility to lift up the moral dimensions of the choices before our world and nation. The nuclear age is an era of moral as well as physical danger. We are the first generation since Genesis with the power to threaten the created order. We cannot remain silent in the face of such danger. Why do we address these issues? We are simply trying to live up to the call of Jesus to be peacemakers in our own time and situation.

What are we saying? Fundamentally, we are saying that the decisions about nuclear weapons are among the most pressing moral questions of our age. While these decisions have obvious military and political aspects, they involve fundamental moral choices. In simple terms, we are saying that good ends (defending one's country, protecting freedom, etc.) cannot justify immoral means (the use of weapons which kill indiscriminately and threaten whole societies). We fear that our world and nation are headed in the wrong direction. More weapons with greater destructive potential are produced every day. More and more nations are seeking to become nuclear powers. In our quest for more and more security we fear we are actually becoming less and less secure.

In the words of the 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. Peacemaking is not an optional commitment. It is a requirement of our faith. We are called to be peacemakers, not by some movement of the moment, but by our Lord Jesus. The content and context of our peacemaking is set not by some political agenda or ideological program, but by the teaching of his Church.

Ultimately, this letter is intended as an expression of Christian faith, affirming the confidence we have that the risen Lord remains with us precisely in moment of crisis. It is our belief in his presence and power among us which sustain us in confronting the awesome challenge of the nuclear age. We speak from faith to provide hope for all who recognize the challenge and are working to confront it with the resources of faith and reason.

To approach the nuclear age in faith is to recognize our absolute need for prayer: we urge and invite all to unceasing prayer for peace with justice for all people. In a spirit of prayerful hope we present this message of peace.

Excerpt from *The Challenge of Peace* © 1983 United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Inc., Washington, DC. Used with permission. All rights reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced by any means without permission in writing from the copyright holder.

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <MSperry@uscgb.org>  
Subject: Additional material  
Date: Fri, 17 May 2002 08:42:26 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;  
    boundary="-----=\_NextPart\_000\_000E\_01C1FD7E.C6B45C20"  
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:

Yesterday when I sent you my digital version of the Summary of The Challenge of Peace, I forgot that I have written a longer introduction for the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops which highlights the two documents before producing them. This is attached for your information.

Shalom,  
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](mailto: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**

*The Catholic Church with 60 million members and 19,200 local parishes is the largest religious body in the United States. Bishops are appointed by the pope and serve as spiritual and administrative leaders of 194 dioceses. The bishops join together as the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) to jointly exercise certain pastoral functions on behalf of the Christian faithful of the United States.*

*In 1983 the National Conference of Bishops (as it was then known) offer their views on nuclear weapons in a pastoral letter entitled "The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response." [link to below] Following the lead of Pope John Paul II in a speech to the United Nations, the U.S. bishops accepted nuclear deterrence "as a step on the way toward progressive disarmament". However, they noted:*

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

*They also stated:*

"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."

*Ten years later the U.S. Catholic bishops reflected on the status of nuclear weapons and the movement toward disarmament in a 1993 report entitled "The Harvest of Justice Is Sown in Peace". [link to below] They retained their conditional acceptance of nuclear deterrence but stated:*

"We must continue to say No to the very idea of nuclear war."

*They also insisted:*

"The eventual elimination of nuclear weapons is more than a moral ideal; it should be a policy goal."

###

### **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.*

## **Summary**

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <enquiries@randomhouse.co.uk>  
Subject: Permission to use  
Date: Fri, 17 May 2002 10:44:09 -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: Chatto and Windus Ltd  
 c/o Random House UK Ltd

Working through the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, we are setting up a new web site, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). It is cosponsored by a number of religious denominations, such as Brethren, Mennonites, Presbyterian, United Methodist, Unitarian Universalist, United Church of Christ, Union of American Hebrew Congregations. Its purpose is to provide information and facilitate discussion regarding the global elimination of nuclear weapons.

One of the pages will carry views of military leaders. In that section we would like to use extracts from an article by Admiral Noel Gayler entitled "A Commander-in-Chief's Perspective on Nuclear Weapons". It is found in *The Nuclear Crisis Reader*, edited by Gwyn Prins, published in 1984 by Vintage Books, a division of Random Books. The book bears the copyright of Chatto & Windus Ltd.

Specifically we are interested in using extracts from pp. 16-18 of this book. May we have your permission? We will use whatever language you prescribe to indicate your permission.

Our web site is in its early pages. You may visit our home page at [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org) if you want to see our approach.

Thanks for your cooperation,

Howard W. 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](mailto: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: Re: Religious Statements  
Date: Fri, 17 May 2002 11:11:37 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_0028\_01C1FD93.9C995980"  
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\_0028\_01C1FD93.9C995980  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Marie,  
=20

Here are some comments on some of your answers.

1. The top of the page needs better spacing. "Religious =  
Statements" is crammed too close to "Nuclear Weapons A Moral Issue". =  
Did you receive in the mail my previous artwork for the latter?

=20

I lowered the image of the dove away from the Title of the page. =  
I have to find an image that closely resembles the dove on the poster =  
you sent me. If you find a dove that comes close to the image on the =  
poster, please email it to me.=20

=20

The dove doesn't have to be just like the one on the poster. =  
However, I don't like the one you are using. If I find a dove I like, =  
I'll send it. Otherwise, if you have several choices, send them to me.

=20

2. For the listing under "Catholic" it would be helpful to have =  
buttons for the four sub-items with linkage. Each of them is fairly =  
long. Users should be able to go to each directly without scrolling =  
through all Catholic entries.

=20

I don't understand your question because I added sublinks to the =  
four sub-items under Catholic. Did you want something else other than =  
the sublinks I added?

=20

I didn't realize that the sublinks were there, just by going to =  
the organization names. If that is done, you don't need to put the =  
bullet with the plus sign or cross in the middle. It looked better =  
without the bullet on the four organizations. Just on Catholic is =  
enough.=20

=20

3. For World Council of Churches, did you receive the logo I =  
sent by mail?

=20

The logo on their website is too small. Can you find another =  
logo for WCC on the web that I can just copy? If not, I will try to =  
scan the logo you sent by mail.

=20

I couldn't find one. That's why I sent you the logo from one of =  
their publications.=20

=20

=20

7. Nice job of getting a pix of Pope John Paul II and Archbishop =  
Martino (I assume that is he). How did you get the latter? Should we =  
try to get one for Monsignor Chullikat?

=20

I cannot find Monsignor Chullikat on the web.

=20

I'll try to get a picture from their office in New York.=20

=20

=20

10. At the very end after Jewish are endnotes and permission to =  
use from The Harvest of Justice. This probably comes from what I sent =  
you, which for some reason has these items there as well as in the =  
proper place. Can you eliminate them?

=20

I deleted the permission section. Did you also want me to =  
delete the endnotes - there are references to the endnotes on the =  
paragraph.

=20

Yes, they are already in the proper place.

=20

=20

=20

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Religious Statements page  
Date: Fri, 17 May 2002 21:22:38 -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,

Upon further reflection on the listings on the first page of the Religious Statements, I like the brown you used for Holy See, etc. as subheadings under Catholic, but without the buttons. We may have some sub-headings under other denominations, so the format is good: inset and brown.

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 osgood.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 178Igy4wE3Nl3pt1  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 17 May 2002 09:59:30 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020517135930.84483.qmail@web13902.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [152.163.197.48] by web13902.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Fri, 17 May 2002 06:59:30 PDT

Date: Fri, 17 May 2002 06:59:30 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: Religious Statements

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

In-Reply-To: <008701c1fa98\$a059d7a0\$a15bf7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-494618266-1021643970=:80715"

--0-494618266-1021643970=:80715

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

Hi Howard,

Please see additional notes below....

"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote: Marie, The Religious Statements page is looking good. You're doing a terrific job! This page will continue to grow. I know that you're charging \$80/page for set up. Some pages, such as What's New and Your Feedback won't have much material. Others will have quite a bit. Perhaps it averages out. But is there a point, in fairness to you, that we should pay extra compensation for the heavy volume of Religious Statements? For example, your hourly rate for site maintenance? If so, let me know. Here are some specific comments on the Religious Statements page. 1. The top of the page needs better spacing. "Religious Statements" is crammed too close to "Nuclear Weapons A Moral Issue". Did you receive in the mail my previous artwork for the latter? I lowered the image of the dove away from the Title of the page. I have to find an image that closely resembles the dove on the poster you sent me. If you find a dove that comes close to the image on the poster, please email it to me. 2. For the listing under "Catholic" it would be helpful to have buttons for the four sub-items with linkage. Each of them is fairly long. Users should be able to go to each directly without scrolling through all Catholic entries.

I don't understand your question because I added sublinks to the four sub-items under Catholic. Did you want something else other than the sublinks I added? 3. For World Council of Churches, did you receive the logo I sent by mail?

The logo on their website is too small. Can you find another logo for WCC on the web that I can just copy? If not, I will try to scan the logo you sent by mail. 4. For WCC the PDF file for "Nuclear Arms, Doctrines and Disarmament" should include the introductory paragraph. Otherwise users won't know the context. All pdf files will be added once we finish the religious statements page. 5. Under "Religious Statements for 1998 Preparatory Committee", should the two references to presentations have a click on linkage for the texts presented below? I added sublinks to the presentations. 6. I couldn't locate the PDF for "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition". 7. Nice job of getting a pix of Pope John Paul II and Archbishop Martino (I assume that is he). How did you get the latter? Should we try to get one for Monsignor Chullikat? I cannot find Monsignor Chullikat on the web. 8. At the beginning of the section under Holy See the second sentence of the introduction was omitted. It reads as follows: "In recent years policy statements coming from the Holy See on nuclear disarmament have been made by Vatican delegation to the United Nations in New York. Thus, April 2002 Monsignor Francis Chullikat, deputy head of the delegation, told delegates of the NPT Preparatory Committee:" I corrected this error. 9. Under U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops" I wasn't able to bring up the PDF for the excerpt from The Harvest of Justice. 10. At the very end after Jewish are endnotes and permission to use from The Harvest of Justice. This probably comes from what I sent you, which for some reason has these items there as well as in the proper place. Can you eliminate them? I deleted the permission section. Did you also want me to delete the endnotes - there are references to the endnotes on the paragraph. Keep up the good work. Howard

--0-494618266-1021643970=:80715--

Status: U

Return-Path: <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>

Received: from web13903.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.29])

by strange.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 178JoH11m3Nl3oW0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 17 May 2002 11:11:59 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020517151158.37985.qmail@web13903.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [152.163.207.192] by web13903.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Fri, 17 May 2002 08:11:58 PDT

Date: Fri, 17 May 2002 08:11:58 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: Religious Statements

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

In-Reply-To: <008701c1fa98\$a059d7a0\$a15bf7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-300845846-1021648318=:35549"

--0-300845846-1021648318=:35549

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

I can't seem to ftp the newly revised religious statements pages from work. So I will do it from home. I should have all the changes done this weekend.

Have a great weekend!

Marie :)

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

Marie, The Religious Statements page is looking good. You're doing a terrific job! This page will continue to grow. I know that you're charging \$80/page for set up. Some pages, such as What's New and Your Feedback won't have much material. Others will have quite a bit. Perhaps it averages out. But is there a point, in fairness to you, that we should pay extra compensation for the heavy volume of Religious Statements? For example, your hourly rate for site maintenance? If so, let me know. Here are some specific comments on the Religious Statements page. 1. The top of the page needs better spacing. "Religious Statements" is crammed too close to "Nuclear Weapons A Moral Issue". Did you receive in the mail my previous artwork for the latter? 2. For the listing under "Catholic" it would be helpful to have buttons for the four sub-items with linkage. Each of them is fairly long. Users should be able to go to each directly without scrolling through all Catholic entries. 3. For World Council of Churches, did you receive the logo I sent by mail? 4. For WCC the PDF file for "Nuclear Arms, Doctrines and Disarmament" should include the introductory paragraph. Otherwise users won't know the context. 5. Under "Religious Statements for 1998 Preparatory Committee", should the two references to presentations have a click on linkage for the texts presented below? 6. I couldn't locate the PDF for "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition". 7. Nice job of getting a pix of Pope John Paul II and Archbishop Martino (I assume that is he). How did you get the latter? Should we try to get one for Monsignor Chullikat? 8. At the beginning of the section under Holy See the second sentence of the introduction was omitted. It reads as follows: "In recent years policy statements coming from the Holy See on nuclear disarmament have been made by Vatican delegation to the United Nations in New York. Thus, April 2002 Monsignor Francis Chullikat, deputy head of the delegation, told delegates of the NPT Preparatory Committee:" 9. Under U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops" I wasn't able to bring up the PDF for the excerpt from The Harvest of Justice. 10. At the very end after Jewish are endnotes and permission to use from The Harvest of Justice. This probably comes from what I sent you, which for some reason has these items there as well as in the proper place. Can you eliminate them? Keep up the good work.  
Howard

Status: U

Return-Path: <Mcropsey@umpublishing.org>

Received: from tweety.umpublishing.org ([208.161.156.2])

by bissell.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 178KsM2Lt3Nl3rE0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 17 May 2002 12:20:16 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from tweety.umpublishing.org by tweety.umpublishing.org

via smtpd (for bissell.mail.mindspring.net [207.69.200.198]) with SMTP; 17 May 2002 16:12:23 UT

Received: by tweety.umpublishing.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <LBLECLRB>; Fri, 17 May 2002 11:17:49 -0500

Message-ID: <F304CCB28099FC4885E81A32064DB5A63726C9@tweety.umpublishing.org>

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

To: "Carlee L. Hallman (E-mail)" <mupj@igc.org>

Subject: Maturing in Faith Received

Date: Fri, 17 May 2002 11:17:47 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: text/plain

Thank you, Carlee, for your faithfulness to the task. I received the Winter issue without difficulty and have sent the pieces on for input.

Marvin

Status: U

Return-Path: <WILLNORTH@aol.com>

Received: from imo-r02.mx.aol.com ([152.163.225.98])

by strange.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 1798aY6XH3Nl3oW0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Sat, 18 May 2002 13:39:28 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from WILLNORTH@aol.com

by imo-r02.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v32.5.) id a.177.87b23fe (4552);  
Sat, 18 May 2002 13:39:23 -0400 (EDT)

From: WILLNORTH@aol.com

Message-ID: <177.87b23fe.2a17ebcb@aol.com>

Date: Sat, 18 May 2002 13:39:23 EDT

Subject: Minutes Outreach Committee 5/8/02

To: andrewsa@saic.com, beverly@erols.com, dosmith6@juno.com,  
gene.vincent@starpower.net, HolRonFost@aol.com, jcm@duncanallen.com,  
JFNORTH@aol.com, kiki@wizard.net, mupj@igc.org

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="UTF-8"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Language: en

X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Mac sub 39

Outreach Committee

Bethesda United Methodist Church

Minutes Meeting May 8, 2002

Participating: Dwight Smith, Chairman, Howard Hallman, Jerry Muys, Sue Wells=  
,=20

Jeanne North, Haven North, Gene Vincent

Dwight Smith opened meeting with outline of agenda:

1. Mental Illness/Homelessness Sunday School Sessions:

=C2=B0 Group discussed program possibilities.=20

=C2=B0 Dates first three Sundays in September; suggestion that it be the=

=20

second three (four) weeks;

=C2=B0 Theme: Mental Illness with homelessness as subtheme.

=C2=B0 Topics: a) Overview of mental health and homelessness situation i=

n=20

Montgomery County; b) Understanding Mental Illness, c) what is being done=20

and what we can do.

=C2=B0 Open invitation to congregation

=C2=B0 Jeanne North to look into program and presenters and come back wi=

th=20

plan (see separate message from Jeanne).

P.S. The above is in lieu of a following on to Poverty Conference

2. Budget allocations: There is a balance of \$16,000 in the Building for the=

=20

Future Outreach account. The following allocations of \$13,500 were agreed to=

:

a. \$2000 for Opportunities International (OI) program: =E2=80=9CAfrica=20

Microenterprise AIDS Initiative=E2=80=9D =E2=80=94 Zimbabwe. (Note: Thi=

s is a=20

combination of the Mark Stevens Zimbabwe AIDS trip which was canceled; and=20

the \$1,000 earmarked for OI =E2=80=94 a Helen and Gordon Smith interest);

- b. Hold \$1,000 for use in conjunction with Fall Mental=20  
Illness/homelessness program;
  - c. \$2,000 for Africa University Scholarships;
  - d. \$1,000 for Bethesda Cares (in addition to operating budget=20  
contribution) =E2=80=94 a one time contribution;
  - e. \$2,000 for Missionary Sue Porter=E2=80=99s special project of medical=  
services=20  
in Afghanistan (Note: as she is this country, the funds could be given t=  
o=20  
her directly or as she specifies; Dwight to work out with Rev. Ron.)
  - f. \$2,000 for Missionaries Jeff and Ellen Hoover in Congo for a special=20  
project; not for salary as this is covered in operating budget;
  - g. \$1,000 for Afghanistan relief through UMCOR;
  - h. \$2,000 special contribution to CMMC: \$1,000 for 30th Anniversary Fund=  
=20  
and \$1,000 for Microenterprise program;
  - i. \$500.00 for Peace with Justice Program (Howard Hallman sponsor)
- (Note: The above allocations were approved by the Church Council 5/8/02=20  
with an amendment of \$1,000 for Youth Ministry Work Camp =E2=80=94total=20  
allocations \$14,500). The balance remaining =E2=80=94 \$1500 is reserved =20=  
for=20  
allocation in the Fall.)
3. Dwight reported that Gail Smith has agreed to be the Bethesda Cares Lunch=  
=20  
Volunteer Coordinator and Marianne Cook is the BUMC representative on the=20  
Bethesda Cares Board.
4. Re the CBS homeless shelter meals program: Dwight will call Pat Beverley=20  
about plans.  
(Note: Church Council requested that the Outreach Program and contributions=20  
be featured in Sunday bulletins and the Messenger.

Status: U

Return-Path: <kentkathyb@earthlink.net>

Received: from hawk.mail.pas.earthlink.net ([207.217.120.22])

by payne.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 179m4Ox63Nl3p40  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Sun, 19 May 2002 04:30:02 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from sdn-ap-004watacop0593.dialsprint.net ([63.187.226.85])

by hawk.mail.pas.earthlink.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #2)  
id 179M4Q-0004YF-00

for mupj@igc.org; Sun, 19 May 2002 01:29:38 -0700

User-Agent: Microsoft-Outlook-Express-Macintosh-Edition/5.02.2022

Date: Sun, 19 May 2002 01:33:32 -0700

Subject: NPR

From: Kent/Kathy Barton <kentkathyb@earthlink.net>

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

Message-ID: <B90CB16C.2930%kentkathyb@earthlink.net>

Mime-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="MS\_Mac\_OE\_3104616813\_5738906\_MIME\_Part"

> This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand  
this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

--MS\_Mac\_OE\_3104616813\_5738906\_MIME\_Part

Content-type: text/plain; charset="ISO-8859-1"

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

Howard, I didn't know if you had seen this or not, but thought it was wort=  
h  
forwarding. Thanks again for providing feedback on this issue from the  
faith community! Shalom, Kathy C-B

Disarmament Diplomacy

Issue No. 64, May - June 2002

Opinion & Analysis

=20

The US Nuclear Posture Review:

Plus =E7a change, plus c'est la m=EAmE chose

By Jack Mendelsohn

Last January, the Bush administration presented the classified conclusions  
of its Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) to the Congress<sup>1</sup> and in early March the  
text was leaked to the press.<sup>2</sup> At the time of its initial public briefing,  
the NPR was subjected to a good deal of press and expert criticism, focusse=  
d  
primarily on the details of the proposed "sizing" of the US nuclear force,  
the blurring of the distinction between nuclear and conventional weapons,  
and the hint of an unrequited desire to resume nuclear weapons testing. Onc=  
e

the classified version became available, the critics' list of concerns expanded to include the NPR's listing of potential security contingencies and target countries and the apparent willingness of the United States to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon states. This paper considers these concerns in turn, weighing their separate and collective impact on efforts to strengthen the international arms control and non-proliferation regime.

## 1. The Sizing of the Force

The NPR sets forth the administration's goal of reducing the "operationally deployed" strategic US nuclear warheads - those weapons that are available immediately or within a matter of days - to 1,700-2,200 warheads by 2012. The "operationally deployed" definition would replace the current counting rule approach used in the Strategic Arms Reduction (START) agreements where, in order to facilitate verification and compliance, missile and bomber delivery systems are assigned a fixed number of warheads whether or not that is the actual operational loading.<sup>3</sup>

In a statement worthy of George Orwell, Under Secretary of Defense Douglas Feith referred to the new US operationally deployed approach to sizing the arsenal as "truth in advertising", noting that the US "will no longer count 'phantom warheads' that could be deployed but are not."<sup>4</sup> What Under Secretary Feith neglected to point out is that the United States in large part intends to reach its first reduction threshold - 3,800 warheads by the end of Fiscal Year (FY) 2007 - by "downloading"<sup>5</sup> its existing forces of land-based Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs), Submarine-Launched Ballistic Missiles (SLBMs) and heavy bombers.<sup>6</sup> Removing warheads while maintaining existing platforms with empty spaces on board - creating another type of 'phantom warhead' - will leave the United States with a significant capability to 'breakout' and reconstitute its strike forces, as Feith did acknowledge, "within weeks or months." Thus, despite its claim to "truth in advertising", the Bush administration's plan for strategic nuclear force reductions leaves quite a few of its own "phantom warheads" lying around.

In all, the proposed US reductions would result in about 3,000 START-accountable warheads being removed from the operational forces by FY 07. However, at least 1,600 empty spaces would then be available for 'upload' in the operational ICBM and SLBM missile forces, while an unknown but substantial number of additional weapons could also be redeployed in the bomber force. Reductions below 3,800 warheads would take place in the 2007-2012 period - in the administration of another President - and in a manner yet to be determined.

## 2. Creating the Responsive Force

As is to be expected, the operationally deployed nuclear forces envisioned under the NPR are intended to deter and respond to immediate and unexpected contingencies. Potential contingencies would be met by a "responsive" force of warheads in the strategic active stockpile, many of which would have been

n

placed there after being downloaded from existing delivery systems. Again according to Under Secretary Feith, the weapons in the strategic active stockpile would "give the United States a responsive capability to adjust the number of operationally deployed nuclear weapons should the international security environment change and warrant such action."

The administration claims the size of the responsive force has not yet been determined, but an educated guess would put it at over 2,000 strategic warheads by FY 07.7 The overall strategic "active"8 stockpile would then be some 5,800 warheads.9 There will also be an "inactive" stockpile of nuclear weapons that can be transitioned to the active stockpile if necessary. The future size of that stockpile has not yet been determined but it is currently estimated to be almost 3,000 weapons.10

The upside of the administration's approach in the NPR to strategic force reductions is its willingness to reduce deployed forces to approximately the levels previously agreed to for START III.11 The main downsides of the "operationally deployed" approach are threefold:

\* The very real US reconstitution capability. This is of serious concern to the Russians since, for economic reasons, they will be obliged to drastically reduce their strategic nuclear delivery vehicle force, and thus will not be able to maintain anywhere near the same number of empty spaces for warheads as the United States. Retired Russian Major-General Vladimir Dvorkin has said that the Bush administration has ignored Russian complaints about US plans to stockpile nuclear weapons for a responsive force. Because Russia plans to cut its delivery systems below US levels with or without a nuclear arms agreement with Washington, in a crisis it would not be possible for Russia to re-deploy anywhere near the same number of weapons as the United States12;

\* The incentive for Russia to maintain a large non-deployed strategic arsenal as a "hedge" against unforeseen changes in the strategic environment (in their case, involving a challenge from the United States). One of the supreme ironies of the post-Cold War period is that non-deployed Russian weapons now pose a greater threat than deployed ones. The US proposal would encourage the Russians to increase the size of their non-deployed arsenal, the least secure portion of their strategic nuclear forces; and

\* The stress on a "responsive" force that undercuts the principle of "irreversibility" and complicates achieving any stable arms control settlement. In the negotiations for a legally binding document to 'codify' the unilateral strategic force reductions announced at the Crawford presidential summit last November, the United States has apparently proposed two escape clauses. One is the usual six-month "supreme national interests" withdrawal provision. The other is a 45-day "notice of intention to exceed"

the upper level of deployed warheads (likely to be 2,200). Reportedly, the United States would like to be able to invoke this provision without disrupting other aspects of the document.

### 3. The New Triad=20

One of the policy changes introduced by the NPR is the shift from "a traditional threat-based approach to a capabilities-based approach." According to the Review, US nuclear force size formerly reflected a response to a specific threat, viz., the Soviet Union, and emphasized nuclear weapons, had limited flexibility and placed constraints on missile defences=

According to the new intellectual underpinnings for strategic policy, the nuclear force capabilities required are not country-specific but are designed to respond to "multiple contingencies and new threats in a changing environment." Such a contingency "might include a sudden regime change by which an existing nuclear arsenal comes into the hands of a new, hostile leadership group, or an opponent's surprise unveiling of WMD capabilities."

To implement this new approach, the Defense Department has adopted a 'New Triad'. The older triad was composed of three legs: the air-, land- and sea-based strategic delivery systems - ICBMs, SLBMs and heavy bombers - which were developed and deployed during the Cold War. One leg of the New Triad combines these delivery systems with non-nuclear strike capabilities, including precision-guided munitions. The other two legs are ballistic missile defences and a revitalized and responsive defence infrastructure (in particular, the nuclear weapons production complex).

After decades of debate, the US notice of withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty in December of last year cleared the way for active missile defences to become a part of strategic policy. The NPR, however, is actually rather restrained in its projections for when and how effectively missile defences will actually become part of a New Triad, noting only that "several near-term and mid-term options [2003-2008] that could provide an emergency missile defense capability are under consideration." These options include:

- \* a single airborne laser for boost-phase intercept "that may be available for limited operations;"
  - \* a "rudimentary" ground-based mid-course intercept system that "could be available" in Alaska against long-range threats; and
  - \* a sea-based Aegis system that "could be available to provide rudimentary" mid-course intercepts against short- to medium-range threats.
- [Emphases added]

In effect, the missile defence leg of the New Triad is likely to remain rather weak for some time and will certainly complicate further offensive force reductions with Russia and, in the more distant future, with China and other nuclear-armed states. The most optimistic prediction for the deployment of any element of a missile defence - a handful of ground-based mid-course interceptors in Alaska - is now 2004. But even that date - coinciding with a US presidential election and certain to be heralded as fulfilling a campaign pledge - may still not be realistic given the usual and unavoidable delays characteristic of high-tech defence programs.<sup>13</sup>

#### 4. Blurring the Nuclear/Conventional Distinction

Perhaps of more immediate policy concern than missile defences is that the New Triad postulates a continuum between precision-guided non-nuclear munitions and nuclear weapons. There are two grave dangers inherent in this approach:<sup>20</sup>

- \* Establishing a conventional/nuclear weapons continuum obscures the fact that there are qualitative differences - such as radiation effects or political, legal or moral inhibitions<sup>14</sup> - not just quantitative ones that distinguish precision-guided conventional munitions from low-yield nuclear weapons. This is part and parcel of the long-term effort to make the use of nuclear weapons seem more acceptable and/or credible in other than a deterrent or retaliatory mode; and

- \* Elevating long-range precision strike conventional weapons to a strategic role<sup>15</sup> in a putative continuum with nuclear weapons also makes it easier to claim "gaps" exist that requiring new, more accurate, smaller-yield, specialized (preferably nuclear) weapons. These gaps, as described by the NPR, include holding at risk "hard and deeply buried targets..., mobile and re-locatable targets..., [and] chemical or biological agents," as well as a need for smaller yield weapons to limit collateral damage.<sup>20</sup>

In a later section of the Review dealing with the Department of Energy, which is responsible for the US nuclear weapons production complex, the NPR urges examining three new types of warheads: possible "modifications to existing weapons to provide additional yield flexibility in the stockpile; improved earth penetrating weapons (EPWs) to counter the increased use by potential adversaries of hardened and deeply buried facilities; and warheads that reduce collateral damage."

#### 5. Two Treaties Down, One to Go

As noted, late last year President Bush announced the intention of the United States to withdraw from the ABM Treaty, the only existing strategic defensive forces agreement. START II, the most recent (1993) strategic offensive forces agreement, is a dead letter, the NPR noting that "the Russian resolution of ratification, adopted in 2000, contains unacceptable provisions contrary to the new strategic framework and establishment of the

New Triad." Among other conditions, the Russian ratification legislation would require the US to remain in full compliance with the ABM Treaty. The 1996 Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is the other major nuclear arms control agreement that is strongly opposed - but not yet formally renounced - by the Bush administration.<sup>16</sup>

The NPR buffets the CTBT severely but does not quite overturn it. It claims that the United States is making every effort to maintain the stockpile without additional testing. At the same time, the NPR warns that "this may not be possible for the indefinite future" and builds the case for the eventual resumption of testing by cautioning ominously that "some problems due to ageing and manufacturing defects have already been identified."<sup>17</sup> Meanwhile, to strengthen the case, the NPR proposes increased reliance on the stockpile to supply the responsive force for potential contingencies. The NPR also identifies limitations in the current nuclear force that will require new capabilities. These include "defeating both hard and deeply buried targets with a more effective earth penetrator (heavier casing and lower yield) as well as chemical and biological agents (by thermal, chemical or radiological neutralization)". (Emphasis added.)

Finally, the NPR urges revitalisation of the entire nuclear infrastructure, "in particular the production complex," so that it will be able, "if directed, to design, develop, manufacture, and certify new warheads in response to new national requirements, and maintain readiness to resume underground nuclear testing if required." The NPR goes on to argue that the United States should improve its test readiness posture "from its current two to three year period to something substantially better." The administration has indicated it would like the Department of Energy to be able to resume testing within 12 to 18 months from the time it is directed to do so.<sup>18</sup>

## 6. Targeting Non-Nuclear Nations

When portions of the classified version of the NPR were leaked to the press, critical comment focussed on the discussion in the document of the "immediate, potential or unexpected" security contingencies that set the "requirements for nuclear strike capabilities." Immediate contingencies wherein US nuclear weapons may be called upon to play a role were named as including "an Iraqi attack on Israel or its neighbors, a North Korean attack on South Korea or a military confrontation over the straits of Taiwan."

The document then singles out five countries that could be involved in "immediate, potential or unexpected" contingencies: North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria and Libya. North Korea and Iraq are characterised as "chronic military concerns." All five are considered to "sponsor or harbor terrorists, and all have active WMD and missile programs."

In addition, the NPR lists China as a country that could be involved in an "immediate or potential" contingency and, while a nuclear strike contingency involving Russia "is not expected," Russian nuclear forces and programs "remain a concern." Carrying forward the arguments of the Clinton administration for its 'hedge' force, the NPR cautions that in "the event that US relations with Russia significantly worsen in the future, the United States may need to revise its nuclear force levels and posture."

Keeping open the option to use nuclear weapons in other than a deterrent or retaliatory role is not new. Since at least the Gulf War and during the Clinton administration<sup>19</sup>, the United States has embraced a dual and contradictory policy on nuclear weapons use. The President, through the Secretary of State, declared in 1978 and reaffirmed in 1995 in connection with the review and extension of the 1970 nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), that the United States - joined by the other four declared nuclear powers - would not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapons states party to the NPT unless they are allied with a nuclear state in an attack against the United States or its allies.<sup>20</sup>

The National Security Council (NSC) and the Defense Department, on the other hand, believing that deterrence is strengthened by ambiguity, have for some time taken the position that "no options are ruled out" in response to an attack by any weapon of mass destruction. In 1996, NSC official Robert Bell, in conjunction with the US signature of the Protocols to the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (ANWFZ) Treaty, announced that US adherence "will not limit options available to the United States in response to an attack by an ANWFZ party using weapons of mass destruction." In late 1998, Walter Slocombe, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, stated that retaining the option to use nuclear weapons against an attack with chemical and/or biological weapons "is simply an issue of making sure that we continue to maintain a high level of uncertainty or high level of concern, if you will, at what the potential aggressor would face if he used [CBW] or indeed took other aggressive acts..."<sup>21</sup>

The latest round in this policy tango occurred earlier this year when in February Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security John Bolton called into question the utility of and administration support for the US pledge not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states.<sup>22</sup> Questioned about Bolton's comments, State Department spokesman Richard Boucher reiterated the most recent version of the negative security commitment (1995) and then added: "We will do whatever is necessary to deter the use of WMD against the United States, its allies, and its interests. If a WMD is used against the United States or its allies, we will not rule out any specific type of military response."<sup>23</sup>

## 7. What's It Mean, Rummy?

Four conclusions can be drawn from the policies and arguments put forward i=

n  
the NPR:

- \* First, that the United States over the next decade is committed only to essentially unilateral and largely reversible nuclear force reductions;
- \* Second, that the effort continues to make nuclear weapons more credible as war-fighting instruments and thus more likely to be used in conventional crisis situations;<sup>20</sup>
- \* Third, that the second Bush administration, like the first, believes that if the United States is going to rely on nuclear weapons for deterrence, retaliation and war-fighting then nuclear weapons design and testing must resume; and
- \* Finally, that the NPR marks the two-thirds point on the way to clearing the strategic arms control landscape of all except self-imposed constraints on US nuclear forces.

If those conclusions drawn from the NPR accurately summarize the main trends in US security policy for the medium-term, then fasten your seat-belts, we're in for a rocky decade.<sup>24</sup>

#### Notes and References

1. The public briefing by J.D. Crouch, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy on January 9, and the very useful slides illustrating the findings, are available at <http://www.defenselink.mil>.
2. Twenty-one pages of excerpts from the original report are available at <http://www.globalsecurity.org>. Unreferenced citations, in both the main text and endnotes, are taken either from this or the preceding document.
3. The START counting-figure, assigning a fixed number of warheads to a delivery system whether or not that is the actual operational loading, is usually close to the maximum the system is capable of carrying. In the case of ICBMs and SLBMs, the counting rules usually overcount the actual number of deployed weapons. In the case of long-range bombers, counting rules have traditionally undercounted the actual number.
4. Douglas Feith, testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, February 14, 2002.
5. All current US strategic missiles are designed to carry multiple warheads (3 to 10 depending on the system). "Downloading" means removing some of the multiple warheads from the dispensing platform (often called a "bus").
6. According to the NPR, the force reductions between now and FY-07 will be

accomplished by: retiring the 50 Peacekeeper (MX) ICBMs but maintaining the silos "for future options" (a reduction of 500 warheads); downloading Minuteman III missiles from 3 warheads to 1 (a reduction of 700 warheads); removing 4 Trident submarines from strategic service and converting them to conventional cruise missile carriers (a reduction of 768 warheads); exempting 2 Trident submarines in overhaul (a reduction of 384 warheads); downloading the missiles on the remaining 12 Trident submarines from 8 warheads to 5 or 6 (a reduction of about 600 warheads); downloading weapons from B-52 and B-2 bombers (which in some cases can carry up to 20 bombs or cruise missiles); and eliminating the capability to return the B-1 bomber from a conventional to a nuclear role.

7. This educated guess is deduced from the sum of the 1,600 empty spaces available on downloaded systems, plus 200+ spares and 200+ systems in overhaul. For "conceptual" nuclear force tables for 2002, 2006 and 2012, see  
e  
'Faking Nuclear Restraint: The Bush Administration's Secret Plan for Strengthening US Nuclear Forces', Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) Backgrounder, February 13, 2002 (<http://www.nrdc.org>).

8. The "active stockpile is a weapon which is available, fully ready to be deployed and used." The inactive stockpile "consists of those weapons that are not fielded with limited-life components (e.g. tritium, batteries, neutron generators, etc.)."

9. The current active stockpile is "almost 8,000" including an estimated 1,200 non-strategic warheads.

10. For a discussion and an accounting of US nuclear forces in 2002, see th=  
e  
NRDC Nuclear Notebook in Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, May/June 2002, pp. 70-75.

11. The framework envisaged for START III - set out by Presidents Yeltsin and Clinton in Helsinki in 1997 - anticipated reductions to 2,000-2,500 warheads. The Bush administration will take five years longer to reach approximately the same level than the timeline set out at Helsinki.

12. 'Race Is On To Clinch Arms Cuts Pact', Moscow Times, April 24, 2002.

13. 'America's BMD Stumbles', Jane's Defence Weekly, May 1, 2002.

14. In an ironic but unintended mirror-image description of how nuclear weapons use by the United States would be perceived by the rest of the world, Under Secretary Feith noted in his February 14 testimony that September 11 illustrates that the United States "now confront[s] enemies wh=  
o  
are eager to inflict mass destruction on innocent civilians here and abroad without regard for the possible cost." [Emphases added.]

15. The NPR notes, correctly, that "accurate and timely targeting information can increase...the possibilities for non-nuclear strike capabilities to substitute for nuclear weapons."

