

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
To: <redgar@nccusa.org>, <lisaw@nccusa.org>, agreenblatt@nccusa.org
Subject: Zero-nukes web site
Date: Wed, 5 Jun 2002 10:49:02 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----
=_NextPart_000_001B_01C20C7E.9BB5F100"
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

Bob, Lisa, Andrew:

Establishment of our web site, www.zero-nukes.org, is moving along. The home page is set. Our page on Religious Statements is in the works with information from a number of interfaith and ecumenical organizations and denominations. Soon it will be available through the home page. An interim version is available at [www:zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html](http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html).

Lisa has given me enough information from the National Council of Churches to make an initial draft. It is attached for your review, suggestions, and additions. I am particularly interested in obtaining past resolutions on nuclear disarmament issues. My preference is to reach them through linkage with your web site, but if that isn't possible we can post them on zero-nukes.

I notice that NCC lacks a recent comprehensive statement on nuclear disarmament issues. At a time when President Bush's Nuclear Posture Review and other actions constitute steps backward on a number of nuclear issues, it would be highly desirable for the largest ecumenical organization in the United States to speak out.

My understanding is that many of the NCC policy statements come about through the initiative of member denominations, though often with staff collaboration. Therefore, I'm wondering whether it would be possible to encourage particular denominational units, such as the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society, the United Methodist Council of Bishops, and some others, to take the initiative in developing a new NCC policy statement on nuclear disarmament. I'm willing to use my contacts in the ecumenical community to encourage this, but I would want to do so with your knowledge and cooperation. What do you think?

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.

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
To: SusanML@MennoniteUSA.org
Subject: Fw: A new web site
Date: Thu, 13 Jun 2002 08:47:58 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="-----=_NextPart_000_0018_01C212B7.04C61240"
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

Dear Ms. Landis,

Have you had an opportunity to review the draft about the Mennonite Church USA that I prepared for our web site? Do you have any suggestions for changes or additions?

Shalom,

Howard Hallman

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

From: "J.Ron Byler" rbyler@juno.com
To: mupj@igc.org
Cc: SusanML@mennoniteusa.org
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2002 9:04 AM
Subject: Fw: A new web site

Howard,

(copy to Susan Mark Landis)

I am asking Susan Mark Landis, Peace Advocate for the Mennonite Church USA Executive Board, to review these materials and respond to you more fully. I welcome your use of the Mennonite Church USA logo with our statements, but I think there may be more recent information to include as well. Please feel free to talk directly to Susan (SusanML@MennoniteUSA.org).

Ron

J.Ron Byler
Associate Executive Director
Mennonite Church USA Executive Board
(574) 294-7523 (fax: 293-1892)
rbyler@juno.com (www.MennoniteChurchUSA.org)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <rbyler@juno.com>
Date: Fri, 7 Jun 2002 08:16:13 -0400
Subject: A new web site
Message-ID: <001801c20e1d\$4cf41420\$096ef7a5@default>

Dear Ron Byler,

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, is creating a web site called www.zero-nukes.org. Its purposes are (a) to gather together statements by religious organizations, military leaders, and civil-sector organizations on nuclear disarmament and (b) to provide for dialogue on how to get to zero. Through Daryl Byler the Washington Office of the Mennonite Central Committee is one of the sponsors of the web site.

For the Religious Statements page I have draft the attached page about the Mennonite policy position. As part of the visual layout on the page, we would like to use the logo of the Mennonite Church USA, taken from your web site. Daryl suggests that I should ask you if this acceptable.

You can see our home page at www.zero-nukes.org. Within a few days we will have Religious Statements linked to this page. In the meantime you can see an initial draft at www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html. This shows our use of logos.

Thanks for your cooperation,

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.

Mennonite Church USA

[logo from www.mennonitechurchusa.org if permission granted]

Mennonite Church USA [www.mennonitechurchusa.org] with 116,000 members is known for its peace stand, taken because of the belief that Jesus Christ taught the way of peace. Many Mennonites choose not to participate in military service.

Mennonite Church USA is one of 15 sponsors of the **Mennonite Central Committee** [www.mcc.org], a relief, service, community development and peace agency of the North American Mennonite and Brethren in Christ churches.

In 1981 the biennial General Assembly of the Mennonite Church (one of two predecessor bodies of Mennonite Church USA) adopted a **Resolution on Security and the Current World Arms Race**, which noted:

We seek to follow Christ in refusal to prepare for war or take life for any reason and do not seek security in weapons. We feel called at this time to a particular witness against nuclear weapons because of the enormous consequences of decisions confronting world leaders regarding the testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons.

PDF document

[indented, in box like Holy See model]

Resolution on Security and the Current World Arms Race

As members of the Mennonite Church in the United States and Canada, we have gathered in biennial General Assembly in Bowling Green, Ohio, August 11-16, 1981, to affirm and celebrate our hope in Jesus Christ. In worship, prayer, and mutual deliberations we have sought the mind of Christ.

While celebrating our hope we are also aware of a growing despair in the world due to the escalation of the arms race. The development of new nuclear weapons proceeds amidst a political mood which is apparently ready to use them. Many are now saying that the question is no longer if nuclear weapons will be used, but when. The probable resulting devastation to human life is beyond comprehension.

Two years ago this Assembly adopted a statement on militarism and conscription. In deploring the arms race observed then, the 1979 Assembly called our members and all people to trust in God rather than military technology, urging the church to “plead and pray for reversal of the world’s collision course in manufacturing and deploying the most destructive weapons in all of history.” The need for prayer is even more urgent today.

We seek to follow Christ in refusal to prepare for war or take life for any reason and do not seek security in weapons. We also feel called at this time to a particular witness against nuclear weapons because of the enormous consequences of decisions confronting world leaders regarding the testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons.

God's commandment that we love our neighbors motivates us to oppose those things that would destroy them. The false god of military security must be challenged by our witness to the sole source of salvation in Jesus Christ. To express our nonresistant faith in the context of the current arms race, we encourage our congregations and members to practice the following forms of faithfulness:

1. To pray regularly for national leaders who have in their hands the fateful power of nuclear weapons.
2. To become informed about the potential of nuclear war and the policies that move in that direction. We encourage congregations to find ways to study the issue and clarify their witness. Conference and church wide peace committees can suggest helpful resources.
3. To declare our readiness, in the light of our faith in Christ, to live without nuclear weapons in our countries. The World Peace Pledge is one way to record and share this testimony.
4. To enter into discussion and study with other Christians in our communities. Many Christians who have not fully considered the way of love are asking questions about the meaning of the biblical message for issues of war and peace. As an aid for such discussions, we commend the New Abolitionist Covenant, which raises the faith question in regard to nuclear weapons in a manner similar to the way Christians two centuries ago began to question slavery in the light of the Word of God.
5. To invite men and women, including government leaders to that saving faith in Jesus Christ which provides ultimate security and frees from fear.
6. To consider ways to witness to the decision making process in our governments, urging alternatives to military confrontation and supporting the use of scarce resources for human need rather than armaments.

We confess that we have sometimes compromised our loyalty to the Prince of Peace by our silence in the face of preparations for war. We commit ourselves anew to Jesus Christ and the gospel of peace, sharing that gospel by our words and our consistent living as God's people. We resolve in all our relationships to witness to Christ's reconciling love through proclamation of His good news, through ministries of service, and through sacrificial sharing of our resources.

Our hope is in the gospel; our strength is in God. We rely upon the promise found in Zechariah 4:6: Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, says the Lord of Hosts.

Status: U
Return-Path: <SusanML@MennoniteUSA.org>
Received: from ntserver.mennoniteusa.org ([65.171.155.1])
by walker.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17iuOQ28v23Nl3s70
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 13 Jun 2002 09:39:20 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from ccssusan ([24.140.0.178] unverified) by ntserver.mennoniteusa.org with Microsoft
SMTPSVC(5.0.2195.4905);
Thu, 13 Jun 2002 08:39:37 -0500
Reply-To: <SusanML@mennoniteusa.org>
From: "Susan Landis" <SusanML@mennoniteusa.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: A new web site
Date: Thu, 13 Jun 2002 09:37:32 -0400
Message-ID: <001101c212df\$b7ade8b0\$b2008c18@ccssusan>
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 CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700
In-reply-to: <001b01c212d8\$9fe954a0\$bb5ef7a5@default>
Importance: Normal
Disposition-Notification-To: "Susan Landis" <SusanML@mennoniteusa.org>
X-OriginalArrivalTime: 13 Jun 2002 13:39:37.0640 (UTC) FILETIME=[C2E21A80:01C212DF]

Howard,
What you have is fine. While we've passed numerous other statements, none
use all the words I think you're looking for.

We have more recent statements on war and violence in general, but they
don't use nuclear terminology so specifically.

Oh, and the ironic thing is that I'm working, just barely, on a new web site
with Ron, and so hadn't paid the attention to this note you needed!

Peace,
Susan

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

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

> Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2002 8:48 AM

> To: SusanML@MennoniteUSA.org

> Subject: Fw: A new web site

>

>

> Dear Ms. Landis,

>

> Have you had an opportunity to review the draft about the

> Mennonite Church

> USA that I prepared for our web site? Do you have any suggestions for

> changes or additions?