16. Under Secretary of State John Bolton, who is responsible for arms control and proliferation issues, has reportedly asked Department of State lawyers to examine the possibility of the United States withdrawing its signature from the CTBT.

17. The NPR cites as a major challenge over the next two decades the need to refurbish and extend the life of at least seven types of nuclear warheads: the B61-3, -4, -7, -10, -11 and B83-0, -1 for the B-2 and the non-strategic bomber force; W76 and W88 for the SLBM force; W78 and W87 for the ICBM force; and the W80-0, -1 for the ALCM and SLCM forces.

18. If the Bush administration renounced the CTBT today the US could probably not test a nuclear device until after the next presidential election. The current official specification for the amount of time to achieve test-readiness is 24-36 months.

19. In 1994, for example, in the first and only Annual Report submitted by Defense Secretary Les Aspin, the Pentagon was arguing that the role of US nuclear weapons in "deterring or responding to...non-nuclear threats" - i.e. chemical and biological weapons - "must be considered".

20. This commitment not to use nuclear weapons is called a 'negative security assurance.'

21. See this author's "NATO's Nuclear Weapons: The Rationale for No First Use," Arms Control Today, July/August, 1999.

22. John Bolton, interview and news article in Arms Control Today, March 2002. The interview was conducted on February 11, 2002.

23. Richard Boucher, February 22, 2002. See also Disarmament Diplomacy No. 63 (March/April 2002).

24. With due apologies to Bette Davis.

Jack Mendelsohn, a retired State Department official, served in the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, at the US Mission to NATO and as a member of the US SALT II and START I Delegations.

©A9 2002 The Acronym Institute.

--MS\_Mac\_OE\_3104616813\_5738906\_MIME\_Part  
Content-type: text/html; charset="ISO-8859-1"  
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

<HTML>  
<HEAD>  
<TITLE>NPR</TITLE>  
</HEAD>

<BODY>

<FONT SIZE=3D"5"><FONT FACE=3D"Times New Roman"> Howard, I didn't know if you had seen this or not, but thought it was worth forwarding. &nbsp;Thanks again for providing feedback on this issue from the faith community! &nbsp;Shalom, &nbsp;Kathy C-B<BR>

<BR>

</FONT></FONT><FONT FACE=3D"Times New Roman"><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>

</FONT></FONT><FONT COLOR=3D"#400E72"><FONT FACE=3D"Arial"><H2>Disarmament Diplomacy<BR>

</H2></FONT></FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><FONT FACE=3D"Times New Roman"><BR>

<FONT COLOR=3D"#333399">Issue No. 64, May - June 2002<BR>

</FONT><BR>

</FONT></FONT><FONT COLOR=3D"#990000"><FONT FACE=3D"Arial"><H2>Opinion & Analysis<BR>

</H2></FONT></FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><FONT FACE=3D"Times New Roman"> <BR>

<BR>

</FONT></FONT><FONT COLOR=3D"#400E72"><FONT SIZE=3D"5"><FONT FACE=3D"Arial">The US Nuclear Posture Review:<BR>

Plus a change, plus c'est la merde<BR>

</FONT></FONT></FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><FONT FACE=3D"Times New Roman"><BR>

</FONT></FONT><FONT FACE=3D"Times New Roman"><H3>By Jack Mendelsohn<BR>

</H3><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>

Last January, the Bush administration presented the classified conclusions of its Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) to the Congress and in early March the text was leaked to the press. At the time of its initial public briefing, the NPR was subjected to a good deal of press and expert criticism, focussed primarily on the details of the proposed 'sizing' of the US nuclear force, the blurring of the distinction between nuclear and conventional weapons, and the hint of an unrequited desire to resume nuclear weapons testing. Once the classified version became available, the critics' list of concerns expanded to include the NPR's listing of potential security contingencies and target countries and the apparent willingness of the United States to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon states. This paper considers these concerns in turn, weighing their separate and collective impact on efforts to strengthen the international arms control and non-proliferation regime.<BR>

<BR>

</FONT><H2>1. The Sizing of the Force<BR>

</H2><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>

The NPR sets forth the administration's goal of reducing the 'operationally deployed' strategic US nuclear warheads - those weapons that are available immediately or within a matter of days - to 1,700-2,200 warheads by 2012. The 'operationally deployed' definition would replace the current counting rule approach used in the Strategic Arms Reduction (START) agreements where, in order to facilitate verification and compliance, missile and bomber delivery systems are assigned a fixed number of warheads whether or not that is the actual operational loading.</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">3</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"> <BR>

<BR>

In a statement worthy of George Orwell, Under Secretary of Defense Douglas Feith referred to the new US operationally deployed approach to sizing the arsenal as 'truth in advertising', noting that the US 'will no longer count 'phantom warheads' that could be deployed but are not.'





ased strategic delivery systems - ICBMs, SLBMs and heavy bombers - which were developed and deployed during the Cold War. One leg of the New Triad combines these delivery systems with non-nuclear strike capabilities, including precision-guided munitions. The other two legs are ballistic missile defences and a revitalized and responsive defence infrastructure (in particular, the nuclear weapons production complex).

<BR>

After decades of debate, the US notice of withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty in December of last year cleared the way for active missile defences to become a part of strategic policy. The NPR, however, is actually rather restrained in its projections for when and how effectively missile defences will actually become part of a New Triad, noting only that "several near-term and mid-term options [2003-2008] that could provide an emergency missile defense capability are under consideration." These options include:

<BR>

\* a single airborne laser for boost-phase intercept that may be available for limited operations;

\* a "rudimentary" ground-based mid-course intercept system that "could be available" in Alaska against long-range threats; and

\* a sea-based Aegis system that "could be available to provide rudimentary" mid-course intercepts against short- to medium-range threats. [Emphases added]

<BR>

<BR>

In effect, the missile defence leg of the New Triad is likely to remain rather weak for some time and will certainly complicate further offensive force reductions with Russia and, in the more distant future, with China and other nuclear-armed states. The most optimistic prediction for the deployment of any element of a missile defence - a handful of ground-based mid-course interceptors in Alaska - is now 2004. But even that date - coinciding with a US presidential election and certain to be heralded as fulfilling a campaign pledge - may still not be realistic given the usual and unavoidable delays characteristic of high-tech defence programs.

<BR>

<H2>4. Blurring the Nuclear/Conventional Distinction

</H2>

Perhaps of more immediate policy concern than missile defences is that the New Triad postulates a continuum between precision-guided non-nuclear munitions and nuclear weapons. There are two grave dangers inherent in this approach:

<BR>

\* Establishing a conventional/nuclear weapons continuum obscures the fact that there are qualitative differences - such as radiation effects or political, legal or moral inhibitions - not just quantitative ones that distinguish precision-guided conventional munitions from low-yield nuclear weapons. This is part and parcel of the long-term effort to make the use of nuclear weapons seem more acceptable and/or credible in other than a deterrent or retaliatory mode; and

\* Elevating long-range precision strike conventional weapons to a strategic role in a p

utative continuum with nuclear weapons also makes it easier to claim "gaps" exist that requiring new, more accurate, smaller-yield, specialized (preferably nuclear) weapons. These gaps, as described by the NPR, include holding at risk "hard and deeply buried targets..., mobile and re-locatable targets..., [and] chemical or biological agents," as well as a need for smaller yield weapons to limit collateral damage. <BR>

<BR>

<BR>

In a later section of the Review dealing with the Department of Energy, which is responsible for the US nuclear weapons production complex, the NPR urges examining three new types of warheads: possible "modifications to existing weapons to provide additional yield flexibility in the stockpile; improved earth penetrating weapons (EPWs) to counter the increased use by potential adversaries of hardened and deeply buried facilities; and warheads that reduce collateral damage."<BR>

<BR>

</FONT><H2>5. Two Treaties Down, One to Go<BR>

</H2><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>

As noted, late last year President Bush announced the intention of the United States to withdraw from the ABM Treaty, the only existing strategic defensive forces agreement. START II, the most recent (1993) strategic offensive forces agreement, is a dead letter, the NPR noting that "the Russian resolution of ratification, adopted in 2000, contains unacceptable provisions contrary to the new strategic framework and establishment of the New Triad." Among other conditions, the Russian ratification legislation would require the US to remain in full compliance with the ABM Treaty. The 1996 Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is the other major nuclear arms control agreement that is strongly opposed - but not yet formally renounced - by the Bush administration.</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">16</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"> <BR>

<BR>

The NPR buffets the CTBT severely but does not quite overturn it. It claims that the United States is making every effort to maintain the stockpile without additional testing. At the same time, the NPR warns that "this may not be possible for the indefinite future" and builds the case for the eventual resumption of testing by cautioning ominously that "some problems due to ageing and manufacturing defects have already been identified."</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">17</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"> Meanwhile, to strengthen the case, the NPR proposes increased reliance on the stockpile to supply the responsive force for potential contingencies. The NPR also identifies limitations in the current nuclear force that will require new capabilities. These include "defeating both hard and deeply buried targets with a more effective earth penetrator (heavier casing and lower yield) as well as chemical and biological agents (by thermal, chemical or *radiological* neutralization)"</FONT>. (Emphasis added.)<BR>

<BR>

Finally, the NPR urges revitalisation of the entire nuclear infrastructure, "in particular the production complex," so that it will be able, "if directed, to design, develop, manufacture, and certify new warheads in response to new national requirements, and maintain readiness to resume underground nuclear testing if required." The NPR goes on to argue that the United States should improve its test readiness posture "from its current two to three year period to something substantially better." The administration has indicated it would like the Department of Energy to be able to resume testing within 12 to 18 months from the time it is directed to

do so.

6. Targeting Non-Nuclear Nations

When portions of the classified version of the NPR were leaked to the press, critical comment focussed on the discussion in the document of the "immediate, potential or unexpected" security contingencies that set the requirements for nuclear strike capabilities. Immediate contingencies wherein US nuclear weapons may be called upon to play a role were named as including "an Iraqi attack on Israel or its neighbors, a North Korean attack on South Korea or a military confrontation over the straits of Taiwan."

The document then singles out five countries that could be involved in "immediate, potential or unexpected" contingencies: North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria and Libya. North Korea and Iraq are characterised as "chronic military concerns." All five are considered to "sponsor or harbor terrorists, and all have active WMD and missile programs."

In addition, the NPR lists China as a country that could be involved in an "immediate or potential" contingency and, while a nuclear strike contingency involving Russia "is not expected," Russian nuclear forces and programs "remain a concern." Carrying forward the arguments of the Clinton administration for its 'hedge' force, the NPR cautions that in "the event that US relations with Russia significantly worsen in the future, the United States may need to revise its nuclear force levels and posture."

Keeping open the option to use nuclear weapons in other than a deterrent or retaliatory role is not new. Since at least the Gulf War and during the Clinton administration, the United States has embraced a dual and contradictory policy on nuclear weapons use. The President, through the Secretary of State, declared in 1978 and reaffirmed in 1995 in connection with the review and extension of the 1970 nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), that the United States - joined by the other four declared nuclear powers - would not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapons states party to the NPT unless they are allied with a nuclear state in an attack against the United States or its allies.

The National Security Council (NSC) and the Defense Department, on the other hand, believing that deterrence is strengthened by ambiguity, have for some time taken the position that "no options are ruled out" in response to an attack by any weapon of mass destruction. In 1996, NSC official Robert Bell, in conjunction with the US signature of the Protocols to the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (ANWFZ) Treaty, announced that US adherence "will not limit options available to the United States in response to an attack by an ANWFZ party using weapons of mass destruction." In late 1998, Walter Slocombe, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, stated that retaining the option to use nuclear weapons against an attack with chemical and/or biological weapons "is simply an issue of making sure that we continue to maintain a high level of uncertainty or high level of concern, if you will, at what the potential aggressor would face if he used [CBW] or indeed took other aggressive acts..."



ing. In the case of ICBMs and SLBMs, the counting rules usually overcount the actual number of deployed weapons. In the case of long-range bombers, counting rules have traditionally undercounted the actual number.<BR>

</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>

</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">4. Douglas Feith, testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, February 14, 2002.<BR>

</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>

</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">5. All current US strategic missiles are designed to carry multiple warheads (3 to 10 depending on the system). "Downloading" means removing some of the multiple warheads from the dispensing platform (often called a "bus").<BR>

</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>

</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">6. According to the NPR, the force reductions between now and FY-07 will be accomplished by: retiring the 50 *Peacekeeper* (= MX) ICBMs but maintaining the silos "for future options" (a reduction of 500 warheads); downloading *Minuteman* III missiles from 3 warheads to 1 (a reduction of 700 warheads); removing 4 *Trident* submarines from strategic service and converting them to conventional cruise missile carriers (a reduction of 768 warheads); exempting 2 *Trident* submarines in overhaul (a reduction of 384 warheads); downloading the missiles on the remaining 12 *Trident* submarines from 8 warheads to 5 or 6 (a reduction of about 600 warheads); downloading weapons from B-52 and B-2 bombers (which in some cases can carry up to 20 bombs or cruise missiles); and eliminating the capability to return the B-1 bomber from a conventional to a nuclear role.<BR>

</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>

</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">7. This educated guess is deduced from the sum of the 1,600 empty spaces available on downloaded systems, plus 200+ spares and 200+ systems in overhaul. For "conceptual" nuclear force tables for 2002, 2006 and 2012, see 'Faking Nuclear Restraint: The Bush Administration's Secret Plan for Strengthening US Nuclear Forces', Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) Backgrounder, February 13, 2002 (<http://www.nrdc.org>).<BR>

</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>

</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">8. The "active stockpile is a weapon which is available, fully ready to be deployed and used." The inactive stockpile "consists of those weapons that are not fielded with limited-life components (e.g. tritium, batteries, neutron generators, etc.)."<BR>

</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>

</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">9. The current active stockpile is "almost 8,000" including an estimated 1,200 non-strategic warheads.<BR>

</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>

</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">10. For a discussion and an accounting of US nuclear forces in 2002, see the NRDC Nuclear Notebook in *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, May/June 2002, pp. 70-75.<BR>

</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>

</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">11. The framework envisaged for START III - set out by Presidents Yeltsin and Clinton in Helsinki in 1997 - anticipated reductions to 2,000-2,500 warheads. The Bush administration will take five years longer to reach approximately the same level than the timeline set out at Helsinki.<BR>

</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>

</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">12. 'Race Is On To Clinch Arms Cuts Pact', *Moscow Times*, April 24, 2002.<BR>

</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">13. 'America's BMD Stumbles', <I>Jane's Defence Weekly</I>, May 1, 2002.<BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">14. In an ironic but unintended mirror-image description of how nuclear weapons use by the United States would be perceived by the rest of the world, Under Secretary Feith noted in his February 14 testimony that September 11 illustrates that the United States &quot;now confront[s] enemies who are eager to <I>inflict mass destruction on innocent civilians</I> here and abroad <I>without regard for the possible cost</I>.&quot; [Emphases added.]<BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">15. The NPR notes, correctly, that &quot;accurate and timely targeting information can increase...the possibilities for non-nuclear strike capabilities to substitute for nuclear weapons.&quot;<BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">16. Under Secretary of State John Bolton, who is responsible for arms control and proliferation issues, has reportedly asked Department of State lawyers to examine the possibility of the United States withdrawing its signature from the CTBT.<BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">17. The NPR cites as a major challenge over the next two decades the need to refurbish and extend the life of at least seven types of nuclear warheads: the B61-3, -4, -7, -10, -11 and B83-0, -1 for the B-2 and the non-strategic bomber force; W76 and W88 for the SLBM force; W78 and W87 for the ICBM force; and the W80-0, -1 for the ALCM and SLCM forces.<BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">18. If the Bush administration renounced the CTBT today the US could probably not test a nuclear device until after the next presidential election. The current official specification for the amount of time to achieve test-readiness is 24-36 months.<BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">19. In 1994, for example, in the first and only <I>Annual Report</I> submitted by Defense Secretary Les Aspin, the Pentagon was arguing that the role of US nuclear weapons in &quot;deterring or responding to...non-nuclear threats&quot;; - i.e. chemical and biological weapons - &quot;must be considered&quot;.<BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">20. This commitment not to use nuclear weapons is called a 'negative security assurance.'</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">21. See this author's &quot;NATO's Nuclear Weapons: The Rationale for No First Use,&quot; <I>Arms Control Today</I>, July/August, 1999.<BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">22. John Bolton, interview and news article in Arms Control Today, March 2002. The interview was conducted on February 11, 2002.<BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">23. Richard Boucher, February 22, 2002. See also <I>Disarmament Diplomacy</I> No. 63 (March/April 2002).<BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"2">24. With due apologies to Bette Davis.<BR>  
</FONT><FONT SIZE=3D"4"><BR>

<BR>  
<BR>  
</FONT><FONT COLOR=#400E72><H5>Jack Mendelsohn, a retired State Department  
official, served in the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, at the US =  
Mission to NATO and as a member of the US SALT II and START I Delegations.<B=  
R>  
</H5></FONT><FONT SIZE=4><BR>  
=A9 2002 The Acronym Institute. </FONT></FONT>  
</BODY>  
</HTML>

--MS\_Mac\_OE\_3104616813\_5738906\_MIME\_Part--

Status: U  
Return-Path: <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>  
Received: from web13902.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.28])  
by tyner.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 179MRn16r3Nl3rs0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 20 May 2002 09:05:57 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-ID: <20020520130556.58545.qmail@web13902.mail.yahoo.com>  
Received: from [205.188.199.164] by web13902.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Mon, 20 May 2002 06:05:56 PDT  
Date: Mon, 20 May 2002 06:05:56 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Marie Kayser <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Re: Religious Statements page  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
In-Reply-To: <000301c1fe0a\$8331eda0\$5753f7a5@default>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-901825547-1021899956=:57178"

--0-901825547-1021899956=:57178  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Good Morning,  
I think I made all the changes that you requested last week. I am still working on some of the images you wanted (i.e. map of nagasaki and hiroshima with a star, etc.).  
For now, I simply moved the feedback button down on the second line - this was how we had it before.  
I will be in Seattle on Wednesday then Alaska on Thursday until the end of May. I am not sure how much I can do between now and when I leave for Seattle. Sorry!!  
Please look at the revised pages for Religious Statements and How to Get to Zero. I sort of found a dove (which I think looks 100% better than the faded dove on the poster). If you do not like my dove, I will keep on looking unless you find something better.  
Thanks,  
Marie  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>

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

Upon further reflection on the listings on the first page of the Religious Statements, I like the brown you used for Holy See, etc. as subheadings under Catholic, but without the buttons. We may have some sub-headings under other denominations, so the format is good: inset and brown.

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.

! Music Experience

--0-901825547-1021899956=:57178--

Status: U

Return-Path: <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>

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

by tyner.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 179TkC4IP3NI3rs0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 20 May 2002 16:00:34 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020520200028.27441.qmail@web13902.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [166.90.28.23] by web13902.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Mon, 20 May 2002 13:00:28 PDT

Date: Mon, 20 May 2002 13:00:28 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: How to Get to Zero, etc.

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

In-Reply-To: <001601c20037\$288c9ba0\$fe6bf7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-1501653133-1021924828=:27337"

--0-1501653133-1021924828=:27337

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

Hi Howard,

I will make the changes below and I should have them done tomorrow.

I know nothing about Alaska so everything will be an adventure!

Regards,

Marie

"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote: Marie, That's a good start on How to Get to Zero. I have some refinements to suggest, but I won't bother you now as you prepare for travel. Except for one item: Under Common Elements the lead paragraph says, "....a consensus has merged...." It should be "emerged". Please correct this. I want to share the draft page with a few of my advisers, so this correction is useful. I like the dove on Religious Statements. I'll save further editing of that page until you return. By then I'll have other statements to add. Alaska is a wonderful place. Have a good time. Howard

-----

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>  
Subject: How to Get to Zero, etc.  
Date: Mon, 20 May 2002 15:46:55 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
    boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_0013\_01C20015.9181A0A0"  
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\_0013\_01C20015.9181A0A0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Marie,

That's a good start on How to Get to Zero. I have some refinements to =  
suggest, but I won't bother you now as you prepare for travel. Except =  
for one item: Under Common Elements the lead paragraph says, "....a =  
consensus has merged...." It should be "emerged". Please correct this. =  
I want to share the draft page with a few of my advisers, so this =  
correction is useful.

I like the dove on Religous Statements. I'll save further editing of =  
that page until you return. By then I'll have other statements to add.

Alaska is a wonderful place. Have a good time.

Howard

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Tue, 21 May 2002 09:39:26 -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 Larry,

We are making progress with our web site. The home page is now on line at:  
[www.zero-nukes.org.html](http://www.zero-nukes.org.html)  
Also available for viewing are two other pages, which are works in progress:  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

For the home page listing of sponsors, please tell me the URL to use for linkage with your office.

I know that you are developing material for the Unitarian Universalist Association for the religious statements page. You can see the model: a brief introductory paragraph and then your major policy statements related to nuclear weapons. The latter can be done either through linkage with your web site (with a brief excerpt of highlights), or by posting directly on our site. For linkage, tell me the URL of the policy statements. For direct posting, send me copy via a Word attachment. As an identity marker, we would like to use your logo -- if this is permitted.

Some of the sponsors are making small financial contributions to this effort, with a larger one of \$5,000 from the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society. If this is possible for the Unitarian Universalist Association, a check can be made payable to Methodists United for Peace with Justice and sent to 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

Thanks for your help in this project.

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: <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>  
Subject: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Tue, 21 May 2002 09:40:42 -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 Catherine,

We are making progress with our web site. The home page is now on line at:

[www.zero-nukes.org.html](http://www.zero-nukes.org.html)

Also available for viewing are two other pages, which are works in progress:

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

For the home page listing of sponsors, please tell me the URL to use for linkage with your office.

We would like to add the Presbyterian Church to the religious statements page. You can see the model: a brief introductory paragraph and then your major policy statements related to nuclear weapons. The latter can be done either through linkage with your web site (with a brief excerpt of highlights), or by posting directly on our site. For linkage, tell me the URL of the policy statements. For direct posting, send me copy via a Word attachment. As an identity marker, we would like to use your logo -- if this is permitted.

You indicated that the Presbyterian Church might make a contribution to this effort. A check can be made payable to Methodists United for Peace with Justice and sent to 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

Thanks for your help in this project.

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: <conoverp@ucc.org>  
Subject: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Tue, 21 May 2002 09:41:34 -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

Dear Pat,

We are making progress with our web site. The home page is now on line at:  
[www.zero-nukes.org.html](http://www.zero-nukes.org.html)  
Also available for viewing are two other pages, which are works in progress:  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

For the home page listing of sponsors, please tell me the URL to use for linkage with your office.

We would like to add United Church of Christ to the religious statements page. You can see the model: a brief introductory paragraph and then your major policy statements related to nuclear weapons. The latter can be done either through linkage with your web site (with a brief excerpt of highlights), or by posting directly on our site. For linkage, tell me the URL of the policy statements. For direct posting, send me copy via a Word attachment. As an identity marker, we would like to use your logo -- if this is permitted.

You indicated that UCC might make a contribution to this effort. A check can be made payable to Methodists United for Peace with Justice and sent to 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

Thanks for your help in this project.

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: <turner@onebox.com>  
Subject: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Tue, 21 May 2002 09:42:46 -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

Dear Lonnie,

We are making progress with our web site. The home page is now on line at:  
[www.zero-nukes.org.html](http://www.zero-nukes.org.html)  
Also available for viewing are two other pages, which are works in progress:  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

For the home page listing of sponsors, please tell me the URL to use for linkage with your office.

We would like to add Cooperative Baptist Fellowship to the religious statements page. You can see the model: a brief introductory paragraph and then your major policy statements related to nuclear weapons. The latter can be done either through linkage with your web site (with a brief excerpt of highlights), or by posting directly on our site. For linkage, tell me the URL of the policy statements. For direct posting, send me copy via a Word attachment. As an identity marker, we would like to use your logo -- if this is permitted.

Some of the sponsors are making small financial contributions to this effort, with a larger one of \$5,000 from the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society. If this is possible for the Cooperative Baptist Fellowship, a check can be made payable to Methodists United for Peace with Justice and sent to 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

Thanks for your help in this project.

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: <J.\_Daryl\_Byler@mcc.org>  
Subject: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Tue, 21 May 2002 13:32:19 -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 Daryl,

We are making progress with our web site. The home page is now on line at:  
[www.zero-nukes.org.html](http://www.zero-nukes.org.html)  
Also available for viewing are two other pages, which are works in progress:  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

For the home page listing of sponsors, please tell me the URL to use for linkage with your office.

We would like to add the Mennonite Central Committee to the religious statements page. You can see the model: a brief introductory paragraph and then your major policy statements related to nuclear weapons. The latter can be done either through linkage with your web site (with a brief excerpt of highlights), or by posting directly on our site. For linkage, tell me the URL of the policy statements. For direct posting, send me copy via a Word attachment. As an identity marker, we would like to use your logo -- if this is permitted.

You indicated that your office might make a contribution to this effort. A check can be made payable to Methodists United for Peace with Justice and sent to 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

Thanks for your help in this project.

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: <lisaw@nccusa.org>  
Subject: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Tue, 21 May 2002 13:37:26 -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 Lisa,

We are making progress with our web site. The home page is now on line at:  
[www.zero-nukes.org.html](http://www.zero-nukes.org.html)  
Also available for viewing are two other pages, which are works in progress:  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

We don't yet have the National Council of Churches listed as a sponsor, but we will. Should it be just National Council of Churches, or do you want to add Washington Office, as some of the denominations have done? Whichever, please tell me the URL to use for linkage.

We would like to add the National Council of Churches to the religious statements page. You can see the model: a brief introductory paragraph and then your major policy statements related to nuclear weapons. The latter can be done either through linkage with your web site (with a brief excerpt of highlights), or by posting directly on our site. For linkage, tell me the URL of the policy statements. For direct posting, send me copy via a Word attachment. As a place marker, we have used your logo but want your permission to leave it there.

Thanks for your help in this project.

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: <visner@umc-gbcs.org>  
Subject: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Tue, 21 May 2002 13:45:15 -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,

We are making progress with our web site. The home page is now on line at:  
[www.zero-nukes.org.html](http://www.zero-nukes.org.html)  
Also available for viewing are two other pages, which are works in progress:  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

Am I correct that for home page listing of sponsors, we should use  
[www.umc-gbcs.org](http://www.umc-gbcs.org) for your URL?

As I've previously indicated, we would like to add the United Methodist Church the religious statements page. You can see the model: a brief introductory paragraph and then your major policy statements related to nuclear weapons. This might include the bishops' pastoral letter, "In Defense of Creation", the 2000 General Conference resolution, "Saying No to Deterrence", and whatever else you want to list. This can be done either through linkage with your web site (with a brief excerpt of highlights), or by posting directly on our site. (I have the 2000 resolution in digital format if you want it). For linkage, tell me the URL of the policy statements. For direct posting, send me copy via a Word attachment. As an identity marker, we would like to use your logo -- if this is permitted.

Marie is away for ten days. When she returns on June 3, I would like to have these additional statements ready for her.

Thanks for your help in this project.

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](mailto: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: <dave@paxchristiusa.org>,  
<tony@paxchristiusa.org>,  
<tvpcusa1@prodigy.net>  
Subject: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Tue, 21 May 2002 16:35:23 -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 Dave and Tony,

We are making progress with our web site. The home page is now on line at:  
[www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org)  
Also available for viewing are two other pages, which are works in progress:  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

As you will notice, you are listed on the home page as a sponsor. What URL should we use for linkage to your web site?

We have also put Pax Christi, USA on the religious statements page. We have used your logo. Is that all right? We make reference to "The Morality of Deterrence" and quote a couple of passages. Can you provide us an URL for linkage? Dave said that you can create a PDF document for this purpose.

We want to work some photos into the web pages. Could you provide photos of Bishop Sullivan and Bishop Gumbleton, either through a web site or a photo that we can scan? We will use the Gumbleton photo in connection with the statement he read at the 1998 NPT PrepCom. You will note that it is on the web site.

Thanks for your help in this project.

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: <bgrieves@episcopalchurch.org>,  
<thart@episcopalchurch.org>  
Subject: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Tue, 21 May 2002 16:50:08 -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 Brian and Tom:

We are making progress with our new web site. I've kept Tom informed about our progress. This is my first communication to Brian about it.

The home page is now on line at:

[www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org)

Also available for viewing are two other pages, which are works in progress:

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

The sponsors to date are listed on the home page, plus the National Council of Churches, which we haven't yet added. We're still hoping that your office will join this group as a sponsor. The obligation is to be listed on the home page and to have someone from your office be represented on the steering committee, with which I will confer via e-mail from time to time. Some sponsors have made a financial contribution, but that isn't a hard-and-fast requirement.

Whether you become a sponsor, we would like to add material from the Episcopal Church on the religious statements page. You can see the model: a brief introductory paragraph and then your major policy statements related to nuclear weapons. The latter can be done either through linkage with your web site (with a brief excerpt of highlights), or by posting directly on our site. For linkage, tell me the URL of the policy statements. For direct posting, send me copy via a Word attachment. As an identity marker, we would like to use your logo -- if this is permitted.

If you have questions, reply by e-mail or 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: <marsusab@aol.com>  
Subject: Zero-nukes.org  
Date: Tue, 21 May 2002 16:52:18 -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 Mark,

We are making progress with our new web site. The home page is now on line at:

[www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org)

Also available for viewing are two other pages, which are works in progress:

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

The sponsors to date are listed on the home page, plus the National Council of Churches, which we haven't yet added. We're still hoping that your office will join this group as a sponsor. The obligation is to be listed on the home page and to have someone from your office be represented on the steering committee, with which I will confer via e-mail from time to time. Some sponsors have made a financial contribution, but that isn't a hard-and-fast requirement.

Whether you become a sponsor, we would like to add material from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America on the religious statements page. You can see the model: a brief introductory paragraph and then your major policy statements related to nuclear weapons. The latter can be done either through linkage with your web site (with a brief excerpt of highlights), or by posting directly on our site. For linkage, tell me the URL of the policy statements. For direct posting, send me copy via a Word attachment. As an identity marker, we would like to use your logo -- if this is permitted.

If you have questions, reply by e-mail or 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: <Bpinguel@afsc.org>  
Subject: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Tue, 21 May 2002 16:56:05 -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 Bal,

We are making progress with our new web site. The home page is now on line at:

[www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org)

Also available for viewing are two other pages, which are works in progress:

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

The sponsors to date are listed on the home page, plus the National Council of Churches, which we haven't yet added. We're still hoping that your office will join this group as a sponsor. The obligation is to be listed on the home page and to have someone from your office be represented on the steering committee, with which I will confer via e-mail from time to time. Some sponsors have made a financial contribution, but that isn't a hard-and-fast requirement.

Whether you become a sponsor, we would like to add material from the American Friends Service Committee on the religious statements page. You can see the model: a brief introductory paragraph and then your major policy statements related to nuclear weapons. The latter can be done either through linkage with your web site (with a brief excerpt of highlights), or by posting directly on our site. For linkage, tell me the URL of the policy statements. For direct posting, send me copy via a Word attachment. As an identity marker, we would like to use your logo -- if this is permitted.

If you have questions, reply by e-mail or 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: <ccosby@dhm.disciples.org>  
Subject: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Tue, 21 May 2002 17:07:47 -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 Carol,

In recent months the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament has been developing a web site, called [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). Its purposes are (1) to post a collection of statements and reports from religious organizations, military leaders, and civil-sector organizations related to nuclear disarmament (2) to facilitate a dialogue on practical steps for going to zero nuclear weapons.

The home page of this new web site is now on line at:

[www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org)

Also available for viewing are two other pages, which are works in progress:

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

The sponsors to date are listed on the home page, plus the National Council of Churches, which we haven't yet added. We are seeking primarily denominational offices as sponsors rather than peace fellowships and unofficial organizations, like my own. We are wondering if the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), or one of its units, such as the Division of Homeland Ministries, would be will to join as a sponsor. The obligation is to be listed on the home page and to have someone be represented on the steering committee, with which I will confer via e-mail from time to time. Some sponsors have made a financial contribution, but that isn't a hard-and-fast requirement.

Whether it becomes a sponsor, we would like to add material from the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) on the religious statements page. You can see the model: a brief introductory paragraph and then your major policy statements related to nuclear weapons. The latter can be done either through linkage with your web site (with a brief excerpt of highlights), or by posting directly on our site. For linkage, tell me the URL of the policy statements. For direct posting, send me copy via a Word attachment. As an identity marker, we would like to use the denominational logo -- if this is permitted.

If you have questions, reply by e-mail or 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: <BPinguel@afsc.org>

Received: from national.afsc.org ([12.3.222.2])

by tyner.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17ah09jv3Nl3rs0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 21 May 2002 17:17:01 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by national.afsc.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <J4TX3C8T>; Tue, 21 May 2002 17:17:10 -0400

Message-ID: <4CFAFD5E4CB7D4119D2E005004D7CA45136E56@national.afsc.org>

From: Baltazar Pinguel <BPinguel@afsc.org>

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

Subject: RE: Zero-nukes web site

Date: Tue, 21 May 2002 17:17:04 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Thanks, Howard.

It is beautiful and makes compelling follow-up for AFSC to sponsor it. I will get back to you as soon as I get the nod from our Secretary general.

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

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

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2002 4:56 PM

To: Bpinguel@afsc.org

Subject: Zero-nukes web site

Dear Bal,

We are making progress with our new web site. The home page is now on line at:

[www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org)

Also available for viewing are two other pages, which are works in progress:

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

The sponsors to date are listed on the home page, plus the National Council of Churches, which we haven't yet added. We're still hoping that your office will join this group as a sponsor. The obligation is to be listed on the home page and to have someone from your office be represented on the steering committee, with which I will confer via e-mail from time to time. Some sponsors have made a financial contribution, but that isn't a hard-and-fast requirement.

Whether you become a sponsor, we would like to add material from the American Friends Service Committee on the religious statements page. You can see the model: a brief introductory paragraph and then your major policy statements related to nuclear weapons. The latter can be done either through linkage with your web site (with a brief excerpt of highlights), or by posting directly on our site. For linkage, tell me the URL of the policy statements. For direct posting, send me copy via a Word attachment.

As an identity marker, we would like to use your logo -- if this is permitted.

If you have questions, reply by e-mail or 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: <BPinguel@afsc.org>

Received: from national.afsc.org ([12.3.222.2])

by tyner.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17ah09jv3Nl3rs0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 21 May 2002 17:17:01 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by national.afsc.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <J4TX3C8T>; Tue, 21 May 2002 17:17:10 -0400

Message-ID: <4CFAFD5E4CB7D4119D2E005004D7CA45136E56@national.afsc.org>

From: Baltazar Pinguel <BPinguel@afsc.org>

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

Subject: RE: Zero-nukes web site

Date: Tue, 21 May 2002 17:17:04 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Thanks, Howard.

It is beautiful and makes compelling follow-up for AFSC to sponsor it. I will get back to you as soon as I get the nod from our Secretary general.

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

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

Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2002 4:56 PM

To: Bpinguel@afsc.org

Subject: Zero-nukes web site

Dear Bal,

We are making progress with our new web site. The home page is now on line

at:

[www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org)

Also available for viewing are two other pages, which are works in progress:

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

The sponsors to date are listed on the home page, plus the National Council of Churches, which we haven't yet added. We're still hoping that your office will join this group as a sponsor. The obligation is to be listed on the home page and to have someone from your office be represented on the steering committee, with which I will confer via e-mail from time to time.

Some sponsors have made a financial contribution, but that isn't a hard-and-fast requirement.

Whether you become a sponsor, we would like to add material from the American Friends Service Committee on the religious statements page. You can see the model: a brief introductory paragraph and then your major policy statements related to nuclear weapons. The latter can be done either through linkage with your web site (with a brief excerpt of highlights), or by posting directly on our site. For linkage, tell me the URL of the policy statements. For direct posting, send me copy via a Word attachment.

As an identity marker, we would like to use your logo -- if this is permitted.

If you have questions, reply by e-mail or 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: <dce@wcc-coe.org>,  
<sal@wcc-coe.org>  
Subject: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Wed, 22 May 2002 07:58:05 -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 in the U.S. is moving ahead with the creation of a new web site, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). The home page is now available at that web address. In addition to the sponsors listed on the home page, we can add the National Council of Churches, which recently signed on.