>
> Shalom,
> Howard Hallman
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: "J.Ron Byler" <rbyler@juno.com>
> To: <mupj@igc.org>
> Cc: <SusanML@mennoniteusa.org>
> Sent: Monday, June 10, 2002 9:04 AM
> Subject: Fw: A new web site
>
>
>> Howard,
>> (copy to Susan Mark Landis)
>> I am asking Susan Mark Landis, Peace Advocate for the
> Mennonite Church
>> USA Executive Board, to review these materials and respond
> to you more
>> fully. I welcome your use of the Mennonite Church USA logo with our
>> statements, but I think there may be more recent
> information to include
>> as well. Please feel free to talk directly to Susan
>> (SusanML@MennoniteUSA.org).
>> Ron
>>
>> J.Ron Byler
>> Associate Executive Director
>> Mennonite Church USA Executive Board
>> (574) 294-7523 (fax: 293-1892)
>> rbyler@juno.com (www.MennoniteChurchUSA.org)
>>
>> ----- Forwarded message -----
>> From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
>> To: <rbyler@juno.com>
>> Date: Fri, 7 Jun 2002 08:16:13 -0400
>> Subject: A new web site
>> Message-ID: <001801c20e1d\$4cf41420\$096ef7a5@default>
>>
>> Dear Ron Byler,
>>
>> The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, is
>> creating
>> a web site called www.zero-nukes.org. Its purposes are (a)
> to gather
>> together statements by religious organizations, military
> leaders, and
>> civil-sector organizations on nuclear disarmament and (b)
> to provide for
>> dialogue on how to get to zero.
>> Through Daryl Byler the Washington Office of the Mennonite Central
>> Committee
>> is one of the sponsors of the web site.
>>
>> For the Religious Statements page I have draft the attached

> page about
> > the
> > Mennonite policy position. As part of the visual layout
> on the page, we
> > would like to use the logo of the Mennonite Church USA,
> taken from your
> > web
> > site. Daryl suggests that I should ask you if this acceptable.
> >
> > You can see our home page at www.zero-nukes.org. Within a
> few days we
> > will
> > have Religious Statements linked to this page. In the
> meantime you can
> > see
> > an initial draft at
www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html.
> This shows our use of logos.
>
> Thanks for your cooperation,
>
> 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: <Dwight.Lundgren@abc-usa.org>

Received: from abcex1.ABC-USA.org ([12.3.37.82])

by bissell.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17iuu06K03N13rE0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 13 Jun 2002 09:17:47 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by abcex1.abc-usa.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <MZQH7HVY>; Thu, 13 Jun 2002 09:17:10 -0400

Message-ID: <F894907F8FEDD411B81B0002A53486A311ACC3@abcex1.abc-usa.org>

From: "LUNDGREN, Dwight" <Dwight.Lundgren@abc-usa.org>

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

Cc: "CORTEZ, Hector" <Hector.Cortez@abc-usa.org>, "SCHRAMM, Richard"

<Richard.Schramm@abc-usa.org>, "Ramsey-Lucas, Curtis" <ograbc@aol.com>

Subject: RE: A new web site

Date: Thu, 13 Jun 2002 09:17:08 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Good morning, Howard.

The attachment came through this time.

First, I recommend that you delete the last sentence of the first paragraph;
our polity operation around selection of the general board is a little more
complicated.

Second, I can find no ABC Resolution on Peace , such as you refer to in your
first listing. I suspect that it is an old resolution that was either
retired or folded into a subsequent document. SO.....delete!

The others are correct.

Third, the Office of Communication of the Office of the General Secretary
informs me that we do not authorize use of the ABC logo except by directly
affiliated organizations. Hence, I request that you do not publish it.

Fourth, I appreciate your website and will consider making a contribution
for its maintenance, but at this time I can not say how much. Since it is
not budgeted, I need to review where I am with my budget.

Blessings with your project.

Dwight Lundgren

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

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

Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2002 3:40 PM

To: LUNDGREN, Dwight

Subject: Re: A new web site

Either I forgot to insert the attachment or it didn't go through. It is a
Word attachment. If you don't receive it, let me know, and I'll send as
e-mail paste-on text.

Howard Hallman

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

From: "LUNDGREN, Dwight" <Dwight.Lundgren@abc-usa.org>

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

Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2002 1:59 PM

Subject: RE: A new web site

- > Howard, thanks for contacting me. It may be my ignorance but I can't
- > identify any ABC material with your letter for me to review. I would be
- > happy to do that. I need to check but I believe there would not be a
- > problem
- > using the ABC logo to "mark" any of our statements which you might quote.
- > I need to check our funds to see if I can make a contribution.
- > But first things first; resend anything you wish me to review for your
- > use.
- > Thanks.
- > Dwight M. Lundgren
- > laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.
- >

Status: U

Return-Path: marie_kayser@yahoo.com

Received: from web13905.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.68]) by strange.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17ivzy3X73NI3oW0 for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 13 Jun 2002 10:27:36 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: 20020613142735.9415.qmail@web13905.mail.yahoo.com

Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13905.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Thu, 13 Jun 2002 07:27:35 PDT

Date: Thu, 13 Jun 2002 07:27:35 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser marie_kayser@yahoo.com

Subject: Photo

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

In-Reply-To: <000901c21209\$9bcb6900\$9a6ff7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="0-2118193010-1023978455=:7617"

Howard,

I scanned the National Cathedral picture and here are some of the jpeg pictures. I am putting the smallest picture on the site - where does this go?