We have two other pages ready in draft form, as follows:

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogetozero.html>

The religious statements page contains material from the World Council of Churches, which I would like you to review. Details are as follows:

1. In the draft we use your logo as an identity marker. Is that okay?
2. Is the introductory paragraph accurate?
3. We quote from the 1983 Assembly statement on nuclear disarmament. Do we have your permission?
4. We make reference to the statement of Dr. Raiser and Cardinal Danneels to the 1998 NPT PrepCom, which is presented in full elsewhere. We would like to incorporate a photo of Dr. Raiser under WCC and a photo of Dr. Raiser, Cardinal Danneels, and PrepCom Chair Wyzner, if one exists from the PrepCom reception. Can you help us? We could use either a digital version or a photograph that we could scan.
4. We show a linkage to the WCC "Statement on Nuclear Disarmament, NATO Policy and the Churches" (2001) on your web site.
5. Are there other statements you would like us to include? For instances, Dwain's report on "The Evolution of World Council of Churches Policy on Nuclear Arms and Disarmament, 1948-2000" would be a valuable source if it would be accessed through your web site.

Within another month our site will be far enough along to make a public announcement and invite users to visit it. When that time comes, we will ask you to help publicize it.

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: <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>  
Subject: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Wed, 22 May 2002 08:12:13 -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

Dear Wendy,

We are now on line with the home page of our new web site, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). You can access it at that web address. To the sponsors listed we will add the National Council of Churches, which has now signed on. Decisions by several other denominational offices are pending.

We have the beginnings of two other pages in draft form, as follows:

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

On the Religious Statements page we make reference to the Nuclear Reductions/Disarmament Initiative. I would like you to review it.

1. We use your logo as an identity marker. Is that okay?
2. We show a linkage to your web site for the statement and for your operation.
3. We will use the photo you provided, but our web designer hasn't yet installed it. However, the caption is already there.
4. Elsewhere on the Religious Statements page we make reference to statements at your news conference by Rabbi David Saperstein and Dr. Muzammil H. Siddiqi with linkage to your site.
5. On another page, Military Leaders Speak Out, not yet put on line, we make reference to the statement by Admiral Turner with linkage to your site.

We hope that this usage of your material and the linkage meets your approval.

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](mailto: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: <interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com>  
Subject: A new interfaith web site  
Date: Wed, 22 May 2002 17:02:33 -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 Colleagues:

When we met toward the end of 2001 to evaluate the work of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and to plan for the future, we decided to make greater use of electronic media and to meet together only as appropriate rather than having scheduled monthly meetings.

As first step to make better use of electronic media, we set up the list serve, [interfaithnd@yahoogroups.org](mailto:interfaithnd@yahoogroups.org). I have used it to send announcements, circulate drafts of sign-on letters, and forward information from other organizations. David Culp of FCNL, in particular, has sent out alerts on legislative issues. I would be interested in any comments you have about the usefulness of the list serve and whether the quantity of messages is too much, about right, or too small.

As a second step, during the last three months I have been working with denominational offices to step up a web site, known as [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). The purposes are (1) to provide a consolidated source for statements and reports on nuclear disarmament from the religious community, (2) to make reference to statements and reports on nuclear disarmament by military leaders, civil sector organizations, and international commissions, and (3) to contribute to dialogue on how to achieve zero nuclear weapons, that is, total global nuclear disarmament.

So far ten offices have agreed to sponsor this project. They are listed on the home page, which is now on the web at [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). (The National Council of Churches is a sponsor but hasn't yet been listed.) Invitations with several other denominational offices are pending.

To give you an idea where this project is headed, two other pages, which are works in progress, are available for viewing:

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

I am now working on pages for Military Leaders Speak Out and Civil Sector Statements and Reports.

If you have any comments about this web site project, please reply by e-mail or call me at 301 896-0013. I'll keep you informed as various pages go on line.

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: <jdi@clw.org>  
Subject: A new interfaith web site  
Date: Wed, 22 May 2002 17:05:51 -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

Dear John,

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is setting up a new web site, known as [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). I would like to share information about this project with the Nuclear Policy Task Force (or whatever the new coalition is called). Will you please forward the following community to the participants.

Thanks,  
Howard

###

Dear Colleagues:

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is in the process of creating a web site known as [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). The purposes are (1) to provide a consolidated source for statements and reports on nuclear disarmament from the religious community, (2) to make reference to statements and reports on nuclear disarmament by military leaders, civil sector organizations, and international commissions, and (3) to contribute to dialogue on how to achieve zero nuclear weapons, that is, total global nuclear disarmament.

So far only our home page is on line at [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). However, we have made a start on two other pages, available as follows:

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

They are works in progress.

We are seeking your cooperation in two aspects of our web site.

First, we would like to make reference to your organization and its policy statements related to the elimination of nuclear weapons. We are thinking of longer-term objectives, not statements and sign-on letters on immediate issues, such as legislation now before Congress. The model for this is found on the draft/religiousstatements page, shown above. Typically an entry would consist of the organization logo as an identity marker (if permitted), a brief description of the organization (2 to 4 sentences), the title of policy statements with linkage to your web site, and excerpts of

the highlights.

Please send me such material as a Word document so that our web designer can place it on the page for Civil Sector Statements and Reports.

Second, we are inviting military leaders, scientists, professional experts, and concerned citizens to submit their ideas on How to Get to Zero. This would be step-by-step scenarios involving various parties over a period of time. We will also welcome scenarios that get close to zero from those who are uncertain about going all the way. We have no upper or lower limits on length, but perhaps the 1,000 to 3,000 word range would be sufficient to lay out a set of ideas. We will post the submissions on the How to Get to Zero page and invite comments through the Your Feedback page. If possible, we would like a photo of the author, either in digital form or as a photograph that we can scan and enter.

We invite your staff, board members, and affiliated experts to offer their ideas. They can be sent to me at [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org) until we get a suitable mailbox set up on our web site.

If you have any comments or questions, please reply by e-mail or call me at 301 896-0013.

Thanks for your cooperation,

Howard W. 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](mailto: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: <sal@wcc-coe.org>  
Received: from wccxsmtp ([193.73.242.105])  
by walker.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17aOO218bM3N13s70  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 23 May 2002 05:22:45 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from wccgeneva-Message\_Server by wccxsmtp  
with Novell\_GroupWise; Thu, 23 May 2002 11:19:22 +0200  
Message-Id: <scecd03a.006@wccxsmtp>  
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 5.5.4.1  
Date: Thu, 23 May 2002 11:19:10 +0200  
From: "Salpy Eskidjian" <sal@wcc-coe.org>  
To: <mupj@igc.org>  
Cc: "Alexander Freeman" <ANF@wcc-coe.org>,  
"Dwain Epps" <dce@wcc-coe.org>  
Subject: Re: Zero-nukes web site  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-Disposition: inline

Dear Mr. Hallman,

Please be informed that Salpy is on study leave and will not be back until =  
mid-August.=20

I will look at your questions with Dwain Epps and get back to you as soon =  
as possible.=20

In Peace,=20

isabelle ferrari  
administrative assistant  
international relations  
world council of churches geneva  
ife@wcc-coe.org

>>> "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> 05/22/02 01:58PM >>>  
Dear Dwain and Salpy,

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament in the U.S. is moving =  
ahead  
with the creation of a new web site, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). The home page =  
is  
now available at that web address. In addition to the sponsors listed on  
the home page, we can add the National Council of Churches, which recently  
signed on.

We have two other pages ready in draft form, as follows:  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>=20  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogetozero.html>=20

The religious statements page contains material from the World Council of

Churches, which I would like you to review. Details are as follows:

1. In the draft we use your logo as an identity marker. Is that okay?
2. Is the introductory paragraph accurate?
3. We quote from the 1983 Assembly statement on nuclear disarmament. Do we have your permission?
4. We make reference to the statement of Dr. Raiser and Cardinal Danneels to the 1998 NPT PrepCom, which is presented in full elsewhere. We would like to incorporate a photo of Dr. Raiser under WCC and a photo of Dr. Raiser, Cardinal Danneels, and PrepCom Chair Wyzner, if one exists from the PrepCom reception. Can you help us? We could use either a digital version or a photograph that we could scan.
4. We show a linkage to the WCC "Statement on Nuclear Disarmament, NATO Policy and the Churches" (2001) on your web site.
5. Are there other statements you would like us to include? For instances,=

Dwain's report on "The Evolution of World Council of Churches Policy on Nuclear Arms and Disarmament, 1948-2000" would be a valuable source if it would be accessed through your web site.

Within another month our site will be far enough along to make a public announcement and invite users to visit it. When that time comes, we will ask you to help publicize it.

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: <jdi@clw.org>

Received: from mail.clw.org ([63.106.26.66])

by strange.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17aSgB4s73Nl3oW0

Thu, 23 May 2002 09:04:28 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from clw.clw.org ([63.106.26.83]) by mail.clw.org

(Post.Office MTA v3.5.3 release 223 ID# 0-57746U100L2S100V35)

with ESMTTP id org; Thu, 23 May 2002 08:18:10 -0400

Message-Id: <5.0.0.25.2.20020523090350.00a3b010@[63.106.26.66]>

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0

Date: Thu, 23 May 2002 09:06:00 -0400

To: jdi@clw.org

From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>

Subject: FYI: Study Finds Congressional Offices Prefer Snail Mail

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

## Study Finds Congressional Offices Prefer Snail Mail

Washington D.C. May 8, 2002=96 mindshare Internet Campaigns today released=

=20

the results of a or recent survey of more than 230 Capitol Hill staff,=20

Executive branch workers, and insidethebeltway opinion leaders conducted=20

online on NationalJournal.com. Among the key findings:

=3DCongressional offices indicated they prefer constituent=20  
communications via snailmail over email by a margin of more than 5 to 1=20  
(53.2% prefer snailmail, 10.4% prefer email),

=3D Congressional staff and other opinion leaders indicate they=  
turn=20

to public affairs Web sites run by coalitions, corporations, and issue=20  
groups for position papers, tutorials to learn about complex issues, and=20  
the impact of an issue on their state or district.

=3D Paid on-line advertising can generate significant response=  
rates=20

from this highly desirable audience if it is targeted, relevant, and the=20  
creative execution is professional.

=93These results indicate that even in the wake of anthrax, Congressional=20  
offices continue to prefer snail mail. It is clear that congressional=20

staff struggle with how to handle constituent email,=94 said Jonah Seiger,=  
=20

CoFounder and Chief Strategist with mindshare Internet Campaigns. =93Email=  
=20

and the Web are cost effective tools for mobilizing a constituency, but=20  
according to surveyed Hill staff, letters, phone calls, personal visits,=20

and other offline formats are much more effective tools to employ when=20  
trying to influence Congress.=94

Another important finding revealed that when key decision makers turn to=20  
the Web, they are looking for specific kinds of information. In large=20

numbers, this audience indicated that they are seeking position papers,=20 on-line tutorials to learn about complex issues, and for information=20 presented in ways that illustrate impact on their state or district.

=93The Web has tremendous power to impact public policy deliberations.=94=20 Seiger added. =93These results further our understanding of how to create=20 innovative and effective online programs to help our clients impact=20 Congress and the Executive Branch.=94

The survey was conducted between April 22 and 26 using banner ads and email= =20 alerts on NationalJournal.com, the online home of National Journal, The=20 Hotline, CongressDaily, and Technology Daily. The ads drove visitors to a= =20 tenquestion survey. A total of 239 individuals participated in the survey.

The study also confirmed that online advertising can generate significant=20 response from this highly desirable audience. More than 460,000 ad=20 impressions were delivered during this 5 day period. The overall=20 click-through-rate was 1.16%, more than four times the industry average.=20 The conversion rate (percentage of the visitors who clicked on the ad who=20 completed the survey) was 30%, more than three times the industry=20 average. The results demonstrate that relevant, targeted, and=20 professionally created ads can generate significant response in a=20 measurable way.

Mindshare Internet Campaigns LLC ([www.mindshare.net](http://www.mindshare.net)) is a leading provider= =20 of Internet strategy and technology development for public affairs. Founded= =20 in 1997, mindshare helps trade associations, issue coalitions, Fortune 100= =20 corporations and nonprofit organizations harness the unique power of the=20 Internet to achieve their public affairs objectives.

To obtain a copy of the study, =93Online Advertising: Challenging the= Myths,=94=20 contact Victoria Lion Monroe, Vice President Client Services, Mindshare=20 Internet Campaigns, at 2026540829.

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

Status: U  
Return-Path: <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>  
Received: from wesley-exch1.wesleysem.edu ([63.124.223.7])  
by pickering.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17aXTU2qq3Nl3p20  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 23 May 2002 15:05:26 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: by wesley-exch1.wesleysem.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
id <1J87V01H>; Thu, 23 May 2002 14:55:42 -0400  
Message-ID: <DC1977460103D311B0DE0060943F439FADD175@wesley-exch1.wesleysem.edu>  
From: STARMAN WENDY <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Cc: "NEWPORT, ERICA" <enewport@wesleysem.edu>, CCTPP <cctpp@wesleysem.edu>  
Subject: RE: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Thu, 23 May 2002 14:55:41 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Dear Howard,

I took a look at the NR/DI portion of your new Web site, and so did Barbara. It looks great, and we're delighted to see that you've incorporated our material.

I only have one minor suggestion. I noticed while looking through the highlights from the joint statement, and the statements made by Dr. Siddiqi and Rabbi Saperstein that there were a few instances where you only used a portion of a paragraph but did not indicate that with an ellipsis at the beginning or end of the quote. So in those cases it appears that the entire paragraph is there, when part is actually missing. Adding that punctuation would clarify the highlights.

Thanks for all your hard work and congratulations on putting this together!

If you need the photo beyond June 14, please return it to Erica Newport. June 14 is my last day on the job.

Best,

Wendy Starman

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2002 8:12 AM  
To: wstarman@wesleysem.edu  
Subject: Zero-nukes web site

Dear Wendy,

We are now on line with the home page of our new web site, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). You can access it at that web address. To the sponsors listed we will add the National Council of Churches, which has now

signed on. Decisions by several other denominational offices are pending.

We have the beginnings of two other pages in draft form, as follows:

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

On the Religious Statements page we make reference to the Nuclear Reductions/Disarmament Initiative. I would like you to review it.

1. We use your logo as an identity marker. Is that okay?
2. We show a linkage to your web site for the statement and for your operation.
3. We will use the photo you provided, but our web designer hasn't yet installed it. However, the caption is already there.
4. Elsewhere on the Religious Statements page we make reference to statements at your news conference by Rabbi David Saperstein and Dr. Muzammil H. Siddiqi with linkage to your site.
5. On another page, Military Leaders Speak Out, not yet put on line, we make reference to the statement by Admiral Turner with linkage to your site.

We hope that this usage of your material and the linkage meets your approval.

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](mailto: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: <sentto-4736742-65-1022181199-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com>

Received: from n33.grp.scd.yahoo.com ([66.218.66.101])

by payne.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17aY1y5bh3Nl3p40  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 23 May 2002 15:13:19 -0400 (EDT)

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-4736742-65-1022181199-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com

Received: from [66.218.66.94] by n33.grp.scd.yahoo.com with NNFMP; 23 May 2002 19:13:19 -0000

X-Sender: david@fcnl.org

X-Apparently-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

Received: (EGP: mail-8\_0\_3\_2); 23 May 2002 19:13:18 -0000

Received: (qmail 47664 invoked from network); 23 May 2002 19:13:18 -0000

Received: from unknown (66.218.66.217)

by m1.grp.scd.yahoo.com with QMQP; 23 May 2002 19:13:18 -0000

Received: from unknown (HELO local.fcnl.org) (65.207.12.2)

by mta2.grp.scd.yahoo.com with SMTP; 23 May 2002 19:13:17 -0000

Received: by local.fcnl.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <K6MNS4DN>; Thu, 23 May 2002 15:06:22 -0400

Message-ID: <E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF6A858C8@local.fcnl.org>

To: 'Interfaith Nuclear Disarmament Advocates'

<interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com>

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>

X-Yahoo-Profile: davidculp

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, 23 May 2002 15:06:18 -0400

Subject: [interfaithnd] FCNL Legislative Action Message on New Nuclear Weapons and Missile  
Defense

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

FCNL LEGISLATIVE ACTION MESSAGE - May 23, 2002

The following action items from the Friends Committee on National  
Legislation (FCNL) focus on federal policy issues currently before Congress  
or the Administration.

**TOPICS: CONGRESSIONAL RECESS and OPPOSE FUNDING FOR NEW NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND  
MISSILE DEFENSE**

**CONGRESSIONAL RECESS.** Congress will be in recess May 24 through June 3.

Please contact the local office of your members of Congress and see if there  
will be opportunities to meet with them while they are in the district.

Organize a delegation to discuss common concerns about U.S. nuclear weapons  
policy, military spending, and the need for new U.S. budget and policy  
priorities for the peaceful prevention of deadly conflict as an alternative  
to the war on terrorism or an expanded war with Iraq. If their schedules  
are already full, plan now for the next recesses (roughly) June 28-July 8  
and July 29-September 3.

**OPPOSE FUNDING FOR NEW NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND MISSILE DEFENSE.** The Senate Armed Services Committee completed its FY2003 Defense Authorization Bill on May 10. Timely intervention by constituents encouraged the committee to alter its nuclear policy. This bill strips all funding for the development of a new "useable" nuclear weapon, the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP), and spends \$812 million less than the Bush administration requested for missile defense. The full U.S. Senate may consider the FY 2003 military authorization bill as soon as the week of June 4.

At that time, senators may offer two amendments that should be **OPPOSED**.

\* A new nuclear weapons amendment would restore the \$15.5 million which the Senate Armed Services Committee cut for research into a new earth-penetrating nuclear weapon designed to target deeply buried underground bunkers (also known as a "bunker buster").

\* A missile shield amendment would restore some or all of the \$812 million the committee cut from the missile shield budget.

**ACTION:** Please contact your senators at their Washington office by phone, email, or fax. Urge them to **OPPOSE** amendments to fund new nuclear weapons and so-called missile defense. Senate offices can be reached through the U.S. Capitol switchboard at (202) 224-3121, from 9 am-6pm EDT. During evenings and on weekends, most Senate offices leave their answering machine on for voice messages.

**USE FCNL'S WEB SITE TO MAKE LETTER-WRITING EASIER:** Start with the sample letter posted in our Legislative Action Center, personalize the language, then send your message as an email or fax directly from our site. You can also print it out and mail it. To view a sample letter to your senators, click on the link below, then enter your zip code and click <Go> in the <Take Action Now> box. Here is the link:  
<http://capwiz.com/fcnl/issues/alert/?alertid=154551&type=CO>

**BACKGROUND:** The Senate Armed Services Committee completed its drafting of the military authorization bill during the week of May 9. Under the leadership of committee Chairman Levin (MI) and Strategic Subcommittee Chairman Reed (RI), the committee made several positive changes to the Administration's request of \$393.4 billion for military spending.

FCNL has posted extensive background material on its web site about nuclear weapons and so-called missile defense. For a list of documents, go to [http://www.fcnl.org/issues/arm/cntrl\\_nuclear-weapons.htm](http://www.fcnl.org/issues/arm/cntrl_nuclear-weapons.htm).

For a more detailed fuller report on the Senate Armed Services Committee's actions, read the analysis by the Council for a Livable World at <http://www.clw.org/nmd/senmarkup03.html>.

To read the Senate Armed Services Committee press release, go to [http://www.senate.gov/%7Earmed\\_services/press/03mark.pdf](http://www.senate.gov/%7Earmed_services/press/03mark.pdf).

The committee cut the Administration's request for \$15.5 million to begin work on a new nuclear, earth-penetrating weapon (the so-called "bunker buster"). Sens. Bingaman (NM) and Reed took the lead eliminating this

money. The committee blocked the funds because of growing uncertainty about the Administration's policy for the use of nuclear weapons. Members of Congress are, with increasing frequency, questioning the idea of developing "useable" nuclear weapons.

The committee also cut the Administration's request for missile defense from \$7.6 billion to \$6.8 billion, a net reduction of \$812 million. Most of the savings have been shifted to Navy shipbuilding programs. Some funding also went to improve security at U.S. nuclear facilities and other uses. Sen. Levin explained that the cuts were made because some missile defense programs were not adequately justified, others were duplicates, and some money could not be spent in FY 2003.

## CONTACTING LEGISLATORS

Capitol Switchboard: 202-224-3121

Sen. \_\_\_\_\_  
U.S. Senate  
Washington, DC 20510

Rep. \_\_\_\_\_  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515

Information on your members is available on FCNL's web site:  
<http://capwiz.com/fcnl/dbq/officials/directory/directory.dbq?command=congr>

## CONTACTING THE ADMINISTRATION

White House Comment Desk: 202-456-1111  
FAX: 202-456-2461  
E-MAIL: [president@whitehouse.gov](mailto:president@whitehouse.gov)  
WEB PAGE: <http://www.whitehouse.gov>

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

-----  
This message supplements other FCNL materials and does not reflect FCNL's complete policy position on any issue. For further information, please contact FCNL.

Mail: 245 Second Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002-5795  
Email: [fcnl@fcnl.org](mailto:fcnl@fcnl.org)  
Phone: (202) 547-6000  
Toll Free: (800) 630-1330  
Fax: (202) 547-6019  
Web: <http://www.fcnl.org>

Your contributions sustain our Quaker witness in Washington. We welcome your gifts to FCNL, or, if you need a tax deduction, to the FCNL Education

Fund. You can use your credit card to donate money securely to FCNL through a special page on FCNL's web site <http://www.fcnl.org/suprt/indx.htm> FCNL also accepts credit card donations over the phone. For more information about donating, please contact the Development Team directly at [development@fcnl.org](mailto:development@fcnl.org). Thank you.

-----  
This message may be found regularly on FCNL's web site <http://www.fcnl.org> where a printer-friendly version is available and on PeaceNet in the fcnl.updates conference.

This message is distributed regularly via the fcnl-news mailing list. To subscribe to this list, please visit FCNL's web site at [http://www.fcnl.org/listserv/quaker\\_issues.php](http://www.fcnl.org/listserv/quaker_issues.php).

Alternatively, you can send an e-mail message to [majordomo@his.com](mailto:majordomo@his.com). Leave the subject line blank. The message should read "subscribe fcnl-news." Please Note: Make sure that you are sending this message from the e-mail address to which you would like fcnl-news materials to be sent.

If you currently receive this message via the fcnl-news mailing list and are no longer interested in receiving messages from this list, send an e-mail message to [majordomo@his.com](mailto:majordomo@his.com). The message should read "unsubscribe fcnl-news."

-----  
We seek a world free of war and the threat of war  
We seek a society with equity and justice for all  
We seek a community where every person's potential may be fulfilled  
We seek an earth restored...

----- Yahoo! Groups Sponsor ----->  
Buy Stock for \$4  
and no minimums.  
FREE Money 2002.  
<http://us.click.yahoo.com/orkH0C/n97DAA/Ey.GAA/nJ9qlB/TM>  
----->

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

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

Status: U  
Return-Path: <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>  
Received: from wesley-exch1.wesleysem.edu ([63.124.223.7])  
by tyner.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17aZFn2ye3Nl3rs0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 23 May 2002 16:58:33 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: by wesley-exch1.wesleysem.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
id <1J87V0LC>; Thu, 23 May 2002 16:48:44 -0400  
Message-ID: <DC1977460103D311B0DE0060943F439FADD178@wesley-exch1.wesleysem.edu>  
From: STARMAN WENDY <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: RE: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Thu, 23 May 2002 16:48:43 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Howard,

Would you like us to post a link to your site on our Web site?

Wendy

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2002 8:12 AM  
To: wstarman@wesleysem.edu  
Subject: Zero-nukes web site

Dear Wendy,

We are now on line with the home page of our new web site, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). You can access it at that web address. To the sponsors listed we will add the National Council of Churches, which has now signed on. Decisions by several other denominational offices are pending.

We have the beginnings of two other pages in draft form, as follows:

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

On the Religious Statements page we make reference to the Nuclear Reductions/Disarmament Initiative. I would like you to review it.

1. We use your logo as an identity marker. Is that okay?
2. We show a linkage to your web site for the statement and for your operation.
3. We will use the photo you provided, but our web designer hasn't yet installed it. However, the caption is already there.
4. Elsewhere on the Religious Statements page we make reference to statements at your news conference by Rabbi David Saperstein and Dr. Muzammil H. Siddiqi with linkage to your site.
5. On another page, Military Leaders Speak Out, not yet put on line, we make reference to the statement by Admiral Turner with linkage to your site.

We hope that this usage of your material and the linkage meets your approval.

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](mailto: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: Thu, 23 May 2002 17:36:15 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;  
    boundary="-----=\_NextPart\_000\_000A\_01C20280.56A1A9E0"  
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 new web site: [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). The purposes are (1) to provide a consolidated source for statements and reports on nuclear disarmament from the religious community, (2) to make reference to statements and reports on nuclear disarmament by military leaders, civil sector organizations, and international commissions, and (3) to contribute to dialogue on how to achieve zero nuclear weapons, that is, total global nuclear disarmament.

The home page is now on line at:

[www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org)

Also available for viewing are two other pages, which are works in progress:

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

On the Religious Statements page we want to include the policy positions of the Canadian Council of Churches and Project Ploughshares -- by quotations from policy statements and linkage to statements on your web site. I am attaching a draft along those lines, derived from your web site and a 1998 letter in my file. Please review it and suggest changes and additions that you think are desirable. For instance, you may have additional material on your web site that I don't know about.

In our draft Religious Statements page we have placed the logo of the Canadian Council of Churches as an identity marker. May we use it in that manner? Also, we would like to add photos, such as your president and yourself because of the recent letters you signed, or perhaps a photo of your Executive Committee or a meeting with the prime minister. We could use such photos in digital form or mailed to me at Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036, USA.

As part of this project we are reaching out to military leaders, scientists, and others so that we might build a broader alliance in our work to

eliminate nuclear weapons. We also want to have an international perspective, such as by tying in with your initiatives through the World Council of Churches. Thus, I would be interested in knowing what is going on in that regard.

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](mailto: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.

## Canadian Council of Churches

*The Canadian Council of Churches is a community of 19 churches (denominations) that functions as a forum for working together. Its Governing Board is drawn from the member churches. An Executive Committee consists of the Council's officers and chairs of commissions and standing committees.*

*The Canadian churches have long worked for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Their policy position is regularly expressed in letters to Canadian prime ministers. or instance, in 1982 they wrote to Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau to affirm that:*

nuclear weapons in any form and in any number cannot ultimately be accepted as legitimate components of national armed forces.

*In 1998 the leaders of the 19 member denominations wrote Prime Minister Jean Chrétien:*

The willingness, indeed the intent, to launch a nuclear attack in certain circumstances bespeaks spiritual and moral bankruptcy....

Nuclear weapons do not, cannot, deliver security -- they deliver only insecurity and peril through their promise to annihilate that which is most precious, life itself and the global ecosystem upon which all life depends. Nuclear weapons have no moral legitimacy, they lack military utility, and, in light of the recent judgment of the World Court, their legality is in serious question.

*In April 2002 the Canadian Council of Churches again expressed its views in **Letters to the Prime Minister on the Question of Nuclear Disarmament** [<http://www.ccc-cce.ca/english/jp/index.html>] in response to the Nuclear Posture Review released by the U.S. Department of Defense. On behalf of the Council's Executive Committee, the Most Rev. André Vallée, president of the Council, wrote to Prime Minister Chrétien:*

We have consistently expressed our conviction that governments and citizens should work as expeditiously as possible toward the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

Canada should adhere to and courageously promote its long-held goal of global nuclear disarmament....We need to say very clearly to our neighbours that Canada opposes any widening of the role of nuclear weapons, in any country or in any alliance.

*This view was elaborated by Ernie Regehr, director of Project Ploughshares, a national peace and disarmament agency of the Canadian Council of Churches. He asked Canada to:*

Call on the United States and NATO to explicitly reject all nuclear first-use options and to issue unequivocal public commitments to a policy of no-first-use.

Advocate measures to remove nuclear weapons from alert status, to support demating (separating warheads from delivery systems), and in the case of tactical weapons to keep them out of the control of operating units.

Indicate strong support for the concerns of non-aligned parties to the NPT and back their demand for unequivocal negative security assurances from all nuclear weapon states. [That is, pledge never to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries that are party to the NPT.]

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "STARMAN WENDY" <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>  
Subject: Re: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Thu, 23 May 2002 17:39:04 -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

Wendy,

We're not quite ready for that. I want to have several pages in addition to the home page available in more complete form. I'll let you or Erica know when we are ready.

Thanks for your interest.  
Howard

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

From: STARMAN WENDY <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>  
To: 'Howard W. Hallman' <mupj@igc.org>  
Date: Thursday, May 23, 2002 4:58 PM  
Subject: RE: Zero-nukes web site

>Howard,  
>  
>Would you like us to post a link to your site on our Web site?

>  
>Wendy

>  
>-----Original Message-----  
>From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
>Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2002 8:12 AM  
>To: wstarman@wesleysem.edu  
>Subject: Zero-nukes web site

>  
>  
>Dear Wendy,  
>  
>We are now on line with the home page of our new web site,  
>www.zero-nukes.org. You can access it at that web address. To the  
>sponsors listed we will add the National Council of Churches, which has now  
>signed on. Decisions by several other denominational offices are  
>pending.

>  
>We have the beginnings of two other pages in draft form, as follows:  
><http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>  
><http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

>  
>On the Religious Statements page we make reference to the Nuclear  
>Reductions/Disarmament Initiative. I would like you to review it.  
>1. We use your logo as an identity marker. Is that okay?  
>2. We show a linkage to your web site for the statement and for your  
>operation.  
>3. We will use the photo you provided, but our web designer hasn't yet  
>installed it. However, the caption is already there.  
>4. Elsewhere on the Religious Statements page we make reference to  
>statements at your news conference by Rabbi David Saperstein and Dr.  
>Muzammil H. Siddiqi with linkage to your site.  
>5. On another page, Military Leaders Speak Out, not yet put on line, we  
>make  
>reference to the statement by Admiral Turner with linkage to your site.  
>  
>We hope that this usage of your material and the linkage meets your  
>approval.  
>  
>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: <amillar@fourthfreedom.org>  
Subject: An urgent call  
Date: Thu, 23 May 2002 17:56:43 -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

Alistair,

I am interested to see the Urgent Call Ending Threats of Mass Destruction as a way of getting more attention to this issue. Unfortunately I can't make the June 5 meeting to learn more about it.

I do have one question to raise. Why is it necessary to wait until there are no more than 100 nuclear warheads each before separating warheads from delivery vehicles? I believe that as part of the first step, all weapons still deployed should be taken off quick-launch-alert and then have their warheads separated from the delivery vehicles.

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: <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>  
Received: from wesley-exch1.wesleysem.edu ([63.124.223.7])  
by kendall.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17belP24y3Nl3pM0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 24 May 2002 08:39:21 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: by wesley-exch1.wesleysem.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
id <1J87WA11>; Fri, 24 May 2002 08:29:35 -0400  
Message-ID: <DC1977460103D311B0DE0060943F439FADD17A@wesley-exch1.wesleysem.edu>  
From: STARMAN WENDY <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>  
To: "NEWPORT, ERICA" <enewport@wesleysem.edu>  
Cc: CCTPP <cctpp@wesleysem.edu>, "mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: FW: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Fri, 24 May 2002 08:29:28 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

re-transmitting

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

From: STARMAN WENDY  
Sent: Friday, May 24, 2002 8:28 AM  
To: NEWPORT, ERICA  
Cc: CCTPP; mupj@igc.org  
Subject: FW: Zero-nukes web site

Erica,

Please stay in touch with Howard Hallman over the summer. When Howard gives you the green light, you should add a link to his Web site ([www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org)) on [www.nrdi.org](http://www.nrdi.org).

Please add this to the special file you are organizing.

Thanks,

Wendy

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2002 5:39 PM  
To: STARMAN WENDY  
Subject: Re: Zero-nukes web site

Wendy,

We're not quite ready for that. I want to have several pages in addition to the home page available in more complete form. I'll let you or Erica know when we are ready.

Thanks for your interest.  
Howard

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

From: STARMAN WENDY <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>  
To: 'Howard W. Hallman' <mupj@igc.org>  
Date: Thursday, May 23, 2002 4:58 PM  
Subject: RE: Zero-nukes web site

>Howard,  
>  
>Would you like us to post a link to your site on our Web site?

>Wendy

>-----Original Message-----

>From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
>Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2002 8:12 AM  
>To: wstarman@wesleysem.edu  
>Subject: Zero-nukes web site

>Dear Wendy,

>We are now on line with the home page of our new web site,  
>[www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). You can access it at that web address. To the  
>sponsors listed we will add the National Council of Churches, which has now  
>signed on. Decisions by several other denominational offices are  
>pending.

>We have the beginnings of two other pages in draft form, as follows:

><http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>  
><http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

>On the Religious Statements page we make reference to the Nuclear  
>Reductions/Disarmament Initiative. I would like you to review it.  
>1. We use your logo as an identity marker. Is that okay?  
>2. We show a linkage to your web site for the statement and for your  
>operation.  
>3. We will use the photo you provided, but our web designer hasn't yet  
>installed it. However, the caption is already there.  
>4. Elsewhere on the Religious Statements page we make reference to  
>statements at your news conference by Rabbi David Saperstein and Dr.  
>Muzammil H. Siddiqi with linkage to your site.  
>5. On another page, Military Leaders Speak Out, not yet put on line, we  
>make  
>reference to the statement by Admiral Turner with linkage to your site.

>We hope that this usage of your material and the linkage meets your  
>approval.

>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: <blythe-goodman@erols.com>  
Received: from smtp-hub.mrf.mail.rcn.net ([207.172.4.107])  
by hazard.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17bg6r6oB3NkYBY0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 24 May 2002 10:31:35 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from smtp01.mrf.mail.rcn.net ([207.172.4.60])  
by smtp-hub.mrf.mail.rcn.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #10)  
id 17BG6R-0001bN-00  
for mupj@igc.org; Fri, 24 May 2002 10:31:35 -0400  
Received: from 66-44-106-222.s1238.apx2.lnhdc.md.dialup.rcn.com ([66.44.106.222] helo=default)  
by smtp01.mrf.mail.rcn.net with smtp (Exim 3.33 #10)  
id 17BG6Q-0000m1-00  
for mupj@igc.org; Fri, 24 May 2002 10:31:35 -0400  
Message-ID: <3CEE4EC2.7D07@erols.com>  
Date: Fri, 24 May 2002 10:31:30 -0400  
From: Carol Blythe and Rick Goodman <blythe-goodman@erols.com>  
Reply-To: blythe-goodman@erols.com  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-DH397 (Win95; I)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] A new interfaith web site  
References: <000601c201d4\$831cea40\$b452f7a5@default>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Howard -- I forward many of the messages to the Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America email list. Mostly, I have forwarded the ones from David Culp, or similar "action alerts". The Alliance of Baptist has a committee on peace and justice (I can't remember the exact name). They hope to add to the Alliance web site with a page with links etc. So your zero nukes would probably be a link they would add. I don't know how much they could add as sponsors, they are a tiny organization with small budget (only two staff). But those (and the BPFNA folks) are the Baptists who would be supportive. I will be talking by email to the chair of the committee and keep you informed.

Shalom --  
Carol Blythe

PS -- I feel good about passing on the action alerts. I know it is not much, but at least folks who care have an avenue to information.

Status: U

Return-Path: <jdi@clw.org>

Received: from mail.clw.org ([63.106.26.66])

by farley.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17bg8R2kA3Nl3pa0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 24 May 2002 10:34:05 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from clw.clw.org ([63.106.26.83]) by mail.clw.org

(Post.Office MTA v3.5.3 release 223 ID# 0-57746U100L2S100V35)

with ESMTP id org; Fri, 24 May 2002 09:46:02 -0400

Message-Id: <5.0.0.25.2.20020524103210.00a4c5b0@[63.106.26.66]>

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0

Date: Fri, 24 May 2002 10:33:29 -0400

To: jdi@clw.org

From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>

Subject: Bush-Putin treaty & new conference

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

1. Text of Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty
2. Bush-Putin press conference
3. "Arms Deal Reflects Shift In Priorities" - Phil. Inquirer

- =====
1. Text of Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty

The United States of America and the Russian Federation, hereinafter referred to as the Parties,

Embarking upon the path of new relations for a new century and committed to the goal of strengthening their relationship through cooperation and friendship,

Believing that new global challenges and threats require the building of a qualitatively new foundation for strategic relations between the Parties,

Desiring to establish a genuine partnership based on the principles of mutual security, cooperation, trust, openness, and predictability,

Committed to implementing significant reductions in strategic offensive arms,

Proceeding from the Joint Statements by the President of the United States of America and the President of the Russian Federation on Strategic Issues of July 22, 2001 in Genoa and on a New Relationship between the United States and Russia of November 13, 2001 in Washington,

Mindful of their obligations under the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms of July 31, 1991, hereinafter referred to as the START Treaty,

Mindful of their obligations under Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons of July 1, 1968, and

Convinced that this Treaty will help to establish more favorable conditions for actively promoting security and cooperation, and enhancing international stability,

Have agreed as follows:

#### Article I

Each Party shall reduce and limit strategic nuclear warheads, as stated by the President of the United States of America on November 13, 2001 and as stated by the President of the Russian Federation on November 13, 2001 and December 13, 2001 respectively, so that by December 31, 2012 the aggregate number of such warheads does not exceed 1700-2200 for each Party. Each Party shall determine for itself the composition and structure of its strategic offensive arms, based on the established aggregate limit for the number of such warheads.

#### Article II

The Parties agree that the START Treaty remains in force in accordance with its terms.

#### Article III

For purposes of implementing this Treaty, the Parties shall hold meetings at least twice a year of a Bilateral Implementation Commission.

#### Article IV

1. This Treaty shall be subject to ratification in accordance with the constitutional procedures of each Party. This Treaty shall enter into force on the date of the exchange of instruments of ratification.
2. This Treaty shall remain in force until December 31, 2012 and may be extended by agreement of the Parties or superseded earlier by a subsequent agreement.
3. Each Party, in exercising its national sovereignty, may withdraw from this Treaty upon three months written notice to the other Party.

#### Article V

This Treaty shall be registered pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

Done at Moscow on May 24, 2002, in two copies, each in the English and Russian languages, both texts being equally authentic.

FOR THE UNITED STATES OF                      FOR THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION:

=====  
2. President Bush, Russian President Putin Sign Nuclear Arms Treaty  
Remarks by President Bush and President Putin at Signing of Joint  
Declaration and Press Availability The Kremlin Moscow, Russia

12:55 P.M. (Local)

PRESIDENT BUSH: President Putin, thank you very much. Laura and I are so grateful for your hospitality and your friendship. It's an historic and hopeful day for Russia and America. It's an historic day for the world, as well.

President Putin and I today ended a long chapter of confrontation, and opened up an entirely new relationship between our countries. Mr. President, I appreciate your leadership. I appreciate your vision. I appreciate the fact that we've now laid the foundation for not only our governments, but future governments to work in a spirit of cooperation and a spirit of trust. That's good. It's good for the people of Russia; it's good for the people of the United States.

President Putin and I have signed a treaty that will substantially reduce our nuclear -- strategic nuclear warhead arsenals to the range of 1,700 to 2,200, the lowest level in decades. This treaty liquidates the Cold War legacy of nuclear hostility between our countries.

We've also signed a joint declaration of new strategic relationship that charts a course toward greater security, political and economic cooperation between Russia and the United States. Our nations will continue to cooperate closely in the war against global terror.

I understand full well that the people of Russia have suffered at the hands of terrorists. And so have we. And I want to thank President Putin for his understanding of the nature of the new war we face together, and his willingness to be determined and steadfast and patient as we pursue this war together.

President Putin and I agree also that the greatest danger in this war is the prospect of terrorists acquiring weapons of mass destruction. Our nations must spare no effort at preventing all forms of proliferation. And we discussed Iran in this context today. We'll work closely with each other on this very important issue.

Our nations also agree on the importance of a new NATO-Russia Council that will be launched in a few days in Rome. And, Mr. President, this council is also a tribute to your leadership and your vision. For decades, Russia and NATO were adversaries. Those days are gone, and that's good. And that's good for the Russian people, it's good for the people of my country, it's good for the people of Europe and it's good for the people of the world.

Russia and the United States are also determined to work closely on important regional challenges. Together, we will work to rebuild Afghanistan. Together, we will work to improve security in Georgia. We will work to help end fighting and achieve a political settlement in Chechnya.

Russia and the United States are committed to economic cooperation. We have launched a major new energy partnership. Private firms will take the lead in developing and transforming the vast energy reserves of Russia and the Caspian world to markets through multiple pipelines such as the Caspian

Pipeline Consortium and Baku-Jihan. And I want to thank you for the cooperation and the willingness to work together on energy and energy security.

Russia is building its market economy, opening new opportunities for both our countries. I'm impressed by the level of entrepreneurial growth here in Russia. It's a significant achievement. Again, it's a testimony to the leadership of Vladimir Putin.

In a while, we're going to meet with Russian and American business leaders to discuss how we can continue fostering good relations and fostering opportunity. We want Russia to be a part of the world economy. We look forward to one day welcoming Russia as a member of the World Trade Organization. President Putin and I also agree that we'll work to resolve disputed areas of trading, such as poultry or steel, in a spirit of mutual respect and trust.

America welcomes the dramatic improvement in freedoms in Russia since Soviet days, including the new freedoms of Russia's Jewish community. In recognition of these freedoms, I am determined to work with Congress to remove Russia from the Jackson-Vanik amendment. It is time our Congress responded to my request, President Putin's desire, that the Jackson-Vanik amendment be removed pertaining to Russia.

I also discussed with President Putin the important role of free press in building a working democracy. And today we will meet with media entrepreneurs from both countries. It's an issue we discussed before. The President said it makes sense to have a forum where media entrepreneurs can meet and visit. And it's going to take place today. Mr. President, I appreciate that.

I am pleased with our relationship. I am confident that by working together, we make the world more peaceful. I'm confident that by working together, we can win the first war of the 21st century, and that is the war cold-blooded killers -- against cold-blooded killers, who want to harm nations such as America and Russia. And I'm confident that when we work together in a spirit of cooperation on all fronts, both our peoples will benefit.

Mr. President, thank you for your hospitality.

**PRESIDENT PUTIN:** Distinguished American colleagues, and distinguished Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen. We've just accomplished the official part of our talks with U.S. President George Bush, for our distinguished colleagues of the visit in Moscow and St. Petersburg, but now we can name the major result of our talks -- first of all, the logical development and practical implementation as seen by our agreements reached in Crawford last year. I mean the signature of the treaty between Russia on strategic defensive reductions and, first of all, this document.

It's the statement of our countries to reduce our nuclear arsenals and the joint work for nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction. It's the decision of two states which are particularly responsible for international security and strategic stability. We're on the level of adopting the

declaration on new strategic relationship which determines the basic directions in the security and international policy.

It will have a positive impact for economic cooperation and development of our relations between the institutions of general public, and together with Mr. President, we discussed especially this aspect, the civil society between the people of our countries. The declaration formulates the principles of our dialogue, anti-missile dialogue. That is the transparency and openness and exclusion of potential threats. We confirmed the Genoa agreement on offensive and defensive systems in all their aspects.

A separate issue, the mechanism of NATO-Russia cooperation within the framework of 20, it presumes a new level of joint responsibility and confidence between all its participants.

I would like to stress especially that is the international novelty. And it happened because of the strengthening of Russian-American relations, including in joint confrontation to international terrorists struggling with international terrorism. Russians work together with American people in September the 8th and we're grateful for sincere feelings of compassion headed by President Bush on behalf of American people because of the recent events in Kaspysk. The memory of terrorism victims and the responsibility for the security of our people means joint struggle against this evil, as well as the struggle against Nazism. The spirit of our cooperation will mean fruitful results even today.

That's why the agenda has very concrete issues of interaction against terrorism on the basis of unique standards against any manifestation of terrorism and extremism. We need close contacts through all agencies and services, including special services. Here we have very positive experience we've accrued over the past years. And we see today -- we feel it today during the negotiations.

The bilateral working group on Afghanistan has demonstrated its efficiency. And we, Mr. President, would like to transform it on a group to combat terrorism, especially chemical, biological, nuclear terrorism.

Russia and the United States are oriented to build new relations in economic activity. Our businessman mentality is much alike, that their qualities and their joint work is based on free trade and supporting the initiatives. That's why our task is to open new opportunities for business community.

We need to avoid obstacles of the past. Here we mean not only the market status of the Russian economy -- and I'm grateful to Mr. President that he has given a very positive signal during our talks. And it does also mean such things as Jackson-Vanik amendment, we have to remove administrative obstacles, which encurls both countries to cooperate, especially in the high-tech sphere, which determined the economy of the 21st century -- that is the aeronautics, telecommunications, science and technologies, new sources of energy. I would like to focus on energy, especially nuclear energy. We paid much attention to it today. And the large format of our cooperation will be a great element for the global economy on the whole.

I would like to stress, in conclusion, that, of course, not all ideas, not all initiatives, are on paper and in the form of official documents. But a serious move forward in all these issues is quite evident for us. Today we together counteract global threats and challenges and we're going to form a stable world order that is within the interests of our peoples and our countries. And I think it's in the interest of all the civilized human society.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT BUSH: Name your agency.

Q I have a question for both Presidents, please. If we've truly entered a new era, why do you each need 1,700 nuclear weapons? And, President Putin, why does Russia need to continue producing nuclear warheads? And to, President Bush, why does the United States need to keep some 2,000 of these weapons in storage, ready for deployment?

PRESIDENT BUSH: First of all, remember where we've come from. We've come from 6,000 to 1,700 in a very quick -- or to 1,700 to 2,200 in a very quick period of time. You know, friends really don't need weapons pointed at each other. We both understand that. But it's a realistic assessment of where we've been. And who knows what will happen 10 years from now. Who knows what future presidents will say and how they react.

If you have a nuclear arsenal, you want to make sure they work. It's -- one reason that you keep weapons in storage apart from launchers is for quality control. And the thing I think it's important for you to know, Ron, is that we've made tremendous progress from the past. And the treaty is setting a period of time in the rear-view mirror of both countries. And I am not only confident that this is good for world peace, I'm confident this sets the stage for incredible cooperation that we've never had before between our countries.

PRESIDENT PUTIN: I concur with the assessment given by my colleague, Mr. Bush. And naturally, our position is well-known, we are guided by the facts that it's more worthwhile perhaps to eliminate a certain part of nuclear potentials. At the same time, I'd like to point out another thing here. Any man who has at least once in his career dealt with arms, had arms in his hands, at least to hunt or a rifle or whatever, he knows that it's much better, much safer to have it in stock disarmed, disassembled perhaps, rather than to have it in your arms and charged with bullets in it and with your finger on the trigger at the same time. This is a different state of affairs, as it were.

And the fact that we agreed with President Bush regarding such detente, in such manner, this is a serious move ahead to ensure international security, which is a very good sign as regards the relationship between our two countries.

Now, as to why Russia should continue to produce nuclear arms, I'd like to say that this is not our priority. But in addition to Russia and U.S. out there, there are other states who possess nuclear arms. What is more concerning, there are countries who want to acquire weapons of mass

destruction. Experts in the area of international security are aware of the fact, and they have been talking a lot about nuclear arms as deterrent.

Moreover, many of them assert -- and it is difficult to dispute this fact -- they say the existence of the nuclear arms was an impediment, an obstacle which contained the world from large-scale wars over the past decades, let's say. And I think we should take that into consideration while building a new quality of relationship within the two main nuclear states of the world.

We also should pay attention to the whole set of relations currently in the world out there and we should take into account the prospects of development of the world in the realm of security, bearing in mind those potential threats I've mentioned here.

Q Mr. Bush, when we can hope that Jackson-Vanik will be rescinded, which currently is very out of place? That's, you know, a remnant of the Cold War here. And will the U.S. -- can you use it as a leverage of applying pressure on Russia? And when Russia will finally be recognized as a marketplace country? And what's the prospect of Russia's accession to WTO?

And now to Mr. Putin, Russian President. What's your idea of how U.S. Boeings can help Russian civil aviation?

PRESIDENT BUSH: I couldn't make myself clearer during my opening statement about how I feel about Jackson-Vanik -- not much action by the Congress of the United States and I hope they act. The market-based economy is an issue that the President and I talked about. It is a regulatory matter, the responsibility of which resides at the Commerce Department. Secretary Evans and I have to talk about this subject, and we'll have an answer to the President soon.

And in terms of success of Russia ascending into the WTO, it's something that we want. It's in our nation's interest that Russia be a part of the WTO. And we look forward to working with the President and respective ministers, to see that that happens. It's in our interest that that happen. So it's hard for me to predict the timetables on all the issues you mentioned. Those over which I have got direct control will happen relatively quickly.

PRESIDENT PUTIN: Well, you know, while talking about the whole set of commercial and trade ties between our two countries, today we've mentioned more than once that we are facing somewhat an unusual situation in this area today, which has to do with the fact that while improving relations in disarmament matters, building confidence and so on and so forth, at the same time, we're expanding the whole set of relations in economic area. And, naturally, we'll face new problems we never had to deal with before.

The position taken by the U.S. administration and the President is known to us as regards Jackson-Vanik. It's precisely the administration who initiated its rescinding. And business communities of our two countries, American and Russian business communities, and their interaction together with the interaction of the parliamentary issues, will be able to remove similar problems in automatic manner, I guess.

Now, as regards your specific question on purchase of Boeings, I must say that the best lobbyist of the interests of U.S. companies will be American President standing here, since both Boeings and poultry and other matters very often have been told by my colleagues. People usually say, well, it's not on our level, but I must say -- and then there will be a lengthy monologue on specific matters.

Anyhow, you've posed a very acute and very specific question. Why it's acute, because it's on the agenda or practical interaction. And it's very specific since it has a bearing to very specific matters. And since it's acute and specific, I'll answer as one should in gentlemen's society, in a very general manner.

First and foremost, our carriers, in my opinion, should be primarily guided towards Russian aircraft producers. Why? Because Russian manufacturers, you know, don't have anywhere to sell their products, otherwise, because they are not let anywhere, or with a lot of difficulty. They only can sell it domestically. That's the first thing. And here we can talk about interaction on the market. Now, the second thing, primarily Aeroflot, should be competitive on the market, and should have advanced technology in their hands. Therefore, they both have American Boeings today. They also have European Airbus aircraft. And the question has been raised currently on additional purchase, on replacement of old equipment with those foreign aircraft.

Now, I should say, depending on the decision to be taken by economic structures, this is not a political question, mind you. The economic structure should decide on it. A lot will depend on it in regards of the state of our political interaction, of course. And our American colleague's proposal today is a little bit costlier than the European's proposal. Had Americans bought our cheap aluminum and steel, then their aircraft would have been cheaper and more competitive, including in our market.

So all of this jointly has been a subject of our discussions with the President here, and our good friend and partner, Secretary of Commerce and economy. And I think that in the course of normalization of trade and commerce relations, all these issues will be addressed in a most mutually advantageous manner.

Q -- state sponsor of terrorism. I wonder because of that if these Russians sales that you object to continue, does that -- this new strategic relationship you're discussing today bump up against what you outlined in your speech to Congress when you said, in the war against terrorism, you're either with the United States or against the United States?

And, President Putin, the Bush team says that your sales of nuclear technology and sophisticated military technology to Iran are the world's single biggest proliferation problem right now. Do you agree with that assessment, and did you make any specific promises today in your meeting with President Bush?

PRESIDENT BUSH: Well, first, we spent a lot of time on this subject. And as I said yesterday in Germany, I worry about Iran and I'm confident Vladimir

Putin worries about Iran, and that was confirmed today. He understands terrorist threats, just like we understand terrorist threats. And he understands that weapons of mass destruction are dangerous to Russia, just as they are to America. And he's explained that point himself, of course, now, he standing here.

But we spoke very frankly and honestly about the need to make sure that a non-transparent government run by radical clerics doesn't get their hands on weapons of mass destruction. It could be harmful to us and harmful to Russia. And the President can speak for himself. And he gave me some assurances that I think will be very comforting for you to listen to. And I'm confident we can work together on this issue. This is in both our countries' mutual interest that we solve this problem.

PRESIDENT PUTIN: I will confirm what Mr. Bush has just said, and I agree with your evaluation of threats in this regard. Generally speaking, I believe that the problem of nonproliferation is one of the key problems as regards ensuring international security.

Incidentally, this happened to be one of the main motivating and underpinning logical stimuluses to work in Russia-NATO framework together on non-proliferation on nuclear arms.

At the same time, I'd like to point out that cooperation between Iran and Russia is not all a character which would undermine the process on non-proliferation. Our cooperation is exclusively, as regards energy sector, focused on the problems of economic nature. I'd like to point out also that the U.S. has taken a commitment upon themselves to build similar nuclear power plant in North Korea, similar to Russia.

And in addition to Iran, I think, we also need to think about other countries here. For example, we have some questions concerning development of missile programs in Taiwan, in some other countries where we've been witnessing active work of producing mass destruction weapons and their carriers. All of that should be a subject of our in-depth discussion both bilaterally and in the frameworks of NATO-Russia agreement. That's one of the key issues of the modern times, I believe.

It would seem to me that in order to be efficient, in this sense, like in other areas, we need to address the main task, to upgrade confidence mutually. And today I mentioned to President Bush here, that as regards Iran and some other countries, according to our data, the missile programs of those countries, nuclear programs, are built largely on the basis of the technologies and with the support of the Western companies. We do have such info, and we stand ready to share it with our American partners. So if we pursued that way, not dealing with generalities, then we'll get results with respect to this very complicated and very important for our two countries track.

And the conclusive question.

Q To both Presidents, to what extent the treaty ensures real nuclear parity, and are there conditions that the treaty can be terminated by either side? And how true is the fact that Russia still remains as one of

the nuclear targets for nuclear forces? And how does that relate to the announced new strategic relations between our two countries?

PRESIDENT BUSH: -- is a treaty. This document is a treaty that will be confirmed by the United States Senate and the Duma, hopefully.

Secondly, treaties have always had outs; there's nothing new about that. There are conditions of which things may change and people get out of treaties. That's the way it's been. The Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty had an out; there's nothing new about that. And, thirdly, you know, we are going to work to end the -- forever end the Cold War. And that begins with the statement that Russia's our friend, not our enemy.

And you say targeting -- I mean, the idea of our weaponry, our military has no aims at Russia. There may be old vestiges in place, but Russia's not an enemy. You don't think about how to deal with Russia the way they used to. Russia is a friend. And that's the new thinking. That's part of what's being codified today.

PRESIDENT PUTIN: As regards the parity, the parity relationship of sorts, the weight of military potentials and nuclear potential, and so on, so forth, each state would have its own strategy of development of what you refer to as nuclear deterrent process. But I'd like to assure you that all the action undertaken by us in this area fully confirmed with the interests of the Russian Federation. The documents signed today are a result of joint effort of the Minister of Defense and Chiefs of staff and our Minister of Foreign Affairs, of course, jointly with our American colleagues. And we proceed from the assumption we have today, and we try to forecast the status of affairs in the world for a lengthy period of time -- I would like to point out, again, for a lengthy perspective.

Now, as regards the question of verification and control, perhaps, I'd like to point out that we're very much satisfied with the U.S. administration approach to this question. Our American partners have agreed that we need to retain START I, which is provided for by the system of verification. We agreed we will continue this work on the basis of the documents signed today, as well.

And what was the second part of the question, incidentally? The mike was off at this time. Regarding those targets, that was not to me. I will also make a remark here, regarding aiming targets. And Mr. Baluyevskiy, our military First Deputy Chief of Staff, is here with us. He and his American counterpart are full aware of those things, targeting aims and other things involved and what is the status today of those aimings and targeting. All in speculations in the press are nothing but expression of domestic political infight either here or in the U.S., just on the verge of the visit.

We are not being emotional here. We're not talking to the press, but as experts, we're full aware of that and we have no concern whatsoever in this regard.

Thank you. Thank you for your kind attention and for your participation.

=====

### 3. "Arms Deal Reflects Shift In Priorities"

Philadelphia Inquirer - May 24, 2002 - By Jonathan S. Landay, Inquirer  
Washington Bureau

After years of trying to set nuclear limits, the U.S. and Russia settled on a pact that won't do that. It will be signed today.

WASHINGTON - The treaty that President Bush and Russian President Vladimir V. Putin will sign today in Moscow is being billed as an arms-control breakthrough, but it actually imposes no constraints on the sizes of the U.S. and Russian nuclear forces.

The decade-long accord limits only the numbers of long-range nuclear warheads that are deployed, or ready for use, by both sides by 2012.

The agreement allows Russia and the United States to store as many warheads as they want. It does not require them to destroy bombers, missiles and submarines removed from nuclear service, and it permits them to re-arm those systems with stored warheads by withdrawing from the treaty with a three-month notice.

Both sides also would remain free to keep thousands of short-range nuclear arms, such as artillery shells, and to modernize their nuclear arsenals.

Finally, neither side will have to meet the ceiling of 1,700 to 2,200 deployed warheads, a two-thirds reduction, until the last day of the treaty, Dec. 31, 2012. That number of warheads is more than enough to annihilate both countries.

Thereafter, unless a new pact is signed, the world's largest nuclear powers could deploy as many warheads as they want.

The treaty represents a profound shift in four decades of U.S.-Russian arms-control efforts.

During the Cold War, Moscow and Washington spent years negotiating complex accords designed to lower the risks of a nuclear holocaust by setting precise limits on each other's nuclear forces. To reach those limits, they had to destroy missiles, submarines and bombers.

Benefits to both

The new deal, which has no such requirements, reflects the end of the East-West rivalry and warmer U.S.-Russian relations since the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks. Bush is seeking a "new strategic relationship" with Russia, while Putin needs political stability and Western trade and economic aid to lift his people's sagging living standards.

The new treaty brings important benefits to both sides.

It allows Putin to scrap thousands of aging nuclear weapons that his cash-strapped government can no longer afford and replace them with smaller numbers of a new intercontinental ballistic missile.

The Russian leader also gets a legally binding agreement that will assuage hard-liners in his military and parliament who do not trust the United States to keep its end of the bargain. Bush had originally wanted the agreement to rest on a handshake.

The Pentagon gets the minimum number of warheads it says it needs to deploy to deter a nuclear, biological or chemical attack on the United States or its allies by numerous potential enemies.

More important, the Bush administration gets the "flexibility" it says the United States must have to increase its deployed nuclear forces to meet an unexpected threat, including renewed hostility with Russia, or a Chinese military buildup, in coming years.

Bush insists that the new deal "will liquidate the legacy of the Cold War" by overcoming lingering U.S.-Russian mistrust and accelerating Russia's integration into Western political, economic and security arrangements.

Arms-control advocates contend that the treaty will perpetuate the U.S.-Russian nuclear rivalry and could encourage nuclear proliferation.

By permitting Russia and the United States to maintain large nuclear forces, they argue, the treaty does nothing to dissuade countries such as Iraq, Iran and North Korea from trying to obtain nuclear weapons.

'Huge overstatement'

"It's a huge overstatement for the President to say that we are liquidating the legacy of the Cold War. To truly liquidate the legacy of the Cold War is to dismantle these nuclear weapons, their launchers and their delivery systems," said Stephen I. Schwartz, publisher of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, an arms-control journal. "The weapons are not being liquidated. They are being put in storage, and some of them are being stored in a way that we can reactive them fairly quickly."

Critics also dismiss the new treaty as an arms-control breakthrough because it leaves Russia and the United States free to improve their nuclear arsenals.

The United States stopped full-scale production of new warheads in 1992.

But the Bush administration is taking significant steps toward resuming the development of new nuclear weapons as part of a multibillion-dollar drive to upgrade the country's aging nuclear weapons

production facilities and research laboratories.

Among other moves, the administration is proposing a \$15 million study into the feasibility of a warhead that could burrow deep into the earth and destroy underground bunkers. It also wants to shorten the time required to prepare for underground nuclear test explosions should the United States decide to resume testing that was suspended in 1992.

The recent leak of a top-secret 2001 Pentagon review of U.S. nuclear policy also revealed plans for a new U.S. intercontinental ballistic missile, missile-firing submarine and nuclear-capable bomber.

U.S. officials believe that Russia's nuclear modernization plans include fitting three warheads on its new intercontinental ballistic missile, known as the SS-27 or Topal M. The missile, of which about 30 have been deployed, currently carries one warhead.

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

Status: U  
Return-Path: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
Received: from goose.prod.itd.earthlink.net ([207.217.120.18])  
by osgood.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17bh0K7H43N13pt0  
Fri, 24 May 2002 11:29:45 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from user-2ivelqn.dialup.mindspring.com ([165.247.87.87] helo=esther)  
by goose.prod.itd.earthlink.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #2)  
id 17BGrE-0003uC-00; Fri, 24 May 2002 08:19:56 -0700  
Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
From: "Brink Campaign" <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>  
Subject: SMILING FACES DO NOT ALWAYS RESULT IN A SAFER WORLD  
Date: Fri, 24 May 2002 11:25:07 -0400  
Message-ID: <NEBBKJHCMLACLOPKCPPBMELJCIAA.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)  
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600  
Importance: Normal

Please forward this e-mail alert to your members and contacts.

Thanks.

\*\*\*\*\*

Today or tomorrow there will be a picture in your local newspaper showing a smiling President Bush and President Putin congratulating each other on reducing the nuclear arms threat. While we may agree that removing thousands of weapons from operational status is a good thing, we also realize that keeping them in storage for future use continues the nuclear threat.

We urge you to send a letter-to-the-editor of your local paper while the issue is in the news. We have made it easy.

Go to <http://backfromthebrink.org/new/letters.html> and download the letter, add your name and address and e-mail it to your local newspaper. Most papers prefer this method, and you can find out your local paper's e-mail address by visiting their website.

If you prefer, you can print out the letter, revise it, and send it my mail.

No matter which method you choose, the important thing is to send the letter as soon as possible. Letters that get printed are those that respond to current events and newsworthy events.

Click here <http://backfromthebrink.org/newsroom/scientiststatement.html> for

an important statement by three Nobel Laureates, which calls for accelerating the current reductions and replacing the existing prompt-launch posture, among other things.

Another important article, at <http://backfromthebrink.org/newsroom/wp052102.html> by Senator (Ret) Sam Nunn, William Perry and Eugene Harbiger also calls for both presidents to “devise operational changes in the alert status of their nuclear forces—also among many other important directives.

Take this opportunity to join these voices of reason—write your letter today.

Good luck. Let us know if you take this action.

Thanks.

Esther Pank

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](mailto:prgrm@backfromthebrink.net)

**CHECK OUT OUR NEW WEBSITE AT [www.backfromthebrink.org](http://www.backfromthebrink.org) AND TAKE ACTION TODAY!**

Status: U  
Return-Path: <lwright@churchworldservice.org>  
Received: from smtp6.mindspring.com ([207.69.200.110])  
by walker.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17biGf1NOc3NI3s70  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 24 May 2002 13:16:42 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from user-119b562.biz.mindspring.com ([66.149.148.194] helo=Lisa)  
by smtp6.mindspring.com with smtp (Exim 3.33 #1)  
id 17BIgB-0000oJ-00  
for mupj@igc.org; Fri, 24 May 2002 13:16:40 -0400  
Reply-To: <lwright@churchworldservice.org>  
From: "Lisa Wright" <lwright@churchworldservice.org>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: QRE: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Fri, 24 May 2002 13:15:07 -0500  
Message-ID: <NDBBIPMPILLJDFNEEBCOIEGLEIAA.lwright@churchworldservice.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 (9.0.2910.0)  
Importance: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4910.0300  
In-Reply-To: <000c01c200ef\$52f3fa60\$6e68f7a5@default>

Dear Howard:

Thanks for all this! I'd list the whole NCC, not just the Washington Office (unless you'd prefer that for consistency). Bob's happy to be listed on this, so you've got it either way.

As for policy statements - most of ours are over a decade old - pre-website and even computers! I'll try to go online tomorrow to see what I can find for you. We may have to scan something in and send it to you. Life is pretty crazy tomorrow (but not ALL work related - the elementary school my two oldest go to has a neat program in peace and conflict resolution - the children at the school have earned about 145 "peace days" (no fighting, harsh words, etc.) and the school's having a parade through our town tomorrow morning to celebrate!)

Anyhow, bug me if you don't see a policy statment soon!

Cheers,  
Lisa

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2002 12:37 PM  
To: lisaw@nccusa.org  
Subject: Zero-nukes web site

Dear Lisa,

We are making progress with our web site. The home page is now on line at:

[www.zero-nukes.org.html](http://www.zero-nukes.org.html)

Also available for viewing are two other pages, which are works in progress:

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogettozero.html>

We don't yet have the National Council of Churches listed as a sponsor, but we will. Should it be just National Council of Churches, or do you want to add Washington Office, as some of the denominations have done? Whichever, please tell me the URL to use for linkage.

We would like to add the National Council of Churches to the religious statements page. You can see the model: a brief introductory paragraph and then your major policy statements related to nuclear weapons. The latter can be done either through linkage with your web site (with a brief excerpt of highlights), or by posting directly on our site. For linkage, tell me the URL of the policy statements. For direct posting, send me copy via a Word attachment. As a place marker, we have used your logo but want your permission to leave it there.

Thanks for your help in this project.

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](mailto: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: <lwright@churchworldservice.org>  
Subject: Re: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Fri, 24 May 2002 13:34:25 -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

Lisa,

I'll list the NCC as a whole. In some cases it is easier to get the Washington Office than the whole denomination. But we have no absolute rule.

My web designer is out of town until June 3. I'm hoping to have more religious statements for her that week.

Thanks for your help. And congratulations for being a mother of peaceful children!

Howard

Status: U

Return-Path: <jdi@clw.org>

Received: from mail.clw.org ([63.106.26.66])

by farley.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17biMX7ex3Nl3pa0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 24 May 2002 13:23:39 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from clw.clw.org ([63.106.26.83]) by mail.clw.org

(Post.Office MTA v3.5.3 release 223 ID# 0-57746U100L2S100V35)

with ESMTP id org; Fri, 24 May 2002 12:36:42 -0400

Message-Id: <5.0.0.25.2.20020524132101.00aa11d0@[63.106.26.66]>

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0

Date: Fri, 24 May 2002 13:24:00 -0400

To: jdi@clw.org

From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>

Subject: What might have been -- if Clinton had signed today's agreement

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Clinton-Putin Sign Arms Agreement; Republicans Object

A fable

Today President Bill Clinton and Russian President Valdimir Putin signed an major new arms control agreement that will reduce deployed strategic nuclear weapons to 1,700 to 2,200, the lowest level in decades. The agreement will retire several thousand nuclear weapons in each country.

President Clinton declared: "This treaty liquidates the Cold War legacy of nuclear hostility between our countries."

The treaty represents the culmination of months of negotiations between the two countries. It also jump starts the arms control process that had been stalled for many years.

"It is an historic and hopeful day for Russia and America," said Clinton today at a joint press conference with President Putin.

President Putin called it a "declaration on a new strategic relationship between our two countries."

Congressional Republicans immediately began to criticize the agreement. Minority Leader Trent Lott, who rallied Republicans against the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, vowed to launch a similar effort with this new agreement.

Lott issued a statement saying: "The agreement is very short on specifics. There is no requirement that the Russians reduce any strategic offensive nuclear weapons until 2012, and then the treaty expires. There is no timetable for reductions. If the devil is in the details, President Clinton has ignored these details."

Senator Bob Smith (R-NH), a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and one of only four Senators to vote against START II nuclear reduction

agreement, complained that the treaty permits the Russians to maintain their MIRVed (multiple warhead) missiles. "At least previous agreement eliminated the threat of the largest Russian missiles with many warheads," said Smith. "This treaty moves backwards."

Rep. Curt Weldon, chair of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Readiness, blasted the treaty for leaving the Russians with a huge advantage in tactical nuclear weapons. "We know the Russians have 13,000 tactical nuclear weapons. These tactical nuclear weapons are a real threat to us. At the end of 2002, the Russians will have many more total nuclear weapons than the U.S., creating a military imbalance."

Indiana Republican Senator Dick Lugar pointed to a major flaw in the new treaty. Lugar, along with former Georgia Senator Sam Nunn and Pete Domenici (R-NM), have been leaders in the fight to safeguard Russian nuclear weapons and stockpiles. "This Clinton treaty will leave thousands of nuclear warheads removed from Russian missiles and sitting in a warehouse," said Lugar. "These weapons will be vulnerable to theft or sale to terrorist groups working to harm Americans," he continued. "The treaty would be a greatly improved if it forced Russia to dismantle its nuclear warheads," he concluded.

Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC), from his sickbed in North Carolina, pledged to lead the fight in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee against the agreement. "I have opposed every previous arms control agreement, and I won't let President Clinton get away with this one," said Helms.

Because the Senate will need to provide its advice and consent to the treaty by a two-thirds majority, these statements make it clear that the President has a real fight on his hands to get the agreement through the Senate.

Majority Leader Tom Daschle and Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Joseph Biden have promised hearings and a vote before the end of this congressional session.

###

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

Status: U

Return-Path: <JFNORTH@aol.com>

Received: from imo-d09.mx.aol.com ([205.188.157.41])

by nils.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17b1Y9Yo3Nl3pm0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 24 May 2002 16:47:25 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from JFNORTH@aol.com

by imo-d09.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v32.5.) id a.148.ef8b012 (17079);  
Fri, 24 May 2002 16:47:21 -0400 (EDT)

From: JFNORTH@aol.com

Message-ID: <148.ef8b012.2a2000d8@aol.com>

Date: Fri, 24 May 2002 16:47:20 EDT

Subject: Fwd: Timing September seminar

To: andrewsa@saic.com, beverly@erols.com, dosmith6@juno.com,  
gene.vincent@starpower.net, HolRonFost@aol.com, jcm@duncanallen.com,  
kiki@wizard.net, mupj@igc.org, WILLNORTH@aol.com

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="part1\_148.ef8b012.2a2000d8\_boundary"

X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Mac sub 39

--part1\_148.ef8b012.2a2000d8\_boundary

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Somehow the address list was shortened and confused when I first sent this.

Jeanne

--part1\_148.ef8b012.2a2000d8\_boundary

Content-Type: message/rfc822

Content-Disposition: inline

Return-path: <JFNORTH@aol.com>

From: JFNORTH@aol.com

Full-name: JFNORTH

Message-ID: <127.113d97cd.2a1eed96@aol.com>

Date: Thu, 23 May 2002 21:12:54 EDT

Subject: Timing September seminar

To: andrewsa@saic.com, beverly@erols.com,  
dosmith6@juno.com, gene.vincent@starpower.net

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Mac sub 39

One Outreach person approved the outline for the BUMC September series on Homelessness and Mental Illness, and another said that she agreed with the first. I am assuming that silence means consent for the rest? On the strength of that, I decided we would start on September 8 as Howard's message suggested and I assume Kerri seconded. I've advised Sharon London of this timing. My suggestion for the second session will not work because he will be away in September, but I have some others in mind whom I hope to ask before we leave next Wednesday. Will probably work on the last two toward

the last part of June.

Note to Ron: Your suggestions for the last session are great. Seems like a lot of ideas/people to compress into 45 minutes but we'll work on it later.

Thanks.

Jeanne

--part1\_148.ef8b012.2a2000d8\_boundary--

Status: U  
Return-Path: <paul@paxchristi.net>  
Received: from smtp1.xs4all.be ([195.144.64.135])  
by hazard.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id  
17bv652233NkYBY0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Sat, 25 May 2002 02:32:12 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from smtp.xs4all.be (stat85-66.adsl.xs4all.be [195.144.85.66])  
by smtp1.xs4all.be (8.12.1/8.12.1) with ESMTP id g4P6UoYF009808  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Sat, 25 May 2002 08:30:52 +0200  
Received: from 99paul [192.168.0.111]  
by paxchristi.net [127.0.0.1]  
with SMTP (MDaemon.Standard.v5.0.4.R)  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Sat, 25 May 2002 08:37:58 +0200  
From: "Paul Lansu" <paul@paxchristi.net>  
To: <paul@paxchristi.net>  
Subject: Pax Christi USA Statement, Press Release and Action Suggestions  
Date: Sat, 25 May 2002 08:55:41 +0200  
Message-ID: <001e01c203b9\$2f65f7c0\$6f00a8c0@99paul>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;  
boundary="-----=\_NextPart\_000\_001F\_01C203C9.F2EEC7C0"  
X-Priority: 1 (Highest)  
X-MSMail-Priority: High  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300  
Importance: High  
X-MDRemoteIP: 192.168.0.111  
X-Return-Path: paul@paxchristi.net  
X-MDaemon-Deliver-To: mupj@igc.org

Dear Pax Christi USA Members and Friends,

Greetings of peace from Pax Christi USA. The nuclear arms treaty that was signed today by President Bush and Russian President Putin represents a lost opportunity for the two countries to build global security.

Below in plain text and attached in rich text you will find the following documents:

1. Pax Christi USA's Statement on US/Russian Nuclear Reduction Treaty
2. PCUSA Press Release
3. Action Suggestions

Thank you, in advance, for your support!

Blessings of peace,

Phyllis

Phyllis Turner Jepson, Director  
Pax Christi USA  
Local/Regional Group Development Office  
Email: [paxwpb@gate.net](mailto:paxwpb@gate.net)  
Web: [www.paxchristiusa.org](http://www.paxchristiusa.org)

---

---

Statement on US/Russian Nuclear Reduction Treaty  
Issued May 24, 2002

Pax Christi USA has worked for a world free of the threat of nuclear war throughout our thirty years as the Catholic peace movement in the United States. We have consistently called for and supported those measures that move us closer to the fulfillment of our obligation to eliminate our nuclear arsenal under the terms of Article VI of the Nonproliferation Treaty and in accord with the International Court of Justice's 1996 advisory opinion.

Today's signing of the Nuclear Reduction Treaty with Russia does little to move us toward a nuclear weapon-free world, and may ultimately prove to short circuit real efforts at nuclear elimination while increasing the threat posed by the acquisition of nuclear weapons by terrorist groups.

The hastily negotiated agreement proposes to reduce US and Russian arsenals by two-thirds over the next decade. However, the Treaty provides no timetable for the cuts during the life of the Treaty. The reductions do not have to take place before 2012, the same year in which the Treaty expires. The Treaty provides no verification protocol to provide transparency and ensure its implementation. Most disturbing about this "new approach" to arms reduction is the Bush Administration's insistence, over Russian objections, that the cuts in deployed strategic weapons not be irreversible. What this means is that the Treaty permits both sides to retain warheads withdrawn from operational deployment in a "responsive force" that may be redeployed in the future. Furthermore, the Treaty allows for hundreds of nuclear weapons to be retained as part of the "inactive stockpile" from which replacements are typically drawn. Only a small number of the approximately 4,000 nuclear warheads that will be removed from their delivery vehicles may actually be dismantled.

The retention of nuclear warheads in reserve poses a serious threat to the ongoing effort to secure existing nuclear warheads against theft or diversion to terrorist groups. By maintaining a huge reserve force of warheads, the US forces the Russians to similarly maintain such reserves – reserves which have been shown to be poorly secured and potentially

available to terrorist groups and nations seeking to acquire existing weapons. Given the current concerns over terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, the insistence on maintaining operational warheads in reserve is short-sighted and may ultimately prove disastrous.

As the Vatican stated at the United Nations in April, "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 stocks can be remounted again quickly?"

Moreover, the Treaty's expressed intention to reduce the nuclear threat is contradicted by every other measure of commitment to nuclear disarmament. The recently completed Nuclear Posture Review expands the role of nuclear weapons, abandons the US's commitment to not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapons states, and calls for the US to use nuclear weapons first in a conventional conflict. In addition, the Departments of Defense and Energy are committed to developing new, low-yield nuclear weapons, so-called "mini-nukes" intended to be more "usable" against non-nuclear weapons states' buried targets. For this reason, the Bush Administration has indicated that it must prepare to resume full-scale underground nuclear testing, perhaps within one year. The US has already committed some \$60 billion for upgrading the capabilities for design, testing and development of new nuclear weapons. These plans continue unaffected by the Administration's claims to seek nuclear reductions.

The Treaty signed today is based on the premise that nuclear weapons are in fact an indispensable cornerstone of national security. Far from "liquidating the legacy of the Cold War" the Bush Administration is reaffirming the legitimacy and utility of these horrendous weapons while appearing to be seeking strategic reductions. A leaner, more useable nuclear force as envisioned by the Administration is not in the interest of peace and security.

As the Vatican restated at the April Preparatory Committee Meeting for the 2005 Review Conference of the Nonproliferation Treaty, "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century; they cannot be justified....[I]n clinging to their outmoded rationales for nuclear deterrence, they [the nuclear weapons states] are denying the most ardent aspirations of humanity as well as the opinion of the highest legal authority in the world."

The US and Russian Republic must follow up today's Treaty signing with real measures to rid the world of the nuclear danger. Warheads must be removed and destroyed. Deployed weapons must be taken off alert. Funding for the development of new nuclear weapons must be eliminated. The Comprehensive Test Ban must be ratified. Existing stockpiles of Russian weapons must be

secured, and both nations must end their stonewalling at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva and move immediately to negotiations leading to a Convention that would outlaw the design, development, testing and deployment of nuclear weapons. Such independently verifiable and irreversible reductions along with national strategies that eliminate the role of nuclear weapons are the only way to assure a future free of the nuclear threat in all its aspects.

-----

-----

PRESS RELEASE  
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

May 24, 2002

Contact: Dave Robinson, 814-450-2297

The Sham that is the US/Russian Nuclear Reduction Treaty

US Catholic Peace Group Claims Treaty Increases Chances of Terrorists Getting Nukes

Today President George W. Bush joins Russian President Vladimir Putin in Moscow to sign what the Bush Administration is calling an historic moment in nuclear arms reductions. The Nuclear Reduction Treaty between these two former Cold War enemies proposes that the US and Russia reduce their strategic nuclear arsenals by two-thirds. But some observers believe the Bush Administration is playing fast and loose with the word "reduction." While the Russians pushed for a treaty that would include the destruction of these weapons, the US proposed instead the "storing" of the targeted weapons in case of national emergencies.

In the wake of the terrorist attacks of September 11th and concerns of the Bush Administration that terrorist groups may be seeking to attain nuclear weapons, some weapons experts are stressing that the new treaty may contribute to just such a scenario. "Despite Russian overtures suggesting deeper and more permanent cuts with the actual destruction of nuclear warheads, the Bush Administration insisted that the Treaty would not propose actually destroying nuclear weapons, but instead allow for their storage," said Dave Robinson, national coordinator of Pax Christi USA, the national Catholic peace movement. "This allows the Bush Administration to bring those weapons out of storage at virtually a moment's notice if they so choose. It also increases the likelihood that terrorist groups could get there hands on nuclear weapons."

In a statement released to coincide with the signing of the treaty, Pax Christi USA states, "By maintaining a huge reserve force of warheads, the US

forces the Russians to similarly maintain such reserves – reserves which have been shown to be poorly secured and potentially available to terrorist groups and nations seeking to acquire existing weapons. Given the current concerns over terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, the insistence on maintaining operational warheads in reserve is short-sighted and may ultimately prove disastrous.”

The statement from Pax Christi USA, which has been working on issues of nuclear disarmament for over thirty years, also calls into question the sincerity of the Bush Administration’s commitment to reductions in weapons of mass destruction: “[T]he Treaty’s expressed intention to reduce the nuclear threat is contradicted by every other measure of commitment to nuclear disarmament. The recently completed Nuclear Posture Review [from the Bush Administration] expands the role of nuclear weapons, abandons the US’s commitment to not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapons states, and calls for the US to use nuclear weapons first in a conventional conflict.”

While President Bush finalizes the treaty with President Putin, other departments in the Bush Administration continue to work on the development of low-yield nuclear weapons – coined “mini-nukes.” “Even as Bush trumpets this treaty, our government is searching for a ‘useable’ nuclear weapon, one which they’ve suggested could be employed against non-nuclear weapons states,” Robinson said.

A complete copy of the Pax Christi USA statement on the US/Russian Nuclear Reduction Treaty is available by contacting the Pax Christi USA national office at 814-453-4955, ext 221.

Pax Christi USA is the national Catholic peace movement. Its 14,000 members include over 140 US bishops, 550 religious communities, 450 parish sponsors, and over 230 local groups. Pax Christi USA is a section of Pax Christi International.

---

---

**ACTION SUGGESTIONS:**

1) Contact Local Congressional Offices - Congress will be in recess starting today through June 3rd. Please contact the LOCAL office of your congressional representative and request a meeting while s/he is in their home district. Organize a delegation to discuss common concerns about US nuclear weapons policy, military spending, and the need for new US budget and policy priorities for the peaceful prevention of deadly conflict as an alternative to the war on terrorism or an expanded war with Iraq. (If their schedules are already full, plan now for the next recesses. Approximate

dates of upcoming recesses are: June 28-July 8 and July 29-September 3.

2) Oppose Funding for New Nuclear Weapons and Missile Defense – The Senate Arms Services Committee completed its FY 2003 Defense Authorization Bill on May 10. This bill strips all funding for the development of a new “usable” nuclear weapon, the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator and spends \$812 million LESS than the Bush Administration requested for missile defense.

Contact your Senators and urge them to OPPOSE the following amendments that will likely be offered to the FY 2003 Defense Authorization bill during the week of June 3.

1. Restore the \$812 million the Armed Services Committee cut from missile defense and reduce program oversight. (OPPOSE)
2. Restore the \$15.5 million the Committee cut for research into a new earth-penetrating nuclear weapon or “bunker buster” (OPPOSE)

Email your congressional representative directly:

1. Go to NETWORK’s home page at [www.networklobby.org](http://www.networklobby.org)
2. Click on “Legislative Action Center”
3. Enter your zip code under “Elected Officials” and click “Go”
4. Click on “Oppose Defense Authorization amendments on Nukes and NMD and follow the directions.

Phone Messages:

Senate offices can be reached through the US Capitol switchboard at 202-224-3121 from 9:00 am – 6:00 pm EDT.

3) Contact Local Secular and Religious Media – submit Pax Christi USA’s Statement on US/Russian Nuclear Reduction Treaty to your local newspapers as an op-ed piece or send a personalized version of the sample letter-to-the-editor found below:

Dear Editors,

The nuclear arms reduction treaty, recently signed by President Bush and Russian President Putin does little, if anything, to increase global security. While reductions in both countries' arsenals are a good idea, the treaty's flaws are alarming.

The treaty doesn't require any weapons to be destroyed; they can merely be set-aside in storage where they will be vulnerable to theft or rogue use.

There is neither timeline nor provisions for enforcement - each country can take up to ten years and eliminate only a few weapons, or even none at all.

The treaty allows Russia to deploy new, multiple warhead missiles, the most

dangerous weapons in its arsenal. It also ignores smaller, short-range tactical nuclear weapons. Either country can withdraw from the treaty, for any reason, on three months' notice.

According to the guidelines of this treaty, ten years from now both the US and Russia could have the same number of nuclear weapons as they do now. At a time in which limiting the threat of nuclear weapons is an immediate necessity, this treaty falls flat.

Sincerely,  
(Your name and address)

## Statement on US/Russian Nuclear Reduction Treaty

Issued May 24, 2002

Pax Christi USA has worked for a world free of the threat of nuclear war throughout our thirty years as the Catholic peace movement in the United States. We have consistently called for and supported those measures that move us closer to the fulfillment of our obligation to eliminate our nuclear arsenal under the terms of Article VI of the Nonproliferation Treaty and in accord with the International Court of Justice's 1996 advisory opinion.

Today's signing of the Nuclear Reduction Treaty with Russia does little to move us toward a nuclear weapon-free world, and may ultimately prove to short circuit real efforts at nuclear elimination while increasing the threat posed by the acquisition of nuclear weapons by terrorist groups.

The hastily negotiated agreement proposes to reduce US and Russian arsenals by two-thirds over the next decade. However, the Treaty provides no timetable for the cuts during the life of the Treaty. The reductions do not have to take place before 2012, the same year in which the Treaty expires. The Treaty provides no verification protocol to provide transparency and ensure its implementation. Most disturbing about this "new approach" to arms reduction is the Bush Administration's insistence, over Russian objections, that the cuts in deployed strategic weapons not be irreversible. What this means is that the Treaty permits both sides to retain warheads withdrawn from operational deployment in a "responsive force" that may be redeployed in the future. Furthermore, the Treaty allows for hundreds of nuclear weapons to be retained as part of the "inactive stockpile" from which replacements are typically drawn. Only a small number of the approximately 4,000 nuclear warheads that will be removed from their delivery vehicles may actually be dismantled.

The retention of nuclear warheads in reserve poses a serious threat to the ongoing effort to secure existing nuclear warheads against theft or diversion to terrorist groups. By maintaining a huge reserve force of warheads, the US forces the Russians to similarly maintain such reserves – reserves which have been shown to be poorly secured and potentially available to terrorist groups and nations seeking to acquire existing weapons. Given the current concerns over terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, the insistence on maintaining operational warheads in reserve is short-sighted and may ultimately prove disastrous.

As the Vatican stated at the United Nations in April, "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 stocks can be remounted again quickly?"

Moreover, the Treaty's expressed intention to reduce the nuclear threat is contradicted by every other measure of commitment to nuclear disarmament. The recently completed Nuclear Posture Review expands the role of nuclear weapons, abandons the US's commitment to not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapons states, and calls for the US to use nuclear weapons first in a conventional conflict. In addition, the Departments of Defense and Energy are committed to developing new, low-yield nuclear weapons, so-called "mini-nukes" intended to be more "usable" against non-nuclear weapons states' buried targets. For this reason, the Bush Administration has indicated that it must prepare to resume full-scale underground nuclear testing, perhaps within one year. The US has already committed some \$60 billion for upgrading the capabilities for design, testing and development of new nuclear weapons. These plans continue unaffected by the Administration's claims to seek nuclear reductions.

The Treaty signed today is based on the premise that nuclear weapons are in fact an indispensable cornerstone of national security. Far from "liquidating the legacy of the Cold War" the Bush Administration is reaffirming the legitimacy and utility of these horrendous weapons while appearing to be seeking strategic reductions. A leaner, more useable nuclear force as envisioned by the Administration is not in the interest of peace and security.

As the Vatican restated at the April Preparatory Committee Meeting for the 2005 Review Conference of the Nonproliferation Treaty, "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21<sup>st</sup> century; they cannot be justified....[I]n clinging to their outmoded rationales for nuclear deterrence, they [the nuclear weapons states] are denying the most ardent aspirations of humanity as well as the opinion of the highest legal authority in the world."

The US and Russian Republic must follow up today's Treaty signing with real measures to rid the world of the nuclear danger. Warheads must be removed and destroyed. Deployed weapons must be taken off alert. Funding for the development of new nuclear weapons must be eliminated. The Comprehensive Test Ban must be ratified. Existing stockpiles of Russian weapons must be secured, and both nations must end their stonewalling at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva and move immediately to negotiations leading to a Convention that would outlaw the design, development, testing and deployment of nuclear weapons. Such independently verifiable and irreversible reductions along with national strategies that eliminate the role of nuclear weapons are the only way to assure a future free of the nuclear threat in all its aspects.

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

**May 24, 2002**

**Contact: Dave Robinson, 814-450-2297**

**The Sham that is the US/Russian Nuclear Reduction Treaty** *US Catholic  
Peace Group Claims Treaty Increases Chances of Terrorists Getting Nukes*

Today President George W. Bush joins Russian President Vladimir Putin in Moscow to sign what the Bush Administration is calling an historic moment in nuclear arms reductions. The Nuclear Reduction Treaty between these two former Cold War enemies proposes that the US and Russia reduce their strategic nuclear arsenals by two-thirds. But some observers believe the Bush Administration is playing fast and loose with the word “reduction.” While the Russians pushed for a treaty that would include the destruction of these weapons, the US proposed instead the “storing” of the targeted weapons in case of national emergencies.

In the wake of the terrorist attacks of September 11<sup>th</sup> and concerns of the Bush Administration that terrorist groups may be seeking to attain nuclear weapons, some weapons experts are stressing that the new treaty may contribute to just such a scenario. “Despite Russian overtures suggesting deeper and more permanent cuts with the actual destruction of nuclear warheads, the Bush Administration insisted that the Treaty would not propose actually destroying nuclear weapons, but instead allow for their storage,” said Dave Robinson, national coordinator of Pax Christi USA, the national Catholic peace movement. “This allows the Bush Administration to bring those weapons out of storage at virtually a moment’s notice if they so choose. It also increases the likelihood that terrorist groups could get their hands on nuclear weapons.”

In a statement released to coincide with the signing of the treaty, Pax Christi USA states, “By maintaining a huge reserve force of warheads, the US forces the Russians to similarly maintain such reserves – reserves which have been shown to be poorly secured and potentially available to terrorist groups and nations seeking to acquire existing weapons. Given the current concerns over terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, the insistence on maintaining operational warheads in reserve is short-sighted and may ultimately prove disastrous.”

The statement from Pax Christi USA, which has been working on issues of nuclear disarmament for over thirty years, also calls into question the sincerity of the Bush Administration's commitment to reductions in weapons of mass destruction: "[T]he Treaty's expressed intention to reduce the nuclear threat is contradicted by every other measure of commitment to nuclear disarmament. The recently completed Nuclear Posture Review [from the Bush Administration] expands the role of nuclear weapons, abandons the US's commitment to not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapons states, and calls for the US to use nuclear weapons first in a conventional conflict."

While President Bush finalizes the treaty with President Putin, other departments in the Bush Administration continue to work on the development of low-yield nuclear weapons – coined "mini-nukes." "Even as Bush trumpets this treaty, our government is searching for a 'useable' nuclear weapon, one which they've suggested could be employed against non-nuclear weapons states," Robinson said.

*A complete copy of the Pax Christi USA statement on the US/Russian Nuclear Reduction Treaty is available by contacting the Pax Christi USA national office at 814-453-4955, ext 221.*

---

*Pax Christi USA is the national Catholic peace movement. Its 14,000 members include over 140 US bishops, 550 religious communities, 450 parish sponsors, and over 230 local groups. Pax Christi USA is a section of Pax Christi International.*

## Action Suggestions:

**1. Contact Local Congressional Offices** - Congress will be in recess starting today through June 3<sup>rd</sup>. Please contact the LOCAL office of your congressional representative and request a meeting while s/he is in their home district. Organize a delegation to discuss common concerns about US nuclear weapons policy, military spending, and the need for new US budget and policy priorities for the peaceful prevention of deadly conflict as an alternative to the war on terrorism or an expanded war with Iraq. (If their schedules are already full, plan now for the next recesses. Approximate dates of upcoming recesses are: June 28-July 8 and July 29-September 3.

**2. Oppose Funding for New Nuclear Weapons and Missile Defense** – The Senate Arms Services Committee completed its FY 2003 Defense Authorization Bill on May 10. This bill strips all funding for the development of a new “usable” nuclear weapon, the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator and spends \$812 million LESS than the Bush Administration requested for missile defense.

Contact your Senators and urge them to OPPOSE the following amendments that will likely be offered to the FY 2003 Defense Authorization bill during the week of June 3.

1. Restore the \$812 million the Armed Services Committee cut from missile defense and reduce program oversight. (OPPOSE)
2. Restore the \$15.5 million the Committee cut for research into a new earth-penetrating nuclear weapon or “bunker buster” (OPPOSE)

### **Email your congressional representative directly:**

1. Go to NETWORK’s home page at [www.networklobby.org](http://www.networklobby.org)
2. Click on “Legislative Action Center”
3. Enter your zip code under “Elected Officials” and click “Go”
4. Click on “Oppose Defense Authorization amendments on Nukes and NMD and follow the directions.

### **Phone Messages:**

Senate offices can be reached through the US Capitol switchboard at 202-224-3121 from 9:00 am – 6:00 pm EDT.

**3. Contact Local Secular and Religious Media** – submit Pax Christi USA’s Statement on US/Russian Nuclear Reduction Treaty to your local newspapers as an op-ed piece or send a personalized version of the sample letter-to-the-editor found below:

Dear Editors,

The nuclear arms reduction treaty, recently signed by President Bush and Russian President Putin does little, if anything, to increase global security. While reductions in both countries' arsenals are a good idea, the treaty's flaws are alarming.

The treaty doesn't require any weapons to be destroyed; they can merely be set-aside in storage where they will be vulnerable to theft or rogue use. There is neither timeline nor provisions for enforcement - each country can take up to ten years and eliminate only a few weapons, or even none at all. The treaty allows Russia to deploy new, multiple warhead missiles, the most dangerous weapons in its arsenal. It also ignores smaller, short-range tactical nuclear weapons. Either country can withdraw from the treaty, for any reason, on three months' notice.

According to the guidelines of this treaty, ten years from now both the US and Russia could have the same number of nuclear weapons as they do now. At a time in which limiting the threat of nuclear weapons is an immediate necessity, this treaty falls flat.

Sincerely,  
(Your name and address)

Status: U

Return-Path: <jmatlack@erols.com>

Received: from smtp-hub2.mrf.mail.rcn.net ([207.172.4.76])

by runyon.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17crlR2sf3Nl3sj0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 27 May 2002 16:44:23 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from smtp03.mrf.mail.rcn.net ([207.172.4.62])

by smtp-hub2.mrf.mail.rcn.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #10)  
id 17CRLp-0000p1-00; Mon, 27 May 2002 16:44:21 -0400

Received: from 66-44-102-29.s29.apx2.lnhdc.md.dialup.rcn.com ([66.44.102.29] helo=brmptrue)

by smtp03.mrf.mail.rcn.net with smtp (Exim 3.33 #10)

id 17CRLc-0004bs-00; Mon, 27 May 2002 16:44:09 -0400

Message-ID: <000e01c205c0\$35236c0\$1d662c42@brmptrue>

From: "J. Matlack" <jmatlack@erols.com>

To: <ACStever@aol.com>,

"Arnie Alpert" <AAlpert@afsc.org>,

"Beth Keiser" <ekeiser@guilford.edu>,

"Brewster Grace" <bgrace@quno.ch>

Cc: "Dan & Allison Matlack" <dan\_matlack@nobles.edu>,

"David Ransom" <david.ransom@davidransom.com>,

"ED & PATTI BROWNING" <formerpb@aol.com>,

"Ed Snyder" <edbonsny@acadia.net>,

"george fisk" <gfisk@starlinx.com>,

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

"Jan Dizard" <jedizard@amherst.edu>,

"Jean Sammon" <jsammon@networklobby.org>,

"Joe or Trudy Rogers" <jtrogers@erols.com>,

"JOHN McCULLOUGH" <jmccullough@nccusa.org>,

"Larry Spears" <spears@agree.org>,

"Linda Lotz" <LLotz@afsc.org>,

<lisaw@churchworldservice.org>,

"Tom Leamon" <tomdrachen@aol.com>,

"Marina Riadi" <MRiadi@afsc.org>,

"Mary C Eby" <maryeby@juno.com>,

"Paul & Viki Diamond" <pauld625@aol.com>,

"Penelope Thompson" <pbt9@aol.com>,

"Rick McCutcheon" <rickm@hwcen.org>,

"Ron Young" <USICMPE@aol.com>,

"Saralee Hamilton" <SHamilton@afsc.org>,

"Spring Miller" <spring@mexicousadvocates.org>,

"Tony and Moira Fitt" <Tonyfitt@aol.com>

Subject: ESSAY ON OCCUPATION--JIM MATLACK/AFSC

Date: Mon, 27 May 2002 16:54:54 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_000B\_01C2059F.39ED7F00"

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2919.6600

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----\_NextPart\_000\_000B\_01C2059F.39ED7F00

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

I recently completed this essay and have not yet found  
a published home for it. Any suggestions?

Best Wishes. JIM MATLACK -- AFSC WASHINGTON =20

ECHOES OF OCCUPATION

JAMES MATLACK

Director

Washington Office

AMERICAN FRIENDS

SERVICE COMMITTEE

In the early stages of the recent Israeli assaults upon Palestinian =  
urban areas and refugee camps, news media carried stories about =  
Palestinian men taken into custody, lined up for

later interrogation with numbers inked on their arms for identification. =  
These images stirred

sharp reactions among Israelis, including Holocaust survivors, who were =  
reminded vividly

of the experience of so many Jews in the Nazi death camps. B"tselem (an =  
Israeli human

rights group) reported on March 12 that, "Members of the Security and =  
Foreign Affairs

Committee of Israel's Knesset were outraged at the phenomenon of I.D.F. =  
soldiers writing

blue numbers on the arms of Palestinian detainees."

The fearful symmetry of this juxtaposition-Jews then and Palestinians =  
now, helpless in the hands of a brutal military take-over of their =  
lives-is testimony to the enduring nature of

OCCUPATION itself. Throughout history every prolonged military =  
occupation over a whole

people against their will has become an exercise in repression, =  
de-humanization, and

brutalization.

There is no mystery in this response. A people in bondage will strive to =

be free. The more savage the denial of their freedom, the more resolute =  
the resistance becomes. The will to throw off an occupying power cannot =  
be quelled or defeated by even the most extreme uses of lethal=20

force and collective punishment, short of virtual annihilation (Native =  
Americans) or actual

extermination (Nazi Europe).

The only surprise in the current crisis is that so many Israelis (and =  
Americans) would forget this history lesson and think that all-out =  
military assault on Palestinian society would effectively subdue (rather =  
than stimulate) the horrendous response of suicide bombing attacks.

(As a Quaker pacifist, I condemn utterly ALL bombing attacks against =  
innocent civilians,

whether by individual Palestinians who strap explosives to their bodies =  
or by Israeli tank

shells, Apache helicopters, or F-16 jet fighters.)

It is now clear that Prime Minister Sharon intends the current massive =  
assault not merely

(and mistakenly) to "root out terrorism," but to smash every aspect of =  
Palestinian society,

infrastructure, and capacity for self-governance. Increasing evidence =  
and anguished personal

stories accumulate to confirm that this is indeed the purpose of the =  
devastation wrought by

the intense Israeli attacks.

Those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it, as =  
Santayana observed.

An old warrior like Sharon should know that military occupation, however =  
powerful and

oppressive, cannot extinguish the will of a people to resist it. Yet he =  
repeats the mistake

of rulers and generals through history who thought that they could =  
conquer and break the

spirit of an occupied population as readily as they could control their =  
lands and daily lives.

In the Biblical narratives, the Children of Israel entered the Land of =  
Canaan, fought to subdue

its prior tribal powers, and then faced a succession of challenges and = rebellions from restive

peoples under their sway. The Romans conquered and settled most of = Europe to the farther end of Britain, then had to fight for centuries = against local uprisings (e.g. Baodicea in Britain)

and major wars with Germanic tribes in order to keep their hold on these = "occupied territories."

The Romans also co-opted local leaders wherever they could to serve in = loyalty to Rome--just

as the Israelis attempted unsuccessfully with the "village leagues" in = the West Bank--but in the

end the central power of Rome was broken and the city itself was sacked.

Examples of the brutality of prolonged occupation can be drawn from = every historical era.

Let me cite one that is far removed from the contemporary scene, yet = perfectly embodies the

inevitable effects of occupation imposed upon a subject people.

The great American author, Herman Melville, sailed to the South Pacific = in a whaleship in the 1840's, thereby gaining the experiences upon which = he drew in a series of books culminating in Moby Dick. Melville found = conditions for the sailors on his New Bedford

whaler so harsh that he jumped ship in the Marquesas Islands. To escape = re-capture, he and a=20

companion made their way to the far side of the island which was = inhabited by a fearsome

tribe, the Typees, reputed to be cannibals. Melville noted that their = reputation for violent

hostility to outsiders stemmed in part from an early attempt (1814) by = European sailors and

marines to conquer and occupy their lands. The Typees gave "the stoutest = resistance" to the

attempted take-over, with dire consequences. (Typee Chapter IV)

After some hard fighting [they] obliged their assailants to retreat

and abandon their design of conquest.

The invaders, on their march back to the sea, consoled themselves

for their repulse by setting fire to every house and temple in their =  
route;

and a long line of smoking ruins defaced the once-smiling bosom of the  
valley, and proclaimed to its pagan inhabitants the spirit that reigned =  
in the

breasts of Christian soldiers. Who can wonder at the deadly hatred of =  
the

Typees to all foreigners after such unprovoked atrocities?=20

Our own history has all too many examples of comparable brutality =  
against Native Americans, culminating in the "battle"/slaughter at =  
Wounded Knee. The dynamic expansion of European

settlement across the Continent encroached successively upon one tribal =  
area after another.

Most of the immigrant "occupiers" feared the Native Americans and were =  
determined not only

to subdue them but to eliminate them. As was said in that era, "The only =  
good Indian is a dead

Indian." Remnant tribes penned in on reservations, denied their lands =  
and hunting rights, and

progressively stripped of their very language and culture-this is a sad =  
image of one outcome

of Occupation when the disparity in numbers and firepower is great =  
enough. Many Palestinians

now live in refugee settings as desperate and demeaning as tribal =  
reservations ever were in the

United States.

Our own American Revolution was a war fought to throw off the occupying =  
power of the

British crown. Jefferson's text of the Declaration of Independence =  
includes a litany of oppressive

acts carried out upon the American people by British agents and military =  
officers---"a long train of abuses and usurpations pursuing. . .a design =  
to reduce them under absolute Despotism."

Patrick Henry's famous cry, "Give me Liberty or give me Death!" speaks =  
for every popular

resistance leader through history in its passionate commitment to be =

free of colonial domination.

Our war for liberation from British rule was bitterly fought, marked by =  
military assaults and

reprisals upon civilians, especially in the Southern campaigns by =  
British General Tarleton as he

attempted to crush rebel/patriot armies under Morgan, Marion, and =  
Greene. Less than a century

later the American Civil War brought equally fierce reprisals and =  
brutalities from Union troops

upon civilians in the South, notably in the swath of destruction caused =  
by "Sherman's March."

American history has ample precedents from which to learn the stern =  
lessons of occupation

and resistance.

More recent analogies for the current Israeli assaults into core =  
Palestinian areas lie in the American experiences in Vietnam during the =  
1960's and 1970's. The United States picked up the

role of "occupier" from the long colonial rule of France in Indochina. =  
We fought against Vietnamese who were determined to oust all foreign =  
military domination and we fought in

support of a "native" regime that was in varying degrees corrupt, =  
repressive, and usually headed

by a military strongman. The free elections promised in the Geneva =  
Accords of 1954 were never

held. This was due in part to the communist take-over in the North of =  
Vietnam but also because,

as President Eisenhower later admitted, Ho Chi Minh would have won by =  
ballot in the South

because he was seen as the leader of the anti-colonial movement.

As the U.S. military involvement deepened, at every stage we had immense =  
advantages in

firepower, air power, mobility, sophistication of weapons and =  
communications, and every other

measurable aspect of the conflict-except the "hearts and minds" of the =  
people. We lost.

Before pulling out, however, we battered Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia =

with more tonnage of

bombs than were dropped in the whole of World War Two. U.S. forces set up "free-fire zones"

all over Vietnam where anyone spotted was a target for lethal fire, including random shelling

around the clock.

The My Lai Massacre was only the best documented and therefore best known of countless

instances where U.S. forces killed Vietnamese women and children in their home villages because the men who were the actual combatants could not be found. Throughout the war, top

U.S. military spokesmen in Saigon spoke optimistically about the progress of the conflict,

conveying misleading and deceitful reports of our "success." (Reporters called these

briefing sessions the "Five O'Clock Follies."

The simple statistic of "body-counts" became the false yardstick of "winning." Not only were many civilians counted among those bodies so enumerated; we also failed to grasp the

fact that the Vietnamese resistance knew the cost of waging war against U.S. firepower would

be disproportionate casualties. They were ready to pay the price. In the end, the U.S. was not.

Beyond all the lies and patriotic facade put on the Vietnam War by our leaders, over time there

were simply too many Americans coming home in body bags. The false rationales and phony

success stories collapsed under the weight of this blunt reality. Most Americans came to under-

stand that such a war of occupation was not winnable.

One classic incident in the Vietnam War stands as emblematic of the whole endeavor. It provides an instructive counterpart to Israeli attacks into Palestinian towns and camps.

U.S. troops engaged in a ferocious battle with Vietnamese forces in and around a town called

Ben Tre. As usual, the American commander called in all available

firepower. At the end of a

bloody day's fighting, the surviving Vietnamese combatants melted away =  
into the countryside

and the still-living villagers were extracted from the ruins and taken =  
into custody. The U.S.

commander surveyed the rubble-field that had been the village of Ben Tre =  
and said,

"We had to destroy the town in order to save it."

In his deadpan seriousness and total unawareness of the dreadful =  
contradiction in his remark,

this American officer spoke for the military mind in all ages, down to =  
Ariel Sharon sending his

troops into Hebron and Jenin. Safety and security, they insist, lie only =  
in victory by the fullest

use of armed force and firepower. The political dimension is set aside, =  
diplomacy is scorned,

and the only goal is defeat of the "enemy." The notion that excess use =  
of lethal force against

civilians will increase resistance rather than quell it is mocked. =  
Critics are told to be "realistic"

and patriotic or to be quiet. The very deaths of "our" soldiers become a =  
pretext for further attacks

and deeper engagement so as to impose an acceptable outcome. It is truly =  
said that a fanatic is one who, when faced by failure, re-doubles his =  
efforts without changing his methods.

The "Occupied Palestinian Territories" - West Bank, Gaza, and East =  
Jerusalem - have been under Israeli military control since 1967 (along =  
with the Golan Heights in Syria). This thirty-five

year occupation is the last major example in the post-Colonial world of =  
a people taken over and

controlled by another nation through military power. The Israeli =  
Occupation is an anomaly,

an anachronism of history.

Yet it is also an everyday reality carried out at great human and moral =  
cost to both occupier and the occupied people. The physical and =  
psychological damage, the human casualties are always greater among the =  
occupied. Palestinians have borne these burdens with an increasing

tempo and severity of Israeli usurpation of their land, water, and basis =  
of communal life.

It has never been merely an occupation; it has been a progressive =  
take-over, a theft in progress.

At every stage Israel has used as much brute force as it deemed =  
necessary to continue the

occupation, to seize land and siphon away water, to build settlements, =  
to blockade and lay siege

to Palestinian communities, to build Israel-only super-highways across =  
the terrain that fragment

Palestinian areas into isolated Bantustans. Throughout the diplomatic =  
sequence of Madrid, Oslo,

Wye River, and Camp David Two plus Taba the Israelis have relentlessly =  
expanded their take-overs and controls. Palestinians have seen the basis =  
for any future state whittled away, their

standard of living collapse, and their economy come to a standstill.

Despite the prevailing "spin" to the contrary, President Arafat did NOT =  
refuse a "generous

offer" at Camp David Two. Prime Minister Barak did make unprecedented =  
proposals for possible

final-stage arrangements (purely verbal suggestions that varied from day =  
to day and were never

put on paper) but the ideas offered were also inadequate to meet basic =  
legal and historical=20

requirements for a just outcome-e.g. scattered Palestinian apartheid =  
enclaves on 80-85%

of the West Bank totally surrounded by Israeli roads and settlements; no =  
recognition or return

of Palestinian refugees. No leader could have accepted these vague =  
formulas as "closing the book" on Palestinian rights and claims.

Arafat had been assured by President Clinton that the negotiating =  
process would go forward

whatever happened at Camp David Two. Arafat did NOT "walk away" and turn =  
to a "policy of

violence." Instead the Israeli and Palestinian negotiators went to Taba =  
(in Egypt) and worked hard on all the key issues for weeks. They made =

extraordinary progress, even on the toughest

subjects like refugees and Jerusalem. The lead Israeli negotiator, Yossi Beilin, has said that

they reached 95% agreement on all relevant topics, but time ran out. Clinton and Barak were

lame-duck leaders whose mandates had or soon would expire. The Israeli government, not the

Palestinians, closed down the Taba Talks.

Meanwhile Prime Minister Barak had given permission for Ariel Sharon's armed march across

Temple Mount/Harem el Sharif to declare eternal Israeli sovereignty over this ground held holy

by all three Abrahamic faiths. (Barak and Sharon both sought thereby to head off a political

come-back by Benjamin Netanyahu.) Palestinian leaders warned and begged Barak not to let

Sharon make his triumphal march, knowing that it would provoke intense reactions. Crowds of

Palestinian protesters were fired on by Israeli security forces. On the second day of protests, seven Palestinians were killed. The New Intifada had begun, sparked by the calculated assertion of perpetual Israeli occupation of a sacred Muslim site.

I will not try to summarize the tragic course of the Intifada. I note, however, that the Israelis-

acting to maintain their Occupation grip-have used disproportionate and lethal force at every

stage in the attempt to suppress the uprising. Not surprisingly, such excess use of force has only

stiffened Palestinian resolve and resistance.

In the early days of the Intifada, dozens of Palestinians were killed before the first Israeli fatality. It became commonplace for Palestinian boys throwing stones to be shot dead by

Israeli soldiers. In the October, 2001 issue of Harper's Chris Hedges (a reporter for the New

York Times) described an incident that symbolizes the general pattern of these deadly encounters.

Israeli troops in Gaza were taunting young Palestinians over =  
loudspeakers, saying "Come on,

dogs. Where are the dogs of Khan Younis? Come! Come!" When a group of =  
ten- and eleven-

year-olds ran over a sandbank in response, the soldiers opened fire, =  
killing one and wounding

four others.

"Children have been shot in other conflicts I have covered," wrote

Hedges, "but I have never before watched soldiers entice children

like mice into a trap and then murder them for sport."

The naked disparity in power, the wanton cruelty, and the clear sense of =  
impunity from any

accountability for such murderous conduct is striking but also familiar =  
in the sad chronicle of

the Second Intifada.

When I read Hedges' account, an echo from Shakespeare came to mind. In =  
the Fourth Act

of King Lear, when Lear is destitute and desperate, he laments:

As flies to wanton boys, are we

to the gods;

They kill us for their sport. (IV, i , 36)=20

The point here is not that all Israeli soldiers are heartless killers or =  
that they have no fears for their safety. Rather it is the pervasive =  
sense of helpless victimization that Palestinians feel under

Israeli power, control, and brutality-especially when the world at large =  
and the United States in

particular refuse to do or say anything to recognize and redeem their =  
plight, their human dignity, their daily humiliation and mounting death =  
toll at the hands of Israelis acting in

gross violation of all norms of law and morality.

Over the months as Palestinian civilians by the hundreds have been =  
killed by Israeli tanks,  
helicopters, and jet fighters while the United States says nothing about =  
these violations of

human rights and legal standards, who can be surprised that many =  
Palestinians share Lear's

sense of cosmic abandonment and victimization, or that some of these =  
wounded and desperate

victims decide to carry out desperate acts of violence in reprisal?

Over two decades when I have written and spoken about the =  
Israeli/Palestinian conflict,

I have refrained from mentioning one comparison to Israel's Occupation =  
behavior that

seems relevant but would be offensive to many Jews: the Nazi occupation =  
of Europe in

World War Two. Any suggestion that the I.D.F. were behaving in ways =  
similar to Hitler's=20

Storm Troopers could be so provocative and upsetting to some that my =  
larger points would

be lost. Yet the similarities of sustained occupation by military force =  
are so deep and compelling

that the comparison cannot be ignored.

Amir Oren, military analyst for the Israeli newspaper Ha'aretz, wrote =  
the following before the

full-scale Israeli re-invasion of Palestinian camps and cities in an =  
article entitled, "At the Gates

of Yassargrad." (Jan. 25, 2002---English Edition)

In order to prepare for the next campaign, one of the Israeli officers

in the Territories said not long ago, it's justified and in fact =  
essential

to learn from every possible source. If the mission is to seize a =  
densely

populated refugee camp, or take the casbah in Nablus, . . . then he must

first analyze and internalize the lessons of earlier battles-even, =

however

shocking it may sound, even how the German army fought in the  
Warsaw Ghetto.

Here is an "occupation echo" indeed! It is matched by a Letter to the =  
Editor in the Washington

Post of April 16, 2002.

The Post's April 10 front-page account and photos of the  
devastation in Jenin, West Bank, remind me of my childhood  
years in the Warsaw Ghetto. There, too, innocent civilians were  
shot on sight, houses were blown up indiscriminately, and  
humanitarian aid was blocked. At the end of that horrendous  
Holocaust, we said, "Never again." But now it is we who are  
doing it again. For Shame!

Alex Hershaft --- Bethesda, MD

The pervasive double standard as to whose deaths matter and which =  
killing behaviors are

condemned and which are silently accepted has always been a feature of =  
occupations. A consistent contrast is drawn between "natives," =  
"savages," or "terrorists"-as the subject=20

population are seen by the dominant power-versus the uniformed, =  
"regular" troops or police

of the colonial power who act on behalf of law, order, and civilization.

This, too, marks the Israeli Occupation over Palestinians as well as =  
public and media reactions

in the United States. When a well-trained Israeli soldier fires a tank =  
shell in Gaza that kills a

grandmother and her grand-daughter sleeping in their tent, the incident =  
is seen as a mistake or

unfortunate "collateral damage." When an Israeli operative plants an =  
artillery shell in the dirt=20

on a path in Gaza, hoping to catch "infiltrators" in the night, but five =

young boys on their

way to school the next day come upon the strange object in the sand, =  
kick at it, and are blown

to bits, no outcry is raised about "terrorists" who target innocent =  
civilians. Hundreds of

comparable Palestinian civilian deaths still do not bring the more =  
honest judgment that Israel

has made war against civilians and engaged in persistent use of lethal =  
force under circumstances

that constitute grave abuses of human rights if not war crimes. The =  
Washington Post of April 14

includes the following report that makes this point powerfully:

A Palestinian named Bashir Abu Walid, whose neighbor was shot  
in her home by an Israeli soldier, stood in the wreckage of Ramallah  
and put the question to Washington Post correspondent Daniel

Williams: "Every Israeli death is a big event. But we are just  
statistics. Because a soldier does it, it is not terrorism. Why not?"

Beyond all the deaths, beyond the use of lethal force at the heart of =  
the Israeli onslaught in

recent weeks, lies a deeper, darker aspect of the re-invasion. While =  
Prime Minister Sharon spoke

of resuming dialogue with the Palestinians, but only after inflicting =  
"many losses" and "heavy

blows" upon them, the systematic destruction wrought by the I.D.F. must =  
be seen as an effort

to wipe out the Palestinian Authority, to destroy the capacity for =  
coherent self-governance in

Palestinian communities under occupation. The rationale of "rooting out =  
terrorism" has covered

a more sinister and determined demolition project.

How else account for the ransacking of all government offices and =  
ministries?---for the

relentless destruction of Palestinian security facilities and personnel =  
(despite Israeli demands

that these same forces round up "terrorists")?---for the pervasive =  
disabling of electric, water,

sewer, paved roads, and other services in the urban centers?---for the =  
consistent destruction of

computers, but only after taking copies of their files?---for the =  
gratuitous damage to every sphere

of Palestinian life, society, and economic endeavor? (The Israelis have =  
repeatedly stolen the

historical archives of the Palestinian people-most recently from Orient =  
House in East Jerusalem

--as if they could erase historical memory and Palestinian identity by =  
such lawless pilfering of

the documentary record, including land deeds, marriage records, and =  
other essential data.)

No terrorists lurked in the Ministry of Education. The watchman twice =  
let in Israeli soldiers to

search the premises. He had to stand outside in the rain for six hours =  
the first time while

everything in the offices was smashed and looted. The Israelis carried =  
away the files on one

million school-children and all teachers in the system. Do they want a =  
generation of uneducated

Palestinians, a generation burning with resentment against such =  
pre-meditated savagery?

"The only conclusion I can make is that they don't want

to see any Palestinian institution able to work again." said

Naim Abu Hommos, acting Education Minister, as he

surveyed the damage. (Post, April 20, 2002)

Let me cite another instance of rampage to make the point even clearer. =  
The Lutheran

"Christmas" Church in Bethlehem has close connections with my circle of =  
colleagues in

Washington, D.C. I have been hosted in the International Center that was =  
developed as a=20

church facility. One of my colleagues spent six weeks teaching glass and ceramic skills in the

artisans' studios that also were part of the church complex.

When Israeli soldiers banged on the door of the church, the pastor, Mitri Raheb, went out

to meet them at great risk. He greeted them in Hebrew, saying that he had the keys and would

open all doors for them. The soldiers pushed him aside and proceeded to smash 31 doors and

57 windows in their "search for terrorists." They destroyed not only computers but refrigerators,

light fixtures, the ceramic kiln, and all the art work in the small shop next to the artisans' work

space. They shot holes in all the sinks (as they regularly shoot holes in water tanks atop Palestinian homes). This was a jihad against art and culture and against a center where Israelis

and Palestinians met for dialogue. This was calculated, wanton pillage so petty and yet so

thorough and mindless that it gives the original Vandals who sacked Rome a bad name.

The choice facing Israel is very simple-Land or Peace? End the Occupation in order to gain

a secure, peaceful future or remain a garrison state forever holding Palestinians in restive

subjugation, keeping a contested grip on West Bank and Gaza (and the Golan Heights),

facing permanent hostility from Arab governments and peoples in the region (and from Muslim

peoples around the globe). Most Palestinian leaders and the great majority of the people are

still ready to live by Thoreau's simple dictum in Walden: "I would be a good neighbor,

but a bad subject." A two-state solution has long been the best if not the only resolution of

the conflict, so long as the Palestinians get a viable state on the full

area of West Bank, Gaza,

and East Jerusalem taken by force in the 1967 war. (Mutually-agreed = adjustments of the

boundary line are possible, as was discussed at Taba.)

This version of a two-state outcome is embodied in the Saudi Proposal = recently endorsed at

the Arab Summit in Beirut. The offer of full diplomatic recognition by = Arab governments in

return for ending the Occupation is an historic break-through that Prime = Minister Sharon is

determined to spurn.

The role of the United States government must be to insist upon Israel's = acceptance of this

basic deal, even as we insist that Palestinian leadership curb violence = against Israelis. The

extremists in both communities can be marginalized only by the moderate = majorities in both

communities, when they see a shared future that respects the rights and = security of both peoples.

Unless and until Israel agrees to end its overlord role, the violence = will go on, with waves of

unnecessary casualties on both sides. The United States can do no less = than bring Israeli

leaders to the inescapable imperative: END THE OCCUPATION.

Status: U

Return-Path: <sentto-4736742-66-1022593296-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com>

Received: from n9.grp.scd.yahoo.com ([66.218.66.93])

by pickering.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17cHef1r3Nl3p20  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 28 May 2002 09:41:35 -0400 (EDT)

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-4736742-66-1022593296-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com

Received: from [66.218.66.94] by n9.grp.scd.yahoo.com with NNFMP; 28 May 2002 13:41:36 -0000

X-Sender: mupj@igc.org

X-Apparently-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

Received: (EGP: mail-8\_0\_3\_2); 28 May 2002 13:41:33 -0000

Received: (qmail 20329 invoked from network); 28 May 2002 13:41:33 -0000

Received: from unknown (66.218.66.217)

by m1.grp.scd.yahoo.com with QMQP; 28 May 2002 13:41:33 -0000

Received: from unknown (HELO atlantic.mail.pas.earthlink.net) (207.217.120.179)

by mta2.grp.scd.yahoo.com with SMTP; 28 May 2002 13:41:32 -0000

Received: from user-2ivek5o.dialup.mindspring.com ([165.247.80.184] helo=default)

by atlantic.mail.pas.earthlink.net with smtp (Exim 3.33 #2)  
id 17ChEB-0006Rd-00

for interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com; Tue, 28 May 2002 06:41:32 -0700

Message-ID: <002f01c2064d\$4cac3d80\$b850f7a5@default>

To: <interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com>

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

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

X-Yahoo-Profile: howhall20817

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: Tue, 28 May 2002 09:40:32 -0400

Subject: [interfaithnd] Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear Colleagues,

As you have read and heard, on May 24, 2002 in Moscow President George W. Bush and President Vladimir Putin signed the Strategic Offensive Reduction Treaty. This treaty commits the United States and Russian to reduce their respective strategic nuclear warheads to 1,700 to 2,200 by December 31, 2012.

The full text of the treaty is available on the web site of the Council for a Livable World at <http://www.clw.org/control/sorttext.html>. A verbatim account of the news conference of Presidents Bush and Putin is found at <http://www.clw.org/control/sortcontrol.html>.

This commitment to reduce strategic nuclear warheads is a step in the right direction. When carried out, it will take out of active service thousands of nuclear weapons. This is a worthy accomplishment.

Yet the treaty has many flaws, including some steps backwards. On the whole it is an opportunity lost.

At the treaty signing ceremony President Bush said, "This treaty liquidates the Cold War legacy of nuclear hostility between our countries." If he is speaking of attitudes, this may be correct. But if he is speaking of practice, he is wrong. The Cold War doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD) remains in place because the nuclear arsenals remain on quick-launch alert. Nothing in the treaty dictates otherwise.

The treaty contains no timetable for reductions, only that the process must be completed by December 31, 2012. On that date the treaty expires.

There is no requirement for the dismantlement of nuclear warheads or delivery vehicles. Either party may withdraw from the treaty with three months notice. Therefore, in a relatively short time warheads can be returned to active deployment. Moreover, all stored warheads may be put back in service when the treaty expires. Thus, there is no irreversibility as recommended, for instance, in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference.

There is no restriction on multi-warhead missiles as there was in START II that never entered into force. Because of their potency such missiles are more vulnerable to attack. For that reason they are more likely to be kept on quick-launch alert.

There are no provisions for elimination of tactical nuclear weapons, that is, those intended for short-range use.

With the tactical arsenal intact and larger number of strategic warheads in storage rather than dismantled, the risk of theft or sale to terrorists groups is greater.

In sum, the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty is mostly window-dressing for a desire of the United States and Russia to take redundant warheads out of service. At numbers still high enough to eliminate both nations several times over, it continues the Cold War heritage of awesome destructive capability.

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: <sentto-4736742-67-1022593982-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com>  
Received: from n26.grp.scd.yahoo.com ([66.218.66.82])  
by farley.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17cHpw2CR3Nl3pa0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 28 May 2002 09:53:09 -0400 (EDT)  
X-eGroups-Return: sentto-4736742-67-1022593982-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com  
Received: from [66.218.67.196] by n26.grp.scd.yahoo.com with NNFMP; 28 May 2002 13:53:06 -0000  
X-Sender: tvpcusa1@prodigy.net  
X-Apparently-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
Received: (EGP: mail-8\_0\_3\_2); 28 May 2002 13:52:58 -0000  
Received: (qmail 84163 invoked from network); 28 May 2002 13:52:58 -0000  
Received: from unknown (66.218.66.218)  
by m3.grp.scd.yahoo.com with QMQP; 28 May 2002 13:52:58 -0000  
Received: from unknown (HELO pimout5-int.prodigy.net) (207.115.63.98)  
by mta3.grp.scd.yahoo.com with SMTP; 28 May 2002 13:52:57 -0000  
Received: from nsmall.paxchristiusa.org (dialup-65.56.59.119.Dial1.Cleveland1.Level3.net [65.56.59.119])  
by pimout5-int.prodigy.net (8.11.0/8.11.0) with SMTP id g4SDqs4294658  
for <interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com>; Tue, 28 May 2002 09:52:54 -0400  
Message-ID: <007701c2064f\$2582b020\$1400a8c0@paxchristiusa.org>  
To: "interfaith nuclear discussion group" <interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com>  
References: <002f01c2064d\$4cac3d80\$b850f7a5@default>  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700  
X-Mimeole: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700  
From: "ANTHONY VENTO" <TVPCUSA1@prodigy.net>  
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: Tue, 28 May 2002 09:54:10 -0400  
Subject: [interfaithnd] Treaty: Pax Christi Statement, Release and Action  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi all,

Here is a new statement from Pax Christi USA (PCUSA) on the US/Russian Nuclear Reduction Treaty, a supporting press release, and action suggestions we sent to PCUSA members last week.

Hope you had a safe holiday weekend.

May peace be with you,

Tony

+++++

Tony Vento, Program Director

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

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

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

\*\*\*\*\*

Statement on US/Russian Nuclear Reduction Treaty

Issued May 24, 2002

Pax Christi USA has worked for a world free of the threat of nuclear war throughout our thirty years as the Catholic peace movement in the United States. We have consistently called for and supported those measures that move us closer to the fulfillment of our obligation to eliminate our nuclear arsenal under the terms of Article VI of the Nonproliferation Treaty and in accord with the International Court of Justice's 1996 advisory opinion.

Today's signing of the Nuclear Reduction Treaty with Russia does little to move us toward a nuclear weapon-free world, and may ultimately prove to short circuit real efforts at nuclear elimination while increasing the threat posed by the acquisition of nuclear weapons by terrorist groups.

The hastily negotiated agreement proposes to reduce US and Russian arsenals by two-thirds over the next decade. However, the Treaty provides no timetable for the cuts during the life of the Treaty. The reductions do not have to take place before 2012, the same year in which the Treaty expires. The Treaty provides no verification protocol to provide transparency and ensure its implementation. Most disturbing about this "new approach" to arms reduction is the Bush Administration's insistence, over Russian objections, that the cuts in deployed strategic weapons not be irreversible. What this means is that the Treaty permits both sides to retain warheads withdrawn from operational deployment in a "responsive force" that may be redeployed in the future. Furthermore, the Treaty allows for hundreds of nuclear weapons to be retained as part of the "inactive stockpile" from which replacements are typically drawn. Only a small number of the approximately 4,000 nuclear warheads that will be removed from their delivery vehicles may actually be dismantled.

The retention of nuclear warheads in reserve poses a serious threat to the ongoing effort to secure existing nuclear warheads against theft or diversion to terrorist groups. By maintaining a huge reserve force of warheads, the US forces the Russians to similarly maintain such reserves - reserves which have been shown to be poorly secured and potentially available to terrorist groups and nations seeking to acquire existing weapons. Given the current concerns over terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, the insistence on maintaining operational warheads in reserve is short-sighted and may ultimately prove disastrous.

As the Vatican stated at the United Nations in April, "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 stocks can be remounted again quickly?"

Moreover, the Treaty's expressed intention to reduce the nuclear threat is contradicted by every other measure of commitment to nuclear disarmament. The recently completed Nuclear Posture Review expands the role of nuclear weapons, abandons the US's commitment to not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapons states, and calls for the US to use nuclear weapons first in a conventional conflict. In addition, the Departments of Defense and Energy are committed to developing new, low-yield nuclear weapons, so-called "mini-nukes" intended to be more "usable" against non-nuclear weapons states' buried targets. For this reason, the Bush Administration has indicated that it must prepare to resume full-scale underground nuclear

testing, perhaps within one year. The US has already committed some \$60 billion for upgrading the capabilities for design, testing and development of new nuclear weapons. These plans continue unaffected by the Administration's claims to seek nuclear reductions.

The Treaty signed today is based on the premise that nuclear weapons are in fact an indispensable cornerstone of national security. Far from "liquidating the legacy of the Cold War" the Bush Administration is reaffirming the legitimacy and utility of these horrendous weapons while appearing to be seeking strategic reductions. A leaner, more useable nuclear force as envisioned by the Administration is not in the interest of peace and security.

As the Vatican restated at the April Preparatory Committee Meeting for the 2005 Review Conference of the Nonproliferation Treaty, "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century; they cannot be justified..[I]n clinging to their outmoded rationales for nuclear deterrence, they [the nuclear weapons states] are denying the most ardent aspirations of humanity as well as the opinion of the highest legal authority in the world."

The US and Russian Republic must follow up today's Treaty signing with real measures to rid the world of the nuclear danger. Warheads must be removed and destroyed. Deployed weapons must be taken off alert. Funding for the development of new nuclear weapons must be eliminated. The Comprehensive Test Ban must be ratified. Existing stockpiles of Russian weapons must be secured, and both nations must end their stonewalling at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva and move immediately to negotiations leading to a Convention that would outlaw the design, development, testing and deployment of nuclear weapons. Such independently verifiable and irreversible reductions along with national strategies that eliminate the role of nuclear weapons are the only way to assure a future free of the nuclear threat in all its aspects.

-----  
-----  
PRESS RELEASE  
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

May 24, 2002

Contact: Dave Robinson, 814-450-2297

The Sham that is the US/Russian Nuclear Reduction Treaty

US Catholic Peace Group Claims Treaty Increases Chances of Terrorists Getting Nukes

Today President George W. Bush joins Russian President Vladimir Putin in Moscow to sign what the Bush Administration is calling an historic moment in nuclear arms reductions. The Nuclear Reduction Treaty between these two former Cold War enemies proposes that the US and Russia reduce their strategic nuclear arsenals by two-thirds. But some observers believe the Bush Administration is playing fast and loose with the word "reduction." While the Russians pushed for a treaty that would include the destruction of

these weapons, the US proposed instead the "storing" of the targeted weapons in case of national emergencies.

In the wake of the terrorist attacks of September 11th and concerns of the Bush Administration that terrorist groups may be seeking to attain nuclear weapons, some weapons experts are stressing that the new treaty may contribute to just such a scenario. "Despite Russian overtures suggesting deeper and more permanent cuts with the actual destruction of nuclear warheads, the Bush Administration insisted that the Treaty would not propose actually destroying nuclear weapons, but instead allow for their storage," said Dave Robinson, national coordinator of Pax Christi USA, the national Catholic peace movement. "This allows the Bush Administration to bring those weapons out of storage at virtually a moment's notice if they so choose. It also increases the likelihood that terrorist groups could get there hands on nuclear weapons."

In a statement released to coincide with the signing of the treaty, Pax Christi USA states, "By maintaining a huge reserve force of warheads, the US forces the Russians to similarly maintain such reserves - reserves which have been shown to be poorly secured and potentially available to terrorist groups and nations seeking to acquire existing weapons. Given the current concerns over terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, the insistence on maintaining operational warheads in reserve is short-sighted and may ultimately prove disastrous."

The statement from Pax Christi USA, which has been working on issues of nuclear disarmament for over thirty years, also calls into question the sincerity of the Bush Administration's commitment to reductions in weapons of mass destruction: "[T]he Treaty's expressed intention to reduce the nuclear threat is contradicted by every other measure of commitment to nuclear disarmament. The recently completed Nuclear Posture Review [from the Bush Administration] expands the role of nuclear weapons, abandons the US's commitment to not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapons states, and calls for the US to use nuclear weapons first in a conventional conflict."

While President Bush finalizes the treaty with President Putin, other departments in the Bush Administration continue to work on the development of low-yield nuclear weapons - coined "mini-nukes." "Even as Bush trumpets this treaty, our government is searching for a 'useable' nuclear weapon, one which they've suggested could be employed against non-nuclear weapons states," Robinson said.

A complete copy of the Pax Christi USA statement on the US/Russian Nuclear Reduction Treaty is available by contacting the Pax Christi USA national office at 814-453-4955, ext 221.

Pax Christi USA is the national Catholic peace movement. Its 14,000 members include over 140 US bishops, 550 religious communities, 450 parish sponsors, and over 230 local groups. Pax Christi USA is a section of Pax Christi International.

-----  
-----

## ACTION SUGGESTIONS:

1) Contact Local Congressional Offices - Congress will be in recess starting today through June 3rd. Please contact the LOCAL office of your congressional representative and request a meeting while s/he is in their home district. Organize a delegation to discuss common concerns about US nuclear weapons policy, military spending, and the need for new US budget and policy priorities for the peaceful prevention of deadly conflict as an alternative to the war on terrorism or an expanded war with Iraq. (If their schedules are already full, plan now for the next recesses. Approximate dates of upcoming recesses are: June 28-July 8 and July 29-September 3.

2) Oppose Funding for New Nuclear Weapons and Missile Defense - The Senate Arms Services Committee completed its FY 2003 Defense Authorization Bill on May 10. This bill strips all funding for the development of a new "usable" nuclear weapon, the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator and spends \$812 million LESS than the Bush Administration requested for missile defense.

Contact your Senators and urge them to OPPOSE the following amendments that will likely be offered to the FY 2003 Defense Authorization bill during the week of June 3.

1. Restore the \$812 million the Armed Services Committee cut from missile defense and reduce program oversight. (OPPOSE)
2. Restore the \$15.5 million the Committee cut for research into a new earth-penetrating nuclear weapon or "bunker buster" (OPPOSE)

Email your congressional representative directly:

1. Go to NETWORK's home page at [www.networklobby.org](http://www.networklobby.org)
2. Click on "Legislative Action Center"
3. Enter your zip code under "Elected Officials" and click "Go"
4. Click on "Oppose Defense Authorization amendments on Nukes and NMD and follow the directions.

Phone Messages:

Senate offices can be reached through the US Capitol switchboard at 202-224-3121 from 9:00 am - 6:00 pm EDT.

3) Contact Local Secular and Religious Media - submit Pax Christi USA's Statement on US/Russian Nuclear Reduction Treaty to your local newspapers as an op-ed piece or send a personalized version of the sample letter-to-the-editor found below:

Dear Editors,

The nuclear arms reduction treaty, recently signed by President Bush and Russian President Putin does little, if anything, to increase global security. While reductions in both countries' arsenals are a good idea, the treaty's flaws are alarming.

The treaty doesn't require any weapons to be destroyed; they can merely be set-aside in storage where they will be vulnerable to theft or rogue use.

There is neither timeline nor provisions for enforcement - each country can

take up to ten years and eliminate only a few weapons, or even none at all. The treaty allows Russia to deploy new, multiple warhead missiles, the most dangerous weapons in its arsenal. It also ignores smaller, short-range tactical nuclear weapons. Either country can withdraw from the treaty, for any reason, on three months' notice.

According to the guidelines of this treaty, ten years from now both the US and Russia could have the same number of nuclear weapons as they do now. At a time in which limiting the threat of nuclear weapons is an immediate necessity, this treaty falls flat.

Sincerely,  
(Your name and address)

----- Yahoo! Groups Sponsor ----->  
Buy Stock for \$4  
and no minimums.  
FREE Money 2002.  
<http://us.click.yahoo.com/orkH0C/n97DAA/Ey.GAA/nJ9qlB/TM>  
----->

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

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

Status: U  
Return-Path: <millerph@att.net>  
Received: from mtiwmhc21.worldnet.att.net ([204.127.131.46])  
by runyon.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17cM3Dwy3Nl3sj0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 28 May 2002 14:50:57 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from webmail.worldnet.att.net ([204.127.135.41])  
by mtiwmhc21.worldnet.att.net  
(InterMail vM.4.01.03.27 201-229-121-127-20010626) with SMTP  
id <20020528185056.XHJP19182.mtiwmhc21.worldnet.att.net@webmail.worldnet.att.net>  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 28 May 2002 18:50:56 +0000  
Received: from [12.78.118.83] by webmail.worldnet.att.net;  
Tue, 28 May 2002 18:50:56 +0000  
From: millerph@att.net  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Earthlink billing  
Date: Tue, 28 May 2002 18:50:56 +0000  
X-Mailer: AT&T Message Center Version 1 (May 26 2002)  
Message-Id: <20020528185056.XHJP19182.mtiwmhc21.worldnet.att.net@webmail.worldnet.att.net>

As a matter of fact, it has not cleared yet. However,  
it was written the day after the closing date on the  
last statement and I have yet to receive this month's  
statement.

As they say, the plot thickens!

Phil  
> Phil,  
>  
> I'm still trying to get Earthlink straightened out on our billing. Did  
> check #1319 of 4/5/02 clear?  
>  
> I'll do as you suggest and pay through my credit card and seek  
> reimbursement.  
>  
> Howard  
>  
>

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Phillip H. Miller" <millerph@att.net>  
Subject: Earthlink billing  
Date: Tue, 28 May 2002 13:53:00 -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

Phil,

I'm still trying to get Earthlink straightened out on our billing. Did check #1319 of 4/5/02 clear?

I'll do as you suggest and pay through my credit card and seek reimbursement.

Howard

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "ANTHONY VENTO" <TVPCUSA1@prodigy.net>  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Treaty: Pax Christi Statement, Release and Action  
Date: Tue, 28 May 2002 14:10:48 -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

Tony,

That's a good statement. Thanks for sharing it.

Howard

--

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <millerph@att.net>  
Subject: Earthlink billing  
Date: Tue, 28 May 2002 21:58:57 -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,

I found buried on my desk an invoice from EarthLink for \$16.95 for the period ending June 12. That includes \$1.00 for paper invoice, which they have gone to, plus the \$1.00 for non-automated payment and the \$14.95. Please give a check for \$16.95. It is due by June 3

The \$15.95 check you sent me is for past due, which I paid with check #1619. I may hold on to the latest check while I inquire if they received #1619, but go ahead and pay the June bill.

In looking over their information I note that they suggest paying by bank draft. I suppose that means drawing directly on our bank account. Is that acceptable with you rather than having me use a credit card?

Shalom,  
Howard

Status: U  
Return-Path: <ife@wcc-coe.org>  
Received: from wccxsmtp ([193.73.242.105])  
by strange.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id  
17d4ux2zQ3NI3oW0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 29 May 2002 10:31:57 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from wccgeneva-Message\_Server by wccxsmtp  
with Novell\_GroupWise; Wed, 29 May 2002 16:28:37 +0200  
Message-Id: <scf501b5.075@wccxsmtp>  
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 5.5.4.1  
Date: Wed, 29 May 2002 16:28:06 +0200  
From: "Isabelle Ferrari" <ife@wcc-coe.org>  
To: <mupj@igc.org>  
Cc: "Dwain Epps" <dce@wcc-coe.org>  
Subject: Re: Zero-nukes web site  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="=\_C09D0585.37563AE8"

Dear Mr. Hallman,

I talked to Dwain and am now able to bring, on Dwain's behalf, the following responses to your questions of May 22:

- Q 1 and 2: please go ahead with the logo. introductory paragraph is correct.
- Q 3: yes.
- 4. Regarding the photograph: I need to do a research and contact our photographer. I'll get back to you as soon as possible.
- 5. Please find Dwain's report attached

We would gladly make a link to your website from ours and issue a special announcement. Please let us know in due time when the site is completed and active.

I hope this helps. Good luck and kind regards,

"Howard W. Hallman" <[mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)> 05/22/02 01:58PM >>>

Dear Dwain and Salpy,

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament in the U.S. is moving ahead with the creation of a new web site, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). The home page is now available at that web address. In addition to the sponsors listed on the home page, we can add the National Council of Churches, which recently signed on.

We have two other pages ready in draft form, as follows:  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html>  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogetozero.html>

The religious statements page contains material from the World Council of Churches, which I would like you to review. Details are as follows:

1. In the draft we use your logo as an identity marker. Is that okay?
2. Is the introductory paragraph accurate?
3. We quote from the 1983 Assembly statement on nuclear disarmament. Do we have your permission?
4. We make reference to the statement of Dr. Raiser and Cardinal Danneels to the 1998 NPT PrepCom, which is presented in full elsewhere. We would like to incorporate a photo of Dr. Raiser under WCC and a photo of Dr. Raiser, Cardinal Danneels, and PrepCom Chair Wyzner, if one exists from the PrepCom reception. Can you help us? We could use either a digital version or a photograph that we could scan.
4. We show a linkage to the WCC "Statement on Nuclear Disarmament, NATO Policy and the Churches" (2001) on your web site.
5. Are there other statements you would like us to include? For instances, Dwain's report on "The Evolution of World Council of Churches Policy on Nuclear Arms and Disarmament, 1948-2000" would be a valuable source if it would be accessed through your web site.

Within another month our site will be far enough along to make a public announcement and invite users to visit it. When that time comes, we will ask you to help publicize it.

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](mailto: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.

isabelle ferrari  
administrative assistant  
international relations  
WCC - Geneva  
+41-22-791 63 15

**Creation at Risk: A Consultation with Churches on Nuclear Issues  
Brussels  
5-6 October 2000**

**THE EVOLUTION OF WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES POLICY  
ON NUCLEAR ARMS AND DISARMAMENT, 1948-2000\***

Prepared by:

Dwain C. Epps

Coordinator, International Relations

WCC, Geneva

The question of atomic, hydrogen and nuclear weapons has been at the heart of concerns of the World Council of Churches since its first Assembly in 1948. It was a logical focus of an ecumenical movement whose roots were in Christian peace movements going back to the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. The Amsterdam statement laid the foundations for ecumenical concern in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century:

War as a method of settling disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ. The part which war plays in our present international life is a sin against God and a degradation of man. We recognise that the problem of war raises especially acute issues for Christians today. Warfare has greatly changed. War is now total and every man and woman is called for mobilisation in war service. Moreover, the immense use of air forces and the discovery of atomic and other new weapons render widespread and indiscriminate destruction inherent in the whole conduct of modern war in a sense never experienced in past conflicts...

The churches must also attack the causes of war by promoting peaceful change and the pursuit of justice. They must stand for the maintenance of good faith and the honouring of the pledged word, resist the pretensions of imperialist power, promote the multilateral reduction of armaments, and combat indifference and despair in the face of the futility of war...

Report of Section IV, "The Church and the International Disorder," *Official Report of the First Assembly*, Amsterdam, 1948, WCC, Geneva. p 89.

---

\* Excerpts from selected statements or actions that added to the policy development of the WCC.

The II. Assembly responded to developments beyond the atomic bomb:

The development of nuclear weapons makes this an age of fear. True peace cannot rest on fear. It is vain to think that the hydrogen bomb or its development has guaranteed peace because men will be afraid to go to war, nor can fear provide an effective restraint against the temptation to use a decisive weapon either in hope of total victory or in the desperation of total defeat.

The thought of all-out nuclear warfare is indeed horrifying. Such warfare introduces a new moral challenge. It has served to quicken public concern, and has intensified awareness of the urgency of finding means of prevention....

An international order of truth and peace would require:

- a) under effective international inspection and control and in such a way that no state would have cause to fear that its security was endangered, the elimination and prohibition of atomic, hydrogen and all other weapons of mass destruction, as well as the reduction of all armaments to a minimum...

We must also see that experimental tests of hydrogen bombs have raised issues of human rights, caused suffering and imposed an additional strain on human relations between nations. Among safeguards against the aggravation of these international tensions is the insistence that nations carry on tests only within their respective territories, or if elsewhere, only be international clearance and agreement.

Report of Section IV, "International Affairs: Christians in the Struggle for World Community," *Official Report of the Second Assembly*, Evanston, 1954, WCC, Geneva, pp 131-134. The resolutions on International Affairs adopted by the Assembly did not include specific reference to nuclear weapons or disarmament.

Between 1954 and 1961, the WCC's Commission of the Churches on International Affairs (CCIA) spoke and worked intensively on the need for an international instrument to control nuclear testing. The III. Assembly further underscored the dangers of nuclear weapons developments, and for the first time officially expressed concerns about the use of outer space.

The most serious problem facing the world today is that of disarmament. General and complete disarmament is widely recognized to be the desired goal...

The recent violations of the moratorium on nuclear bomb testing have shocked the nations into a new realization of the acute danger and horror of modern warfare. Churches must protest against the accelerating arms race and the mounting terror which it portends. The First Assembly...clearly recognized that war is contrary to the

will of God. War in its newer forms is understood not only by Christians but the general conscience of the nations as an offense against both the world of nature and the race of man, threatening annihilation and laying on mankind an unbearable burden of cost and terror. The use of indiscriminate weapons must now be condemned by the churches as an affront to the Creator and a denial of the very purposes of the Creation. Christians must refuse to place their ultimate trust in war and nuclear weapons. In this situation the churches must never cease warning governments of the dangers, and they must repudiate absolutely the growing conviction in some quarters that the use of mass destruction weapons has become inevitable. Christians must press most urgently upon their governments, as a first step towards the elimination of nuclear weapons, never to get themselves into a position in which they contemplate the first use of nuclear weapons. Christians must also maintain that the use of nuclear weapons, or other forms of major violence, against centers of population is in no circumstances reconcilable with the demands of the Christian Gospel.

Total disarmament is the goal, but it is a complex and long-term process in which the churches must not underestimate the importance of first steps. There may be possibilities of experimenting with limited geographical areas of controlled and inspected disarmament, of neutralizing certain zones, of devising security against surprise attack which would reduce tension, of controlling the use of outer space....

*New Delhi Speaks*, Third WCC Assembly, New Delhi, 1961, Association Press, New York, 1962, pp 79ff.

The landmark 1966 Church and Society Conference in Geneva is most often recalled as having brought Third World perspectives and theologies of liberation onto the stage of the global ecumenical movement. However it too devoted particular attention to nuclear war, based again on the Amsterdam affirmation.

...(The) First Assembly...declared, 'War is contrary to the will of God'... We now say to all governments and peoples that nuclear war is against God's will and the greatest of evils. Therefore we affirm that it is the first duty of governments and their officials to prevent nuclear war. ...

The real problem is how the supreme task, to avoid nuclear war can be carried out... (here there is) an increasing role for the smaller powers in depolarizing international affairs....

The churches should add that they have (a) common...duty to preserve the life of the peoples of this world, and to work for a world order which will transcend the present uneasy peace of the equilibrium of power. It is intolerable for the peace of the world to depend on a precarious nuclear balance...

*Official Report, World Conference on Church and Society, WCC, Geneva 1966, pp 123ff.*

That Conference deeply influenced the agenda of the IV. Assembly held two years later. That agenda was heavily devoted to the timely issues of racism and economic development and others stimulated by the global revolutionary fervor of the year 1968. But it too spoke out on the question of nuclear weapons, beginning once more with the Amsterdam declaration.

The WCC reaffirms its declaration at the (First Assembly): "War as a method of settling disputes is incompatible with the teachings and example of our Lord Jesus Christ." Of all forms of war, nuclear war presents the gravest affront to the conscience of man. The avoidance of atomic, biological or chemical war has become a conditions of human survival...The churches must insist that it is the first duty of governments to prevent such a war: to halt the present arms race, agree never to initiate the use of nuclear weapons, stop experiments concerned with and the production of weapons of mass human destruction by chemical and biological means a move away from the balance of terror towards disarmament. ...

The concentration of nuclear weapons in the hands of a few nations presents the world with serious problems: a) how to guarantee the security of the non-nuclear nations; b) how to enable these nations to play their part in preventing war, and; c) how to prevent the nuclear powers from freezing the exiting order at the expense of changes needed for social and political justice....

*Uppsala Speaks, Fourth WCC Assembly, Uppsala, 1998, Geneva, 1968, pp 62 ff.*

The V. Assembly in Nairobi was marked especially by the global concern for human rights and East-West tensions. In its Section on "Structures of Injustice and Struggles for Liberation," to survival, it shifted the nature of Christian responsibly very significantly based on ideas provided by the Federation of Churches in the German Democratic Republic:

Christians must resist the temptation to resign themselves to a false sense of impotence or security, The churches should emphasize their readiness to live without the protection of armaments, and take a significant initiative in pressing for effective disarmament. Churches, individual Christians, and members of the public in all countries should press their governments to ensure national security without resorting to the use of weapons of mass destruction...

We appeal to Christians to think, work and pray for a disarmed world.

*Breaking Barriers, The Official Report of the Fifth Assembly of the WCC, Nairobi, 1995, WCC, Geneva, p 182.*

The nuclear arms race accelerated rapidly in the late 1970s, and the CCIA was asked by the Central Committee to organize a consultation to consider it and the proliferation of conventional weapons of mass destruction. Its 1978 report noted:

We are living in the shadow of an arms race more intense, more costly, more widespread and more dangerous than the world has ever known. Never before has the arms race been as close as it is now to total self-destruction. Today's arms race is an unparalleled waste of human and material resources; it aids repression and violates human rights; it promotes violence and insecurity in place of the security in whose name it is undertaken; it frustrates humanity's aspirations for justice and peace; it has no part in God's design for His world; it is demonic.... To hope in Christ is neither to be complacent about survival nor powerless in the fear of annihilation by the forces of evil but to open our eyes to the transcendent reality of Christ in history.

"Report of the WCC Consultation on Disarmament," Glion, Switzerland, 1978, in *The Churches in International Affairs 1974-1978*, WCC, Geneva 1979, p 72

That same year, Dr. Philip Potter, WCC General Secretary brought the concerns highlighted in the consultation to the attention of the United Nations in a plenary address to the General Assembly in which he addressed several of the underlying causes of the global arms race:

We must challenge the idol of a distorted concept of national security which is direct to encouraging fear and mistrust resulting in greater insecurity. The only security worthy of its name lies in enabling people to participate fully in the life of their nations and to establish relations of trust between peoples of different nations. It is only when there is a real dialogue -- a sharing of life with life in mutual trust and respect -- that there can be true security.

Address of Dr. Philip Potter, WCC General Secretary, to the First Special Session of the UN General Assembly devoted to Disarmament, NY, 1978. *op. cit.* p 70f

This concern for national security arose not only as a causal factor in the super-power nuclear arms race, but as a justification for massive violations of human rights, especially by military dictatorships around the world. The Central Committee linked these concerns at its meeting in 1979:

...given the need not only to denounce militarism and the arms race, but to develop positive alternatives to the present destructive system...and as a matter of highest priority for the WCC...(the Central Committee establishes the) Program for Disarmament and against Militarism and the Arms Race.

*Minutes of the WCC Central Committee*, Kingston, Jamaica, 1979; also contained in *The Churches in International Affairs, 1970-82*, WCC, Geneva, 1983, p 35.

The WCC Sub-Unit on Church and Society organized in 1979 a major world Conference on Faith, Science and the Future in Boston, Massachusetts. It adopted the following declaration which was subsequently endorsed by the Executive Committee and commended to the churches:

We, scientists, engineers, theologians and members of Christian churches from all parts of the world, participants in the WCC Conference on Faith, Science and the Future, now meeting at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (USA), acknowledge with penitence the part played by science in the development of weapons of mass destruction and the failure of the churches to oppose it, and now plead with the nations of the world for the reduction and eventual abolition of such weapons.

WHEREAS:

- the arsenals of tens of thousands of nuclear weapons already constitute a grave peril to humankind;
- sharp changes by the super-powers towards a counterforce strategy are so destabilizing that sober scientists estimate a nuclear holocaust is probable before the end of the century;
- there is widespread ignorance of the horrible experience of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the even greater implications of limited or global nuclear war with current and projected nuclear weapons;
- we are profoundly disturbed by the willingness of some scientists, engineers and corporations, with the backing of governments, to pursue profit and prestige in weapons development at the risk of an unparalleled destruction of human life;
- the waste of the increasingly scarce materials and energy resources of the world on the instruments of war means further deprivation of the poor whom we are commanded to serve;
- we grieve that so many of the most able scientists, especially the young ones, are seduced away from the nobler aspirations of science into the unwitting service of mutual destruction;
- in a time of radical readjustment of the world economy the intolerable burden of the nuclear arms race creates worldwide economic problems;
- 

AND BECAUSE WE BELIEVE:

- that God made us and all creation;
- that He requires us to seek peace, justice and freedom, creating a world where none need fear and every life is sacred;
- that with His grace no work of faith, hope and love need seem too hard for those who trust him;

## WE NOW CALL UPON:

- all member communions of the WCC and all sister churches sending official observers, and through them each individual church and congregation;
- our fellow religionists and believers in other cultures, whether Hindu, Jewish, Buddhist or Muslim, and our Marxist colleagues;
- the science and engineering community, especially those engaged in research and development, together with professional scientific associations and trade unions;
- the governments of all nations and especially the nuclear powers;
- all concerned citizens of the world;

## TO EMBARK IMMEDIATELY ON THE FOLLOWING TASKS:

- to support and implement the WCC Program on Disarmament and against Militarism and the Arms Race, and give special emphasis to issues related to military technology and its conversion to peaceful uses;
- ...
- to stop the development and production of new forms and systems of nuclear weapons...
- to educate and raise the consciousness of every constituency to the realities of nuclear war in such a way that people cease to avoid it as an issue too big to handle;
- ...
- to prepare local and national programs for the conversion to civilian use of laboratories and factories related to military research and production, and to provide for the retraining and re-employment of those who work on them;
- to resolve never again to allow science and technology to threaten the destruction of human life, and to accept the God-given task of using SCIENCE FOR PEACE.

*Minutes of the WCC Executive Committee, Bossey, Switzerland, 1979, op. cit. p 40ff.*

That year, 1979, marked a major turning point in the mobilization of world public opinion about the nuclear arms race. The announcement by the USA of its intention to produce a neutron bomb and radically to escalate the number and quality of its nuclear arms based in Europe created a massive public outcry. The Central Committee echoed the demands of the anti-nuclear movement the following year:

The Central Committee urges all nuclear powers to:

- a) freeze immediately all further testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and of missiles and new aircraft designed primarily to deliver nuclear weapons;
- b) start immediately discussions with a view to making agreements not to enhance the existing nuclear potentials and progressively reducing the overall number of nuclear weapons and a speedy conclusion of a comprehensive test ban treaty.

*Minutes of the WCC Central Committee, Geneva, 1980, in op. cit. pp 43f*

The following year, in Dresden (GDR), it received a report from the Program for Disarmament and against Militarism and the Arms Race, and said:

The Central Committee...calls upon the churches now to:

- 1) challenge the military and militaristic policies that lead to disastrous distortions of foreign policy sapping the capacity of the nations of the world to deal with pressing economic and social priorities which have become a paramount political issue of our times;
- 2) counter the trend to characterize those of other nations and ideologies as the "enemy" through the promotion of hatred and prejudice;
- 3) assist in de-mythologizing current doctrines of national security and elaborate new concepts of security based on justice and the rights of peoples;...

Commends the work of a large number of peace and disarmament groups and movements, old and new, around the world, in several of which large numbers of Christians actively participate in obedience to the demands of the Gospel...

Urges the churches, in the context of the preparations for the

Sixth Assembly, whose theme is "Jesus Christ, the Life of the World," to make commitment to peace-making a special concern and to give emphasis to studies on issues related to peace, paying special attention to the underlying theological issues.

*Minutes of the WCC Central Committee, Dresden, 1981, in op. cit. pp 45ff.*

In November 1981, the WCC convened an International Public Hearing on Nuclear Weapons and Disarmament at the Free University in Amsterdam. A hearing panel of 17 church leaders, theologians and ethicists from all the world's region heard testimony from 38 expert witnesses, including former US national security advisors, USSR foreign policy experts, senior diplomats in the field of disarmament, political leaders including Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme, leading nuclear scientists and leaders of anti-nuclear peace movements in several parts of the world. Its extensive report was submitted to the WCC

Central Committee and widely distributed. It contained, *inter alia*, the following affirmations:

We believe 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. ... We recognize that nuclear weapons will not disappear because of such an affirmation by the churches. But it will involve the churches and their members in a fundamental examination of their own implicit or explicit support of policies which, implicitly or explicitly, are based on the possession and use of those weapons.

*Before It's Too Late: The Challenge of Nuclear Disarmament*, WCC, Geneva, 1983, pp 3ff.

Dr. Philip Potter took these affirmations and the rising concern of the ecumenical movement back to the United Nations the following year when he addressed the plenary session of the Second Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament.

...Compared with the public mood in 1978 when you last met, the growing massive strength of movements of people of every walk of life and ideological position gives us hope that the political will to take concrete steps to disarmament will emerge, and that governments will respect and act on this will. ...

During the last four years after the First Special Session on Disarmament the economic crisis has worsened throughout the world with grave consequences for the poor nations resulting in tensions within and among nations. The continuing stalemate in the North-South discussions on global issues has been accompanied by policies of confrontation and an attempt to divide the South. The present global military order is inextricably tied up with the economic and social system and therefore the quest for disarmament can in no way be isolated from the struggle for justice and human dignity. Consequently, there is deep distrust among the peoples of the Third World about the postures of the nuclear weapon states on deterrence and non-proliferation. Their struggles for social and political change are often distorted by the security considerations and economic interests of the major powers. ...

“Choose Life!” (Deut.30:15,19) Choose what is good, that is, what expresses our inner being as made in God’s image to be shared with others. Choose the blessing, that is, what communicates our vitality to others, what enables us to put what we are and have at the disposal of others that they might become their true selves and share their lives also with others. That is God’s purpose revealed in creation and in men and women made in his image to participate in his life and communicate that life to one another according to his commandments and promises of good. That is life. That is true security and peace.

Statement by WCC General Secretary Philip Potter to the Second Special Session of the UN General Assembly devoted to Disarmament, NY, June 1982, in *The Churches in International Affairs 1979-82*, pp 49ff.

At this same meeting of the UN General Assembly, Patriarch Pimen of the Russian Orthodox Church presented the report of the World Conference of Religious Workers for Saving the Sacred Gift of Life from Nuclear Catastrophe he convened in Moscow in May 1982.

The Central Committee in July 1982 commended the report of the International Public Hearings, highlighting its recommendations and calling upon the churches to take clear positions on them. It also issued a statement lamenting the lack of progress at the UN Special Session and renewed its call to the churches and governments to promote peace and disarmament. In this same period, two volumes were published by the CCIA in the context of the Program for Disarmament and against Militarism and the Arms Race, entitled *The Security Trap I and II* (WCC, Geneva, and IDOC, Rome, 1979 and 1982), that provided in-depth analysis and theological perspectives on militarism and the nuclear arms race. *Peace and Disarmament*, A compendium of major documents of the WCC and the Roman Catholic Church, was also published jointly by the CCIA and the Pontifical Commission "Justitia et Pax" (Rome and Geneva, 1982).

The Sixth WCC Assembly in Vancouver, 1983, was held at a time when massive public protests were being held around the world against the nuclear arms race, many of them inspired or led by the churches. This Assembly was particularly marked by this concern. It said:

Humanity is now living in the dark shadow of an arms race more intense, and of systems of injustice more widespread, more dangerous and more costly than the world has ever known. Never before has the human race been as close as it is now to total self-destruction. Never before have so many lived in the grip of deprivation and oppression.

Under that shadow we have gathered here...to proclaim our common faith in Jesus Christ, the Life of the Word, and to say to the world:

- fear not, for Christ has overcome the forces of evil; in him are all things made new;
- fear not; for the love of God, rise up for justice and for peace;
- trust in the power of Christ who reigns over all; give witness to him in word and in deed, regardless of the cost...

The churches today are called to confess anew their faith, and to repent for the times when Christians have remained silent in the face of injustice or threats to peace. The biblical vision of peace with justice for all, of wholeness, of unity for all God's people is not one of several options for the followers of Christ. It is an imperative in our time...

We call upon the churches, especially those in Europe, both East and West, and in North America, to redouble their efforts to convince their governments to reach a negotiated settlement and to turn away now, before it is too late, from plans to deploy additional or new nuclear weapons in Europe, and to begin immediately to reduce and then eliminate altogether present nuclear forces.

We urge the churches as well to intensify their efforts to stop the rapidly growing deployment of nuclear weapons and support systems in the Indian and Pacific Oceans, and to press their governments to withdraw from or refuse to base or service ships or airplanes bearing nuclear weapons in their regions...

...(I)n the spirit of the Fifth Assembly's appeal to the churches "to emphasize their readiness to live without the protection of armaments," we believe that Christians should give witness to their unwillingness to participate in any conflict involving weapons of mass destruction or indiscriminate effect.

*Gathered for Life*, Official Report of the VI. Assembly of the WCC, Vancouver, 1983, WCC, Geneva, pp 131ff.

The Vancouver Assembly also called on the churches to engage in a "conciliar process of mutual commitment (covenant) to justice, peace and the integrity of all creation" and to make this a priority for all WCC programs.

The period following the Vancouver Assembly provided no new policy statements on nuclear weapons, but was one in which the WCC encouraged a number of international disarmament initiatives and pressed on the major nuclear powers their responsibilities to disarm. WCC General Secretaries encouraged the initiatives of the "Middle Power Coalition," the signatories of the Delhi Declaration, the Groupe Bellerive and others. Letters were written to President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev on the occasions of their summit meetings in Geneva and Iceland, encouraging them to take more rapid steps toward nuclear disarmament. On the eve of the meeting of the same leaders in Geneva in January 1987, the Central Committee welcomed the resumption of the earlier talks and appealed to the two nations:

- to declare a moratorium on nuclear tests as a provisional measure that would enable negotiations towards a comprehensive test ban treaty;
- to negotiate agreements on substantial reduction of strategic weapons and elimination of medium range missiles, with a definite time-table;
- to take all necessary steps to present the development of space weapons and to strengthen the terms of the Anti-Ballistic Missiles Treaty.

The WCC specially appeals to the US government to respond positively to the initiatives of the USSR on moratorium on nuclear testing, to review its decision to exceed the SALT II ceilings and to reconsider its Strategic Defense Initiative. The WCC also appeals to the USSR government to reinstate and continue the moratorium on nuclear testing.

The Central Committee renews its appeal to the French government to stop forthwith nuclear weapon testing in Polynesia...

We urge the churches in the context of the call to strengthen their commitment to justice, peace and the integrity of creation:

- to intensify their engagement in efforts for peace by specifically working for an end to nuclear testing as an immediate priority;
- to engage in bilateral and multilateral discussions among churches with a view to promoting common understandings and developing common strategies;
- to join other forces of peace for public education and efforts to influence policies of governments and inter-governmental bodies;
- to support the Six Nations Initiative and that of the South Pacific Forum.

*Minutes of the Central Committee, Geneva, January 1987, in The Churches in International Affairs, 1987-1990, WCC, Geneva, 1990, pp 44ff.*

Later that year, the WCC Officers welcomed the conclusion of the agreements at the USA-USSR Summit in Washington DC, saying that

The agreement to eliminate intermediate nuclear forces and thus an entire class of nuclear weapons is a significant achievement especially with the elaborate system of verification which augurs well for further steps in nuclear disarmament. The initiative already taken for making proposals for reducing strategic nuclear weapons is reassuring.

WCC Officers' Statement on the Washington Summit, 14 December 1987, *op. cit.*, p 47.

In a statement presented by Dr. Lamar Gible, a CCIA Commissioner, the WCC told the Third Session of the UN General Assembly devoted to Disarmament (1988):

In the limited time given for this testimony, among many concerns, we choose the following for emphasis. Firstly, even in the aura of a historic agreement to reduce intermediate range nuclear weapons the awful risk of nuclear war remains. We are painfully aware that this agreement can only reduce the nuclear arsenal by 3%. We would, therefore, urge the pursuit of every possible effort to further reduce and ultimately eliminate these weapons of mass destruction. We reiterate the declaration of our most recent Assembly that "the production and deployment of nuclear weapons as well as their

use constitute a crime against humanity, and therefore there<sup>3</sup> should be a complete halt in the production of nuclear weapons and in weapons research and development in all nations, to be expeditiously enforced through a treaty..." Only if such a comprehensive approach is taken to nuclear disarmament and complemented and reinforced by mutually accepted verification procedures and by the new technology available for verification can the possibility of nuclear holocaust be significantly reduced. We would encourage this session to establish a multilateral mechanism under the auspices of the United Nations to perform such verification functions for our global community.

Secondly, while we recognize the possibility of significant steps in the reduction of nuclear weapons, we cannot overlook the significant new dynamics in the arms race. We view with alarm the development of "star wars" technology, chemical weapons, and the ever more deadly capacity of conventional weapons which blur the distinction between conventional and nuclear, and defensive and offensive weapons. Only through multilateral agreements banning the research, development and testing of these new weapons can we effectively end this process....

*op. cit.* pp 48ff

The WCC addressed a letter in 1987 to President Bush and General Secretary Gorbachev on the occasion of their summit meeting in Malta, reiterating appeals addressed earlier. But this was the last initiative on nuclear weapons before the VII. Assembly in Canberra (1991).

In Canberra the agenda was radically shifted in the direction of post Cold War armed interventions and internal conflicts. That assembly, meeting as the Gulf War was raging, gave strong clues that this would be a period of divided views and sometimes contentious relationships among the churches as they wrestled with new challenges. The VII. Assembly adopted a major policy statement on the implications of the use of armed force by the Gulf Coalition led by the USA, and another on internal conflicts. The attention of the Central Committee was fixed for most of the ensuing decade on the implications of such challenges and by renewed debates and efforts to address the churches' positions on violence.

The war in Bosnia/Herzegovina again led to contentious debates in the Central Committee on the old tension between the Christian traditions of pacifism and the just war. In 1994, on the basis of a background document, "Overcoming the Spirit, Logic and Practice of War," the Central Committee created the Program to Overcome Violence. In the course of the international campaign, "Peace to the City," carried out in the context of the POV, the focus turned especially to the issue of small arms and light weapons, and this has continued as a part of the new ecumenical Decade to Overcome Violence established by the VIII. Assembly in Harare (1998).

The disarmament agenda shifted more to the area of conventional arms, following the line traced earlier in consultations on militarism and disarmament. The CCIA Commission held a consultation in 1993 on the conventional arms trade (cf. *The Arms Trade Today*, CCIA Background Information, 1993/1, WCC, Geneva, 1993) and adopted a statement on the subject.

Soon after the Harare Assembly, the following document was issued, and it was the last major policy statement devoted particularly to nuclear weapons to date.

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and therefore morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment...

(Therefore) we ask the delegates to call resolutely upon the nuclear weapons states to embark upon a series of steps along the road leading to nuclear abolition. There is broad consensus...on what these steps should be. They include:

- declare a policy of no first use among themselves and non-use in relation to non-nuclear weapons 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.

...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...We appeal to the delegates...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 the earth.

Joint statement of WCC General Secretary Konrad Raiser and Cardinal Daneels, President of Pax Christi International to the NPT Review Conference Preparatory Committee, Geneva, April 1998.

At its first meeting (Morges, Switzerland, January 2000), the newly elected Commission of the Churches on International Affairs adopted guidelines for programmatic work in the field of disarmament which stressed the need for the WCC and its member churches to turn their attention back the continuing threat of nuclear weapons. So, concern about nuclear weapons

has not disappeared from the WCC agenda. However, it has been dropped to the lowest levels of priority of many churches, including those in nuclear weapons states. There is an urgent need for the ecumenical movement to remember its history and to reassert leadership at what is in fact a very critical moment of new challenges to the international disarmament regime and the ever more dangerous legacy of the decaying products of the decades-long US-USSR nuclear arms race. Statements alone will not be enough. The statements reviewed here were often backed by movements in the churches working to bring official church assemblies with them in action and conviction. If we are to be effective again, attention will have to be paid during the forthcoming ecumenical Decade to Overcome Violence to the strengthening, regeneration re-connection of such movements.

Geneva, 4 October 2000

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Isabelle Ferrari" <ife@wcc-coe.org>  
Subject: Re: Zero-nukes web site  
Date: Wed, 29 May 2002 12:04:53 -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

Thanks for your prompt response. Here is further query.

Regarding Dwain's 2000 report on "The Evolution of World Council of Churches Policy on Nuclear Arms and Disarmament, 1948-2000", is it correct to assume that it is not available on your web site? And that if we want it to be available, we should post it on [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org)? I am willing to do that. However, it would be preferable to have a linkage to your web site if you are willing to post it there.

I'll let you know when our site is available for wider viewing.

Shalom,  
Howard Hallman

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Phillip H. Miller" <millerph@att.net>  
Subject: EarthLink bill  
Date: Wed, 29 May 2002 13:03:20 -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,

I called EarthLink to find out if that check had shown up. It had not.

While on the phone, I made arrangements to pay directly by bank draft. That is, they will draw down on our bank account each month for the amount due. I decided to pay what we owe that way: \$15.95 and \$16.95. Therefore, I won't send in the checks you prepared.

I hope this works out okay.

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 mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net ([204.127.131.47])  
by walker.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17da4i60K3N13s70  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 29 May 2002 16:29:13 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from webmail.worldnet.att.net ([204.127.135.43])  
by mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net  
(InterMail vM.4.01.03.27 201-229-121-127-20010626) with SMTP  
id <20020529202912.CIUQ13408.mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net@webmail.worldnet.att.net>  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 29 May 2002 20:29:12 +0000  
Received: from [12.91.114.197] by webmail.worldnet.att.net;  
Wed, 29 May 2002 20:29:11 +0000  
From: millerph@att.net  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: EarthLink bill  
Date: Wed, 29 May 2002 20:29:11 +0000  
X-Mailer: AT&T Message Center Version 1 (May 26 2002)  
Message-Id: <20020529202912.CIUQ13408.mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net@webmail.worldnet.att.net>

Howard,  
As you find out when you receive the check I sent you  
this morning, a so-called "Bank Draft", by which you  
mean direct debit from our account, would not be my  
preferred method.

As a result of EarthLink, Inc., for the first time I will  
have two spoiled checks, and uncertain balances for the  
rest of my tenure as treasurer. That doesn't make a  
treasurer happy. At all.

Phil  
> Phil,  
>  
> I called EarthLink to find out if that check had shown up. It had not.  
>  
> While on the phone, I made arrangements to pay directly by bank draft. That  
> is, they will draw down on our bank account each month for the amount due.  
> I decided to pay what we owe that way: \$15.95 and \$16.95. Therefore, I  
> won't send in the checks you prepared.  
>  
> I hope this works out okay.  
>  
> 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: <millerph@att.net>  
Subject: Re: EarthLink bill  
Date: Wed, 29 May 2002 17:28:48 -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,

I acted too hastily. I was trying to get this situation solved quickly.

I have reversed the arrangement with EarthLink. I'll use the checks to pay for what is due, so they will be used, not spoiled. Starting with next month, Earthlink will bill my credit card. You will have no uncertain balances.

I don't want to have an unhappy treasurer. You're too valuable to Methodists United.

Howard

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

From: millerph@att.net <millerph@att.net>  
To: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.org>  
Date: Wednesday, May 29, 2002 4:29 PM  
Subject: Re: EarthLink bill

>Howard,

>As you find out when you receive the check I sent you  
>this morning, a so-called "Bank Draft", by which you  
>mean direct debit from our account, would not be my  
>preferred method.

>

>As a result of EarthLink, Inc., for the first time I will  
>have two spoiled checks, and uncertain balances for the  
>rest of my tenure as treasurer. That doesn't make a  
>treasurer happy. At all.

>

>Phil

>> Phil,

>>

>> I called EarthLink to find out if that check had shown up. It had not.

>>

>> While on the phone, I made arrangements to pay directly by bank draft.  
That

>> is, they will draw down on our bank account each month for the amount due.

>> I decided to pay what we owe that way: \$15.95 and \$16.95. Therefore, I  
>> won't send in the checks you prepared.  
>>  
>> I hope this works out okay.  
>>  
>> 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: <zack@gsinstitute.org>  
Subject: New web site  
Date: Wed, 29 May 2002 17:09:58 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;  
    boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_000A\_01C20733.A9AFEA40"  
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 Zack,

About a month ago I talked with you about a new web site -- [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org) -- that the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is creating. Its purposes are (1) to pull together policy statements of religious organizations on nuclear disarmament, reports and statements from civil sector organizations, and views of military leaders and (2) to promote dialogue on how to get to zero nuclear weapons.

It's taken longer than I thought to get initial material on line, but now we have some things to share. You can see what we are about by going to:  
[www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org)  
[www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html](http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html)  
[www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogetozero.html](http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/howtogetozero.html).

I'm also sending as a Word attachment an initial draft of the page for Military Leaders Speak Out for Nuclear Disarmament.

You will note in the latter that we reference the Statement by International Generals and Admirals, developed by Senator Cranston and posted on the Global Security Institute web site. There are references to other items on your web site. When we put together the civil sector statements, we will make reference to other items.

With this background, I have several requests.

(1) Do you have available photos of Senator Cranston releasing the Generals and Admirals statement and of Generals Goodpaster and Butler at that event? We would like to include them on our site. Actually for Senator Cranston any photo would do.

(2) Can you suggest other military leaders who have spoken out individually for nuclear disarmament? In particular we would like to make reference to statements that are available on the World Wide Web.

(3) For the How to Get to Zero page we are seeking the ideas of military leaders, scientist, other professionals, and others on scenarios for achieving that objective. We have no maximum or minimum, but perhaps the 1,000 to 3,000 word range might be appropriate. In your outreach to military leaders, would you be willing to help us solicit their contributions to this web page?

You can reply by e-mail, or call me at 301 896-0013.

Thanks for your cooperation,  
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](mailto: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.

# MILITARY LEADERS SPEAK OUT FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

## Statements

International Generals and Admirals  
General Andrew J. Goodpaster and General Lee Butler

## Individual Views

General Lee Butler  
Admiral Noel Gayler  
Commander Robert Green  
General Charles Horner  
  
General Collin Powell

## Statements

### International Generals and Admirals Speak Out

[photo of Senator Cranston at release of statement] *On December 5, 1996 there was worldwide release of a **Statement by International Generals and Admirals** [<http://www.gs institute.org/archives/000014.shtml>] calling for the abolition of nuclear weapons. Initiated by the late Senator Alan Cranston of the Global Security Institute [[www.gs institute.org](http://www.gs institute.org)], the statement was signed by 60 military leaders from around the globe, including from the United States, Russia, 6 United Kingdom, France, Canada, Denmark, Ghana, Greece, India, Japan, Jordan, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Sri Lanka, and Tanzania. The closing words were:*

- We have been presented with a challenge of the highest possible historic importance: the creation of a nuclear-weapons-free world. The end of the Cold War makes it possible.
  
- The dangers of proliferation, terrorism, and a new nuclear arms race render it necessary. We must not fail to seize our opportunity.

## **Statement by General Andrew J. Goodpaster and General Lee Butler**

[photo of the two generals] *On December 4, 1996 at a Newsmaker Luncheon at the National Press Club, General Andrew J. Goodpaster and General Lee Butler released a **Joint Statement on Reduction of Nuclear Weapons Arsenals: Declining Utility, Continuing Risks** [<http://www.gs institute.org/archives/000009.shtml>]. General Goodpaster was former Supreme Allied Commander in Europe (1969-74). General Butler was former Commander-in-Chief of the U.S Strategic Command and its predecessor, the Strategic Air Command (1992-94). Among other things they said:*

- With the end of the Cold War, [nuclear] weapons are of sharply reduced utility, and there is much now to be gained by substantially reducing their numbers and lowering their alert status, meanwhile exploring the feasibility of their ultimate elimination.
  
- The ultimate objective of phased reductions should be the complete elimination of nuclear weapons from all nations. No one can say today whether or when this final goal will prove feasible....We believe that the time for action is now, for the alternative of inaction could very well carry a high price.

## **Individual Views**

### **General Lee Butler**

[photo] *A graduate of the U. S. Air Force Academy, General Lee Butler, U.S. Air Force (ret.), served in Vietnam, commanded a heavy bomber wing, and filled a variety positions at the Pentagon. In 1991 he became the Commander-in-Chief of the Strategic Air Command and its successor agency, the U.S. Strategic Command until his retirement in 1994.*

*After his retirement General Butler served as member of the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons. His first public expression of his views on this issue occurred in October 1996 in an Address to the State of the World Forum [<http://www.gs institute.org/archives/000008.shtml>].*

*Two months later he addressed a national broadcast audience in **Remarks at the National Press Club** [[linkage to be added](#)]. On this occasion he spoke of the rapid changes taking place since the end of the Cold War and his reflections of what was occurring. In his remarks he indicated*

Most importantly, I could see for the first time the prospect of restoring a world free of the apocalyptic threat of nuclear weapons. Over time, the shimmering hope gave way to judgement which has now become a deeply held conviction: that a world free of the threat of nuclear weapons is necessarily a world devoid of nuclear weapons.

*General Butler elaborated on the concerns which compelled this conviction.*

First, a growing alarm that despite all evidence, we have yet to fully grasp the monstrous effects of these weapons, that the consequences of their use defy reason, transcending time and space, poisoning the earth and deforming its inhabitants.

Second, a deepening dismay at the prolongation of Cold War policies and practices in a world where our security interests have been utterly transformed.

Third, that foremost among these policies, deterrence reigns unchallenged, with its embedded assumption of hostility and associated preference for forces on high states of alert.

Fourth, an acute unease over renewed assertions of the utility of nuclear weapons, especially as regards response to chemical or biological attack.

Fifth, grave doubt that the present highly discriminatory regime of nuclear and non-nuclear states can long endure absent a credible commitment by the nuclear powers to eliminate their nuclear arsenals.

And finally, the horrific prospect of a world seething with enmities, armed to the teeth with nuclear weapons, and hostage to maniacal leaders strongly disposed toward their use.

*General Butler noted that "the world has begun to recoil from the nuclear abyss." But, he noted:*

There is a much larger issue which now confronts the nuclear powers and engages the vital interest of every nation: whether the world is better served by a prolonged era of cautious nuclear weapons reductions toward some intermediate endpoint; or by an unequivocal commitment on the part of the nuclear powers to move with much greater urgency toward the goal of eliminating these arsenals in their entirety.

*General Butler chose the latter course. His National Press Club Remarks occurred upon the occasion of the joint statement with General Goodpaster and*

*the Statement of International Generals and Admirals. General Butler said that he had decided*

to join my voice with respected colleagues such as General Goodpaster to urge publicly that the United States make unequivocal its commitment to the elimination of nuclear arsenals, and take the lead in setting an agenda for moving forthrightly toward that objective.

*In subsequent months General Butler continued to speak out on the need to eliminate nuclear weapons. He returned to the National Press Club on February 2, 1998 and gave a speech on **The Risks of Nuclear Deterrence: From Superpowers to Rogue Leaders**. [<http://www.gsintstitute.org/archives/000023.shtml>] Among other matters he dealt with the legitimacy of nuclear retaliation.*

What better illustration of misplaced faith in nuclear deterrence than the persistent belief that retaliation with nuclear weapons is a legitimate and appropriate response to post-cold war threats posed by weapons of mass destruction. What could possibly justify our resort to the very means we properly abhor and condemn? Who can imagine our joining in shattering the precedent of non-use that has held for over fifty years? How could America's irreplaceable role as leader of the campaign against nuclear proliferation ever be re-justified?

What target would warrant such retaliation? Would we hold an entire society accountable for the decision of a single demented leader? How would the physical effects of the nuclear explosion be contained, not to mention the political and moral consequences? In a singular act we would martyr our enemy, alienate our friends, give comfort to the non-declared nuclear states and impetus to states who seek such weapons covertly.

In short, such a response on the part of the United States is inconceivable. It would irretrievably diminish our priceless stature as a nation noble in aspiration and responsible in conduct, even in the face of extreme provocation.

*In a speech given at the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library in Boston on November 22, 1998, General Butler offered a set of judgments on nuclear weapons and nuclear war, including the following:*

- Nuclear weapons are not weapons at all. They are insanely destructive agents of physical and genetic terror, whose effects transcend time and space, poisoning the earth and deforming its inhabitants for generation upon generation.
- The stakes of nuclear war engage not just the survival of the antagonists but the fate of mankind.

- The prospect of shearing away entire societies has no military nor political justification.

### **Admiral Noel Gayler**

[photo] *Admiral Noel Gayler, U.S. Navy (ret.) served during World War II as a carrier fighter pilot. His subsequent sea commands included fighter and experimental squadrons, and carriers. From 1972 until his retirement as a four-star admiral he was Commander-in-Chief of all U.S. forces in the Pacific. In 1984 Admiral Gayler offered "A Commander-in-Chief's Perspective on Nuclear Weapons" in The Nuclear Crisis Reader (Gwyn Prins, editor; New York, Vintage Books, 1984, pp. 16-18).*

[permission pending to use excerpt]

### **Commander Robert Green**

[photo] *In his twenty years of service in the Royal Navy, Commander Robert Green (ret.) from New Zealand flew nuclear-armed aircraft for nine years and then served in the intelligence service. During his navy career he became disillusioned with nuclear deterrence. Becoming a strong advocate of nuclear abolition in his retirement, he presented his views in The Naked Nuclear Emperor: Debunking Nuclear Deterrence (2000, The Disarmament and Security Center, P.O. Box 8390, Christchurch, New Zealand).*

*Commander Green summarized his thinking in an article entitled **Why Nuclear Deterrence is a Dangerous Illusion** [<http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/deter.html>], posted by the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation. Highlights are as follows:*

- What is at stake from deterrence failing between nuclear weapon states is the devastation and poisoning of not just the belligerent powers, but potentially of all forms of life on the planet.
- Meanwhile, retention of nuclear arsenals encourages proliferation of the problem, and with it this unacceptable risk.
- The Bomb directly threatens security -- both of those who possess it and those it is meant to impress. Indeed, it is a security problem, not a solution. This is because it provokes the greatest threat: namely, the spread of nuclear weapons to megalomaniac leaders and terrorist -- who are least likely to be deterred.

## General Charles A. Horner

[photo] *In his Air Force career General Charles Horner served two tours of duty as a combat pilot in Vietnam. In 1991, he was Allied Air Forces Commander in Gulf War, and from 1992 to 1994 he served as Commander of the U.S. Space Command. On July 15, 1994, just prior to retirement from the U.S. Air Force, General Horner offered his views on the utility of nuclear weapons at a breakfast meeting of the Defense Writers' Group. As reported in a variety of newspaper accounts, he said the following:*

- The nuclear weapon is obsolete. I want to get rid of them all
  
- I want to go to zero, and I'll tell you why: If we and the Russians can go to zero nuclear weapons, then think what that does for us in our efforts to counter the new war.
  
- The new military threat, unlike the superpower tensions of the past, comes from smaller, less stable countries that obtain weapons of mass destruction.
  
- Think how intolerant we will be of nations that are developing nuclear weapons if we have none. Think of the high moral ground we secure by having none...It's kind of hard for us to say to North Korea, 'You are terrible people, you're developing a nuclear weapons,' when we have oh, 8,000.
  
- I'm not saying that we militarily disarm. I'm saying that I have a nuclear weapon, and you're North Korea and you have a nuclear weapon. You can use yours. I can't use mine. What am I going to use it on? What are nuclear weapons good for? Busting cities. What president of the United States is going to take out Pyongyang?
  
- So then, you say, 'Why do I have nuclear weapons?' To use against small countries creating problems. But then you get into that moral issue...I just don't think nuclear weapons are usable.

*General Horner was one of 18 military leaders who joined 21 religious leaders in signing the Joint Statement on Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament [<http://www.nrdi.org/nuclear/Nuclear02.html>] in June 2000. In his own statement [<http://www.nrdi.org/nuclear/NuclearP03.html>] on that occasion he said, among other things:*

- The Cold War is over. The United States and Russia no longer require the strategy of nuclear deterrence. Yet the world remains a dangerous place.
- The Statement...addresses the fact that nuclear deterrence increasingly lacks credibility, and if these weapons are retained for such purposes, it may only legitimize their use. It is hopeful, but not overly optimistic, as it calls for reciprocal and phased reductions that may require many years. It is a challenge, for while the banning of nuclear weapons is not the sole responsibility of the United States, we are in a position to lead the effort.

## **General Colin Powell**

[photo] *General Colin Powell, U.S. Army (ret.) entered the Army through the ROTC. He had two tours of duty in Vietnam and served as a battalion commander in Korea. He held a succession of military and civilian positions, culminating as National Security Adviser to President Reagan. In 1989 President George H.W. Bush appointed him Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a position he held until the fall of 1993 under President Clinton. He now serves as Secretary of State under President George W. Bush.*

*In a commencement address at Harvard University on June 10, 1993 General Powell spoke on the future of nuclear weapons.*

Today -- on what happens to be the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the talks that led to the Limited Test Ban Treaty -- 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.

*Three months later General Powell articulated his views on the utility of nuclear weapons in a breakfast meeting with the Defense Writers' Group, held on September 23, 1993.*

- With respect to nuclear weapons, I think their principal purpose remains deterrence against a major nuclear attack against the United States, however remote that might be, and thank God it's becoming more and more and more remote.
- The second part of that, though, has to do with the fact that there are a number of nations in the Third World who think that they will gain some political or military utility through the possession of nuclear weapons. Every time I get a chance to talk to them, I try to dissuade them of that. And I make the point that I think that it's a wasted investment in a military capability that is limited in political or military utility, and that we have ways of responding and

punishing conventionally that you would not wish to see us use. And at the end of the day, we have far more nuclear weapons than you do, so what's the utility that you get out of this?

- I have not been faced with a military situation in the several conflicts we've been involved in over the last four years where I thought there was going to be a need to resort to such weapons, and I'm glad that turned out to be the case. We've had two wars [in Panama and the Persian Gulf], six rescues and 22 other major events in the last four years for these reluctant warriors in the Pentagon.

### **Admiral Stansfield Turner**

*After serving as Commander of a carrier task group of the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean (1970-71), Commander of the Second Fleet in the Atlantic (1974-75), and Commander-in-Chief of Allied Forces in Southern Europe, NATO (1975), Admiral Stansfield Turner, USN (ret.) was Director of Central Intelligence (1977-81).*

*In 1997 Admiral Turner offered his ideas on nuclear weapons in a book entitled Caging the Nuclear Genie: An American Challenge for Global Security (Westview Press). He wrote that*

*it is time to move away from the Cold War policy of "sitting on hair trigger alert with thousands of nuclear warheads" (p.99). As an alternative, he offered a new vision based on*

- strategic escrow,
- a Treaty of No First-Use supplemented with sanctions, and
- modest defenses (p.102).

*Admiral Turner explained his idea of strategic escrow in a 1999 interview [<http://www.cdi.org/adm/1316/stansfield.html>] recorded by the Center for Defense Information.*

It's a process I call strategic escrow. It's a form of de-alerting both the Russian and American nuclear forces. You take a thousand warheads off of missiles in the United States today and you move them maybe 300 miles away, so they can't just go back overnight. You ask the Russians to put observers on that

storage site where you've put the thousand warheads. They can count what went in, they can count if anything went out.

You don't need detailed verification procedures that take years to negotiate in a treaty. What you hope is the Russians then take a thousand off and put our observers on them. A lot of people think they will not, but I say they have to. It's the only quick way to avoid their having one-fourth to one-sixth the number of warheads on line that we have maybe eight or ten years from now, because of the decline inexorably of the size of their force due to the lack of maintenance.

So then we have a process going. We do another thousand, they do another thousand. I mean from today's numbers, we can be down into hundreds in a matter of, in my opinion, four or five years if we do this. And the most urgent thing for the United States today is to get the Russian nuclear arsenal off alert, get it down to as few of these as possible.

And my ultimate objective is to get every nuclear warhead in the world in escrow so nobody can pull the trigger today, but if somebody cheats, like Saddam Hussein, and decides to threaten the world because he's got the nuclear weapons that he shouldn't, then you still have the warheads in escrow and you can bring them back and say, "Saddam, you've got ten, but we just have recombined a hundred, and therefore you have no advantage. In fact, you're very vulnerable if you decide to continue threatening or using nuclear weapons."

*When Admiral Turner joined military and religious leaders in the release of the Joint Statement on Nuclear Reductions/Disarmament [<http://www.nrdi.org/nuclear/Nuclear02.html>] at the Washington National Cathedral in June 2000, he said in his own statement [<http://www.nrdi.org/nuclear/NuclearP08.html>]:*

- We must go downward much more rapidly than we are if we are going to prevent the further proliferation of these weapons to other states as we've recently had proliferation to Pakistan and India.
- As long as the two nuclear superpowers maintain arsenals in the tens of thousands of nuclear warheads, there is no way they can with any consistency urge that other nations not be allowed to acquire these weapons.

Status: U

Return-Path: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>

Received: from harrier.mail.pas.earthlink.net ([207.217.120.12])

by farley.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17dtvm1Bp3NI3pa0  
Thu, 30 May 2002 13:14:23 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from pool-63.49.129.10.bltn.grid.net ([63.49.129.10] helo=esther)

by harrier.prod.itd.earthlink.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #2)  
id 17DTUN-0003Wj-00; Thu, 30 May 2002 10:13:28 -0700

Reply-To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>

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

To: <prgrm@backfromthebrink.net>

Subject: BRINK CAMPAIGN UPDATE

Date: Thu, 30 May 2002 13:18:57 -0400

Message-ID: <NEBBKJHCMLACLOPKCPPBAENNCIAA.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

Dear Friends,

While we have no way of knowing the total number of "Friends Don't Threaten Friends with Nuclear Weapons" faxes that were sent TO President's Bush and Putin, we do know that over 1000 faxes were sent from our web site alone--and many copies were sent to our office. Thanks for your help.

Of course, as we all know, the treaty is a flawed document that won't "liquidate the legacy of the Cold War" as Bush claimed--and nuclear dangers are rising with tensions between India and Pakistan, and the dangerous direction of the nuclear posture review (NPR)

The upcoming Senate hearings on the treaty, leaks of the NPR, and the upcoming elections present us with opportunities to educate on ways to reduce this nuclear threat.

Along with our partner groups, Back from the Brink, plans to move forward aggressively with a concentrated Public Education campaign. As a major part of this effort, Brink Director, Ira Shorr will be visiting local communities in strategically important states. The visits will include community presentations, trainings, media outreach (see the attached op-ed from a recent visit to Maine) and political satire. There's much to burn Bush on. (The article is also printed below and available at <http://backfromthebrink.org/newsroom/pressherald.html>)

If you are interested in finding out more about this, please contact Ira directly at [irashorr@hotmail.com](mailto:irashorr@hotmail.com) or at our NEW PROGRAM address [program@backfromthebrink.ORG](mailto:program@backfromthebrink.ORG) Please note the change from .net to .ORG.

ON A PERSONAL NOTE-- After two great years at the campaign working with a all of you, I am leaving to the Brink campaign as a full time staff member. I expect to continue with the campaign as a consultant for special projects.

To be sure that your inquiries, comments and general communications with the campaign are answered promptly during a transition period, please use the new program address <program@backfromthebrink.ORG> and be sure to cc:irashorr@hotmail.com

Thank you again for all your support and hard work that has contributed to the success of this campaign so far. Your participation has been integral in the success and viability of the campaign. There is still much to be done.

Esther Pank

P.S. It has been great working with all of you. I would like to stay in touch, so please keep me on your e-lists at estherpank@hotmail.com.

\*\*\*\*\*

From the Press Herald, Portland, Maine May 24, 2002 Available at <http://backfromthebrink.org/newsroom/pressherald.html> By Daniel Oppenheim and Ira Shorr  
Missile Pact Should Destroy Warheads  
The U.S.-Russian Summit now underway will be notable more for what is not accomplished than what is. Presidents Bush and Putin are signing an agreement to "reduce" their nuclear arsenals and they once again are declaring their friendship. But behind the smiles, handshakes and treaty announcements lies a darker reality. The United States and Russia still cling to the Cold War policy of being poised to destroy each other with thousands of nuclear weapons on full alert - ready to be launched in minutes. The treaty leaves the United States vulnerable to the threat of a massive nuclear attack by Russia due to a false alert from Russia's deteriorating early warning system. While both presidents will talk about their plans to remove thousands of nuclear weapons from operational status, you can be sure that President Bush won't mention that his Defense Department is busy trying to develop "usable" nuclear weapons. Further, Russia is one of seven nations that the recently leaked Nuclear Posture Review names as potential targets for U.S. nuclear missiles. A newspaper in Moscow responded to the NPR revelations with the headline: "America Prepares Friendly Nuclear Strike for Russia." Even the nuclear "reductions" are a bit of a shell game. The Bush administration wants to reduce the U.S. nuclear arsenal down to some 1,700-2,200 nuclear weapons by removing 3,800 nuclear warheads from operational status. But instead of dismantling these nuclear weapons, the Pentagon wants to keep most of them in a "responsive reserve force" where they could be put back on bombers and missiles. The United States also wants to stockpile additional nuclear warheads in non-operational status. The Natural Resources Defense Council has concluded that the Bush administration is actually planning to retain the potential to deploy as many as 15,000 nuclear warheads. To put these numbers in perspective, in a study earlier this year the NRDC found that just 192 nuclear warheads on one U.S. Trident submarine could cause more than 50 million Russian casualties. Taking nuclear warheads off of missiles is a good idea - it is a form of de-alerting. But substituting

storage for dismantlement makes the claims of "reductions" extremely dubious. This agreement, of course, gives Russia the chance to do as it pleases with its weapons. Storing warheads indefinitely increases the danger that nuclear weapons or nuclear materials in Russia could be stolen or sold to terrorists. What we need are serious steps towards both de-alerting and disarmament. If President Bush were to really fulfill his stated intentions to end the Cold War policy of mutually assured destruction, he would begin by taking all U.S. nuclear weapons off full alert and ask the Russians to join the United States in abandoning a launch-on-warning posture. This would help ensure that the United States and Russia don't stumble into a nuclear war by accident or miscalculation. A truly historic summit meeting would result in the United States and Russia announcing that: 1) Nuclear warheads targeted for elimination will be removed from missiles and stored, secured and verified. 2) these weapons will then be dismantled as part of a binding treaty so the reductions are irreversible. 3) The two nations will remove all their nuclear weapons from full-alert status. The summit would also be a good time for President Bush to respond to the concerns expressed by Russia and other nations over U.S. plans to develop new nuclear weapons. The president could commit to not restarting the nuclear arms race and reaffirm the commitment the United States made under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to work for the eventual elimination of weapons of mass destruction. Unfortunately, we're likely to see more smiles than substance at the summit. Daniel Oppenheim is co-president of Physicians for Social Responsibility in Maine. Ira Shorr is director of Back From the Brink, a coalition of 40 national arms control organizations working to get nuclear weapons off high-alert status.

Back from the Brink Campaign  
6856 Eastern Avenue, NW, # 322  
Washington DC 20012  
202.545.1001 ph  
202.545.1004 fax  
NEW E-MAIL ADDRESS: [program@backfromthebrink.ORG](mailto:program@backfromthebrink.ORG)

WEBSITE [www.backfromthebrink.org](http://www.backfromthebrink.org)

---

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

Status: U

Return-Path: <debate44646@yahoo.com>

Received: from igcb.igc.apc.org ([192.82.108.46])

by walker.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17dwXWBfH3N13s70  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 30 May 2002 16:56:12 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from web10704.mail.yahoo.com (web10704.mail.yahoo.com [216.136.130.212])

by igcb.igc.apc.org (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id NAA09396  
for <mupj@igc.apc.org>; Thu, 30 May 2002 13:54:26 -0700 (PDT)

Message-ID: <20020530205609.83541.qmail@web10704.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [24.140.23.16] by web10704.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Thu, 30 May 2002 13:56:09 PDT

Date: Thu, 30 May 2002 13:56:09 -0700 (PDT)

From: hipkins james <debate44646@yahoo.com>

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

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Took the Peace Leaf to be mailed this afternoon. They really drug their feet printing it. I'll have to talk with the guy and see what the problem might be. I did not include you as the author of the article on the nuclear posture. I am sorry . I left it off. Not intentionally.

Jim

---

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! - Official partner of 2002 FIFA World Cup

<http://fifaworldcup.yahoo.com>

Status: U

Return-Path: <debate44646@yahoo.com>

Received: from igcb.igc.apc.org ([192.82.108.46])

by walker.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17dx20BfK3Nl3s70  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 30 May 2002 17:00:24 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from web10704.mail.yahoo.com (web10704.mail.yahoo.com [216.136.130.212])

by igcb.igc.apc.org (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id NAA10302  
for <mupj@igc.apc.org>; Thu, 30 May 2002 13:57:56 -0700 (PDT)

Message-ID: <20020530205939.83923.qmail@web10704.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [24.140.23.16] by web10704.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Thu, 30 May 2002 13:59:39 PDT

Date: Thu, 30 May 2002 13:59:39 -0700 (PDT)

From: hipkins james <debate44646@yahoo.com>

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

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Tried to sen Phil an email but evidently my address is not correct. The North East Conf. Office did not receive a check in Dec. We still owe them \$128 for that printing.

I just got back Phil's email I sent.

Jim

---

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! - Official partner of 2002 FIFA World Cup

<http://fifaworldcup.yahoo.com>

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "hipkins james" <debate44646@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Phil's e-address  
Date: Fri, 31 May 2002 07:53:54 -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

Jim,

Phil Miller's e-address is now millerph@att.net.

I know I signed the check and sent it to the Conference. Either the U.S. mail or the Conference lost it. From my experience elsewhere the latter is most likely.

I'm looking forward to receiving the next Peace Leaf.

I hope that you and Char are doing well.

Howard

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

From: hipkins james <debate44646@yahoo.com>  
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Thursday, May 30, 2002 5:00 PM

>Tried to sen Phil an email but evidently my address is  
>not correct. The North East Conf. Office did not  
>receive a check in Dec. We still owe them \$128 for  
>that printing.

>  
>I just got back Phil's email I sent.

>  
>Jim

>  
>  
>-----  
>Do You Yahoo!?  
>Yahoo! - Official partner of 2002 FIFA World Cup  
><http://fifaworldcup.yahoo.com>  
>

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Material for a new page  
Date: Thu, 30 May 2002 11:24:58 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;  
    boundary="-----=\_NextPart\_000\_0006\_01C207CC.A1C72160"  
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,

Welcome back! While you were gone, I purchased a new monitor with a larger screen and adjusted it so that I can see our web site in its full width. It makes me better appreciate your design and choice of colors.

I took a fresh look at the home page. I'm speculating about some changes but haven't made up my mind. By snail mail I'm sending you a crude paste up of a possible revision.

I have completed the initial material for the Military Leaders Speak Out page. I'm sending it as Word attachment. It is ready for you to put on line as another draft page.

For a graphic at the beginning I suggest a bald eagle holding olive branches in one claw and arrows in the other. This is based upon the Great Seal of the United States, which is shown on: <http://www.greatseal.com/>

However, I don't want the complete Great Seal design with its shield with stripes and the stars. Our site is international in scope and will have military leaders from other countries. Rather try to find an eagle without this augmentation and put the olive branches and arrows in its claws.

If this is too difficult to accomplish, let me know, and I'll think of another design. You may have an idea, too.

In looking at other web sites, I note the use of colored type for heads and subheadings of articles and speeches. You may want to try this in Military Leaders Speak Out.

I like the way you framed statements on the Religious Statements page. The lines on either side provide a better appearance than words by themselves. Please do the same for Military Leaders Speak Out.

In this latest page I'm making more use of bold in introductory paragraphs to highlight the subject. And also more bullets to break into stream of written text. I have used arrows, which I like better than the standard dot, for it has dynamism. But you may have something else available.

Next I'm going to make a critical review of the Religious Statements page and the How to Get to Zero pages to see whether some these graphic ideas apply. After such revisions are made, do you think we can put these pages on line for others to access?

I'm starting to work on the Arsenal and Treaties page and gathering material for Civil Sector Statements and Reports.

Let me know when you're back and have things for me to see.

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](mailto: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.

# MILITARY LEADERS SPEAK OUT FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

## Statements

International Generals and Admirals

General Andrew J. Goodpaster and General Lee Butler

## Individual Views

General Lee Butler

Admiral Noel Gayler

Commander Robert Green

General Charles Horner

General Collin Powell

## Statements

### International Generals and Admirals Speak Out

[photo of Senator Cranston at release of statement] *On December 5, 1996 there was worldwide release of a **Statement by International Generals and Admirals** [<http://www.gs institute.org/archives/000014.shtml>] calling for **the irrevocable elimination of nuclear weapons**. Initiated by the late Senator Alan Cranston of the Global Security Institute [[www.gs institute.org](http://www.gs institute.org)], the statement was signed by 60 military leaders from around the globe, including from the United States, Russia, 6 United Kingdom, France, Canada, Denmark, Ghana, Greece, India, Japan, Jordan, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Sri Lanka, and Tanzania. They stated:*

It is our deep conviction that the following is urgently needed and must be undertaken now.

- First, present and planned stockpiles of nuclear weapons are exceedingly large and should now be greatly cut back;
- Second, remaining nuclear weapons should be gradually and transparently taken off alert, and their readiness substantially reduced both in nuclear weapon states and in de facto nuclear weapon states;

- Third, long-term international nuclear policy must be based on the declared principle of continuous, complete and irrevocable elimination of nuclear weapons.



*Their closing words were:*

- We have been presented with a challenge of the highest possible historic importance: the creation of a nuclear-weapons-free world. The end of the Cold War makes it possible.
- The dangers of proliferation, terrorism, and a new nuclear arms race render it necessary. We must not fail to seize our opportunity.



### **Statement by General Andrew J. Goodpaster and General Lee Butler**

[photo of the two generals] *On December 4, 1996 at a Newsmaker Luncheon at the National Press Club, General Andrew J. Goodpaster and General Lee Butler released a **Joint Statement on Reduction of Nuclear Weapons Arsenals: Declining Utility, Continuing Risks** [<http://www.gs institute.org/archives/000009.shtml>]. General Goodpaster was former Supreme Allied Commander in Europe (1969-74). General Butler was former Commander-in-Chief of the U.S Strategic Command and its predecessor, the Strategic Air Command (1992-94). Among other things they said:*

- With the end of the Cold War, [nuclear] weapons are of sharply reduced utility, and there is much now to be gained by substantially reducing their numbers and lowering their alert status, meanwhile exploring the feasibility of their ultimate elimination.
- The ultimate objective of phased reductions should be the complete elimination of nuclear weapons from all nations. No one can say today whether or when this final goal will prove feasible....We believe that the time for action is now, for the alternative of inaction could very well carry a high price.

### **Individual Views**

#### **General Lee Butler**

[photo] *A graduate of the U. S. Air Force Academy, General Lee Butler, U.S. Air Force (ret.), served in Vietnam, commanded a heavy bomber wing, and filled a variety positions at the Pentagon. In 1991 he became the Commander-in-Chief of the Strategic*

*Air Command and its successor agency, the U.S. Strategic Command until his retirement in 1994.*

*After his retirement General Butler served as member of the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons. His first public expression of his views on this issue occurred in October 1996 in an Address to the State of the World Forum [<http://www.gs institute.org/archives/000008.shtml>].*

*Two months later he addressed a national broadcast audience in **Remarks at the National Press Club** [*linkage to be added*]. On this occasion he spoke of **the rapid changes taking place since the end of the Cold War** and his reflections of what was occurring. In his remarks he indicated*

Most importantly, I could see for the first time the prospect of restoring a world free of the apocalyptic threat of nuclear weapons. Over time, the shimmering hope gave way to judgment which has now become a deeply held conviction: that a world free of the threat of nuclear weapons is necessarily a world devoid of nuclear weapons.

*General Butler elaborated on **his concerns** which compelled this conviction.*

- First, a growing alarm that despite all evidence, we have yet to fully grasp the monstrous effects of these weapons, that the consequences of their use defy reason, transcending time and space, poisoning the earth and deforming its inhabitants.
- Second, a deepening dismay at the prolongation of Cold War policies and practices in a world where our security interests have been utterly transformed.
- Third, that foremost among these policies, deterrence reigns unchallenged, with its embedded assumption of hostility and associated preference for forces on high states of alert.
- Fourth, an acute unease over renewed assertions of the utility of nuclear weapons, especially as regards response to chemical or biological attack.
- Fifth, grave doubt that the present highly discriminatory regime of nuclear and non-nuclear states can long endure absent a credible commitment by the nuclear powers to eliminate their nuclear arsenals.

- And finally, the horrific prospect of a world seething with enmities, armed to the teeth with nuclear weapons, and hostage to maniacal leaders strongly disposed toward their use.

*General Butler noted that "the world has begun to recoil from the nuclear abyss." He indicated that **a choice** must be made:*

There is a much larger issue which now confronts the nuclear powers and engages the vital interest of every nation: whether the world is better served by a prolonged era of cautious nuclear weapons reductions toward some intermediate endpoint; or by an unequivocal commitment on the part of the nuclear powers to move with much greater urgency toward the goal of eliminating these arsenals in their entirety.

**General Butler chose the latter course.** *His National Press Club Remarks occurred upon the occasion of the release of the joint statement with General Goodpaster and the Statement of International Generals and Admirals. General Butler said that he had decided*

to join my voice with respected colleagues such as General Goodpaster to urge publicly that the United States make unequivocal its commitment to the elimination of nuclear arsenals, and take the lead in setting an agenda for moving forthrightly toward that objective.

*In subsequent months General Butler continued to speak out on the need to eliminate nuclear weapons. He returned to the National Press Club on February 2, 1998 and gave a speech on **The Risks of Nuclear Deterrence: From Superpowers to Rogue Leaders.** [<http://www.gs institute.org/archives/000023.shtml>] Among other matters he dealt with **the legitimacy of nuclear retaliation.***

What better illustration of misplaced faith in nuclear deterrence than the persistent belief that retaliation with nuclear weapons is a legitimate and appropriate response to post-cold war threats posed by weapons of mass destruction. What could possibly justify our resort to the very means we properly abhor and condemn? Who can imagine our joining in shattering the precedent of non-use that has held for over fifty years? How could America's irreplaceable role as leader of the campaign against nuclear proliferation ever be re-justified?

What target would warrant such retaliation? Would we hold an entire society accountable for the decision of a single demented leader? How would the physical effects of the nuclear explosion be contained, not to mention the political and moral consequences? In a singular act we would martyr our enemy, alienate

our friends, give comfort to the non-declared nuclear states and impetus to states who seek such weapons covertly.

In short, such a response on the part of the United States is inconceivable. It would irretrievably diminish our priceless stature as a nation noble in aspiration and responsible in conduct, even in the face of extreme provocation.

*In a speech given at the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library in Boston on November 22, 1998, General Butler offered a **set of judgments on nuclear weapons and nuclear war**, including the following:*

- Nuclear weapons are not weapons at all. They are insanely destructive agents of physical and genetic terror, whose effects transcend time and space, poisoning the earth and deforming its inhabitants for generation upon generation.
- The stakes of nuclear war engage not just the survival of the antagonists but the fate of mankind.
- The prospect of shearing away entire societies has no military nor political justification.

### **Admiral Noel Gayler**

[photo] *Admiral Noel Gayler, U.S. Navy (ret.) served during World War II as a carrier fighter pilot. His subsequent sea commands included fighter and experimental squadrons, and carriers. From 1972 until his retirement as a four-star admiral he was Commander-in-Chief of all U.S. forces in the Pacific. In 1984 Admiral Gayler offered "A Commander-in-Chief's Perspective on Nuclear Weapons" in The Nuclear Crisis Reader (Gwyn Prins, editor; New York, Vintage Books, 1984, pp. 16-18).*

[permission pending to use excerpt]

### **Commander Robert Green**

[photo] *In his twenty years of service in the Royal Navy, Commander Robert Green (ret.) from New Zealand flew nuclear-armed aircraft for nine years and then served in the intelligence service. During his navy career he became disillusioned with nuclear deterrence. Becoming a strong advocate of nuclear abolition in his retirement, he presented his views in The Naked Nuclear Emperor: Debunking Nuclear Deterrence (2000, The Disarmament and Security Center, P.O. Box 8390, Christchurch, New Zealand).*

Commander Green summarized his thinking in an article entitled **Why Nuclear Deterrence is a Dangerous Illusion** [<http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/deter.html>], posted by the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation. Highlights are as follows:

- What is at stake from deterrence failing between nuclear weapon states is the devastation and poisoning of not just the belligerent powers, but potentially of all forms of life on the planet.
- Meanwhile, retention of nuclear arsenals encourages proliferation of the problem, and with it this unacceptable risk.
- The Bomb directly threatens security -- both of those who possess it and those it is meant to impress. Indeed, it is a security problem, not a solution. This is because it provokes the greatest threat: namely, the spread of nuclear weapons to megalomaniac leaders and terrorist -- who are least likely to be deterred.

### **General Charles A. Horner**

[photo] *In his Air Force career General Charles Horner served two tours of duty as a combat pilot in Vietnam. In 1991, he was Allied Air Forces Commander in Gulf War, and from 1992 to 1994 he served as Commander of the U.S. Space Command. On July 15, 1994, just prior to retirement from the U.S. Air Force, General Horner offered his views on **the utility of nuclear weapons** at a breakfast meeting of the Defense Writers' Group. As reported in a variety of newspaper accounts, he said the following:*

- The nuclear weapon is obsolete. I want to get rid of them all
- I want to go to zero, and I'll tell you why: If we and the Russians can go to zero nuclear weapons, then think what that does for us in our efforts to counter the new war.
- The new military threat, unlike the superpower tensions of the past, comes from smaller, less stable countries that obtain weapons of mass destruction.
- Think how intolerant we will be of nations that are developing nuclear weapons if we have none. Think of the high moral ground we secure by having none...It's kind of hard for us to say to North Korea, 'You are terrible people, you're developing a nuclear weapons,' when we have oh, 8,000.

- I'm not saying that we militarily disarm. I'm saying that I have a nuclear weapon, and you're North Korea and you have a nuclear weapon. You can use yours. I can't use mine. What am I going to use it on? What are nuclear weapons good for? Busting cities. What president of the United States is going to take out Pyongyang?
- So then, you say, 'Why do I have nuclear weapons?' To use against small countries creating problems. But then you get into that moral issue...I just don't think nuclear weapons are usable.

*General Horner was one of 18 military leaders who joined 21 religious leaders in signing the Joint Statement on Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament*

*[<http://www.nrdi.org/nuclear/Nuclear02.html>] in June 2000. In his own statement [<http://www.nrdi.org/nuclear/NuclearP03.html>] on that occasion he said, among other things:*

- The Cold War is over. The United States and Russia no longer require the strategy of nuclear deterrence. Yet the world remains a dangerous place.
- The Statement...addresses the fact that nuclear deterrence increasingly lacks credibility, and if these weapons are retained for such purposes, it may only legitimize their use. It is hopeful, but not overly optimistic, as it calls for reciprocal and phased reductions that may require many years. It is a challenge, for while the banning of nuclear weapons is not the sole responsibility of the United States, we are in a position to lead the effort.

## **General Colin Powell**

*[photo] General Colin Powell, U.S. Army (ret.) entered the Army through the ROTC. He had two tours of duty in Vietnam and served as a battalion commander in Korea. He held a succession of military and civilian positions, culminating as National Security Adviser to President Reagan. In 1989 President George H.W. Bush appointed him Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a position he held until the fall of 1993 under President Clinton. He now serves as Secretary of State under President George W. Bush.*

*In a commencement address at Harvard University on June 10, 1993 General Powell spoke on **the future of nuclear weapons**.*

Today -- on what happens to be the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the talks that led to the Limited Test Ban Treaty -- 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.

*Three months later General Powell articulated his views on **the utility of nuclear weapons** in a breakfast meeting with the Defense Writers' Group, held on September 23, 1993.*

- With respect to nuclear weapons, I think their principal purpose remains deterrence against a major nuclear attack against the United States, however remote that might be, and thank God it's becoming more and more and more remote.
  
- The second part of that, though, has to do with the fact that there are a number of nations in the Third World who think that they will gain some political or military utility through the possession of nuclear weapons. Every time I get a chance to talk to them, I try to dissuade them of that. And I make the point that I think that it's a wasted investment in a military capability that is limited in political or military utility, and that we have ways of responding and punishing conventionally that you would not wish to see us use. And at the end of the day, we have far more nuclear weapons than you do, so what's the utility that you get out of this?
  
- I have not been faced with a military situation in the several conflicts we've been involved in over the last four years where I thought there was going to be a need to resort to such weapons, and I'm glad that turned out to be the case. We've had two wars [in Panama and the Persian Gulf], six rescues and 22 other major events in the last four years for these reluctant warriors in the Pentagon.

### **Admiral Stansfield Turner**

*After serving as Commander of a carrier task group of the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean (1970-71), Commander of the Second Fleet in the Atlantic (1974-75), and Commander-in-Chief of Allied Forces in Southern Europe, NATO (1975), Admiral Stansfield Turner, USN (ret.) was Director of Central Intelligence (1977-81).*

*In 1997 Admiral Turner offered his ideas on nuclear weapons in a book entitled Caging the Nuclear Genie: An American Challenge for Global Security (Westview Press). He wrote that*

*it is time to move away from the Cold War policy of "sitting on hair trigger alert with thousands of nuclear warheads" (p.99). As an alternative (p. 102), he offered a **new vision** based on*

- Strategic escrow
- Treaty of No First-Use supplemented with sanctions
- Modest defenses

*Admiral Turner explained his idea of **strategic escrow** in a 1999 interview [<http://www.cdi.org/adm/1316/stansfield.html>] recorded by the Center for Defense Information.*

It's a process I call strategic escrow. It's a form of de-alerting both the Russian and American nuclear forces. You take a thousand warheads off of missiles in the United States today and you move them maybe 300 miles away, so they can't just go back overnight. You ask the Russians to put observers on that storage site where you've put the thousand warheads. They can count what went in, they can count if anything went out.

You don't need detailed verification procedures that take years to negotiate in a treaty. What you hope is the Russians then take a thousand off and put our observers on them. A lot of people think they will not, but I say they have to. It's the only quick way to avoid their having one-fourth to one-sixth the number of warheads on line that we have maybe eight or ten years from now, because of the decline inexorably of the size of their force due to the lack of maintenance.

So then we have a process going. We do another thousand, they do another thousand. I mean from today's numbers, we can be down into hundreds in a matter of, in my opinion, four or five years if we do this. And the most urgent thing for the United States today is to get the Russian nuclear arsenal off alert, get it down to as few of these as possible.

And my ultimate objective is to get every nuclear warhead in the world in escrow so nobody can pull the trigger today, but if somebody cheats, like Saddam Hussein, and decides to threaten the world because he's got the nuclear weapons that he shouldn't, then you still have the warheads in escrow and you can bring them back and say, "Saddam, you've got ten, but we just have recombined a hundred, and therefore you have no advantage. In fact, you're very vulnerable if you decide to continue threatening or using nuclear weapons."

*When Admiral Turner joined military and religious leaders in the release of the Joint Statement on Nuclear Reductions/Disarmament [<http://www.nrdi.org/nuclear/Nuclear02.html>] at the Washington National Cathedral in June 2000, he said in his own statement [<http://www.nrdi.org/nuclear/NuclearP08.html>]:*

- We must go downward much more rapidly than we are if we are going to prevent the further proliferation of these weapons to other states as we've recently had proliferation to Pakistan and India.
  
- As long as the two nuclear superpowers maintain arsenals in the tens of thousands of nuclear warheads, there is no way they can with any consistency urge that other nations not be allowed to acquire these weapons.

Status: U  
Return-Path: <millerph@att.net>  
Received: from igcb.igc.apc.org ([192.82.108.46])  
by runyon.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17dP366H23Nl3sj0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 31 May 2002 12:14:43 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from mtiwmhc21.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc21.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.46])  
by igcb.igc.apc.org (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id JAA03633  
for <mupj@igc.apc.org>; Fri, 31 May 2002 09:12:37 -0700 (PDT)  
From: millerph@att.net  
Received: from webmail.worldnet.att.net ([204.127.135.59])  
by mtiwmhc21.worldnet.att.net  
(InterMail vM.4.01.03.27 201-229-121-127-20010626) with SMTP  
id <20020531161349.PCGO19182.mtiwmhc21.worldnet.att.net@webmail.worldnet.att.net>  
for <mupj@igc.apc.org>; Fri, 31 May 2002 16:13:49 +0000  
Received: from [12.78.129.16] by webmail.worldnet.att.net;  
Fri, 31 May 2002 16:13:45 +0000  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org (Howard Hallman)  
Subject: Ohio Conference Bill  
Date: Fri, 31 May 2002 16:13:45 +0000  
X-Mailer: AT&T Message Center Version 1 (May 26 2002)  
Message-Id: <20020531161349.PCGO19182.mtiwmhc21.worldnet.att.net@webmail.worldnet.att.net>

Howard,  
From Jim's message, it seems that the check I wrote  
soome time ago to the Ohio Conference has gone astray.  
It might have been caught up in the anthrax scare.

Shall I write and send you a new check?

Phil

----- Forwarded Message: -----  
From: hipkins james <debate44646@yahoo.com>  
To: Phil Miller <millerph@att.net>  
Date: Fri, 31 May 2002 05:46:33 -0700 (PDT)

Greetings etc.

Checked with the North East Ohio Conf. Office. They  
did not receive the chec in Dec. for \$128. Bill is  
still in active file for payment. Apparently Uncle Sam  
loses things occasionally. You wouldn't believe the  
trouble we have had with a claim for lost items with  
UPS. It is virtually impossible to collect for lost  
items. You know the huge mailing instruction material  
they give when you send package, you remember the 25  
plus pages, but note pages 10-13 with wrapping  
instructions. Who is the responsible claim agent? If  
it were enough I would take them to court. Hope all is  
well with you. Maybe I need a magician rather than a  
lawyer./

Jim

---

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! - Official partner of 2002 FIFA World Cup

<http://fifaworldcup.yahoo.com>

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <millerph@att.net>  
References: <20020531161349.PCGO19182.mtiwmhc21.worldnet.att.net@webmail.worldnet.att.net>  
Subject: Re: Ohio Conference Bill  
Date: Fri, 31 May 2002 13:51:32 -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 5.50.4807.1700  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Phil,

Go ahead and write a new check.

Howard

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

From: <millerph@att.net>  
To: "Howard Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2002 12:13 PM  
Subject: Ohio Conference Bill

> Howard,  
> From Jim's message, it seems that the check I wrote  
> soome time ago to the Ohio Conference has gone astray.  
> It might have been caught up in the anthrax scare.  
>  
> Shall I write and send you a new check?  
>  
> Phil  
> ----- Forwarded Message: -----  
> From: hipkins james <debate44646@yahoo.com>  
> To: Phil Miller <millerph@att.net>  
> Date: Fri, 31 May 2002 05:46:33 -0700 (PDT)  
>  
> Greetings etc.  
>  
> Checked with the North East Ohio Conf. Office. They  
> did not receive the chec in Dec. for \$128. Bill is  
> still in active file for payment. Apparently Uncle Sam  
> loses things occasionally. You wouldn't believe the  
> trouble we have had with a claim for lost items with  
> UPS. It is virtually impossible to collect for lost  
> items. You know the huge mailing instruction material  
> they give when you send package, you remember the 25  
> plus pages, but note pages 10-13 with wrapping  
> instructions. Who is the responsible claim agent? If

> it were enough I would take them to court. Hope all is  
> well with you. Maybe I need a magician rather than a  
> lawyer./

>  
> **Jim**

>  
>

> \_\_\_\_\_  
> **Do You Yahoo!?**

> **Yahoo! - Official partner of 2002 FIFA World Cup**

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

>

Status: U  
Return-Path: <millerph@att.net>  
Received: from igcb.igc.apc.org ([192.82.108.46])  
by strange.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17dP4U13W3Nl3oW0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 31 May 2002 12:16:36 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net (mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net [204.127.131.47])  
by igcb.igc.apc.org (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id JAA04052  
for <mupj@igc.apc.org>; Fri, 31 May 2002 09:14:45 -0700 (PDT)  
From: millerph@att.net  
Received: from webmail.worldnet.att.net ([204.127.135.59])  
by mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net  
(InterMail vM.4.01.03.27 201-229-121-127-20010626) with SMTP  
id <20020531161557.KJOH13408.mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net@webmail.worldnet.att.net>;  
Fri, 31 May 2002 16:15:57 +0000  
Received: from [12.78.129.16] by webmail.worldnet.att.net;  
Fri, 31 May 2002 16:15:56 +0000  
To: hipkins james <debate44646@yahoo.com>  
Cc: mupj@igc.apc.org (Howard Hallman)  
Subject: Re: your mail  
Date: Fri, 31 May 2002 16:15:56 +0000  
X-Mailer: AT&T Message Center Version 1 (May 26 2002)  
Message-Id: <20020531161557.KJOH13408.mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net@webmail.worldnet.att.net>

Jim

It's possible that our check got caught up in the USPS  
anthrax difficulties. I've asked Howard for authority  
to write a new check, which should be on its way shortly  
thereby keeping you in the good graces of the Ohio  
Conferencne.

Phil

> Greetings etc.

>

> Checked with the North East Ohio Conf. Office. They  
> did not receive the chec in Dec. for \$128. Bill is  
> still in active file for payment. Apparently Uncle Sam  
> loses things occasionally. You wouldn't believe the  
> trouble we have had with a claim for lost items with  
> UPS. It is virtually impossible to collect for lost  
> items. You know the huge mailing instruction material  
> they give when you send package, you remember the 25  
> plus pages, but note pages 10-13 with wrapping  
> instructions. Who is the responsible claim agent? If  
> it were enough I would take them to court. Hope all is  
> well with you. Maybe I need a magician rather than a  
> lawyer./

>

> Jim

>

>

> Do You Yahoo!?

> Yahoo! - Official partner of 2002 FIFA World Cup

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