Thanks,

Marie

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

Marie,

For our home page here is the URL for the Church of the Brethren Washington Office.

Howard

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

From: "Greg Laszakovits"

To:

Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2002 12:44 PM

Subject: Re: Web site URL

> Howard,

> Sorry its taken so long to get back with you. Our website url is:

> www.brethren.org/genbd/washofc

>

> Thanks, Greg

>

> Greg Davidson Laszakovits

> Church of the Brethren Washington Office

> 337 North Carolina Avenue SE

> Washington, DC 20003

> 202.546.3202

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
References: <20020613142735.9415.qmail@web13905.mail.yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Photo
Date: Thu, 13 Jun 2002 10:55:08 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="-----_NextPart_000_003E_01C212C8.C8B10A00"
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

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_003E_01C212C8.C8B10A00
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Marie,

It goes under Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative after the =
introductory paragraph. You already have the caption that begins =
"Participants in the news conference...." The caption can be in smaller =
type.

Howard
----- Original Message -----=20
From: Marie Kayser=20
To: Howard W. Hallman=20
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2002 10:27 AM
Subject: Photo

Howard,=20

I scanned the National Cathedral picture and here are some of the jpeg =
pictures. I am putting the smallest picture on the site - where does =
this go?=20

Thanks,=20

Marie=20

Status: U
Return-Path: <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Received: from web13904.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.67])
by payne.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17iw0eCQ3Nl3p40
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 13 Jun 2002 10:55:10 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <20020613145511.59283.qmail@web13904.mail.yahoo.com>
Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13904.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Thu, 13 Jun 2002 07:55:11 PDT
Date: Thu, 13 Jun 2002 07:55:11 -0700 (PDT)
From: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Religious editing.04
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
In-Reply-To: <003101c212e8\$b0e7f760\$3d58f7a5@default>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-1144201900-1023980111=:59146"

--0-1144201900-1023980111=:59146
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Howard,
I just emailed you the photos. Was that the photo you were referring to below?
thanks,
marie
"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote: Marie,

Thanks for making changes in the Religious Statements page. It's amazing
how long it takes to get it "perfect", especially as I see new things each
time.

Some further refinements are needed, as indicated in the attachment
"religious editing.04."

I'm also re-sending the revised texts for Pax Christi International and
Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

You seem to be having difficulty in entering the photo of the National
Cathedral signing. If you can't do it at this time, just eliminate the
caption from the present text and later put the photo and caption on the web
site. I don't want this to hold up our getting on line.

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=Pax Christi International.doc > ATTACHMENT part 3
application/msword name=religious editing.04.doc > ATTACHMENT part 4 application/msword name=UAHC.doc

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
To: "Marie Kayser" marie_kayser@yahoo.com
Subject: Religious editing.04
Date: Thu, 13 Jun 2002 10:39:42 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----
=_NextPart_000_0014_01C212C6.A0FDB000"
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

Marie,

Thanks for making changes in the Religious Statements page. It's amazing how long it takes to get it "perfect", especially as I see new things each time.

Some further refinements are needed, as indicated in the attachment "religious editing.04."

I'm also re-sending the revised texts for Pax Christi International and Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

You seem to be having difficulty in entering the photo of the National Cathedral signing. If you can't do it at this time, just eliminate the caption from the present text and later put the photo and caption on the web site. I don't want this to hold up our getting on line.

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.

[logo from www.paxchristi.net]

Pax Christi International

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

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

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

*In 2000 Pax Christi International published **New Challenges on Nuclear Disarmament Agenda: A Call and Statement on Nuclear Disarmament.** [URL to be supplied] Signed by 74 bishops from 20 nations on five continents, the statement declared:*

The need for abolition [of nuclear weapons] exists because of the real possibility that nuclear weapons could be used in anger for the first time since Hiroshima and Nagasaki, with disastrous results for the whole of humanity. In recent years, we have witnessed policies by several states to extend the role of nuclear weapons in their security policies. India and Pakistan are the most prominent examples. The USA and the Russian Federation too are modernizing and extending the role of nuclear weapons.

We call upon all states to put urgent negotiation of a nuclear disarmament convention at the top of the international agenda.

The Pax Christi International statement then presented a set of immediate steps to move closer to abolition, including nuclear reductions by the United States, Russia, and the small nuclear-weapon states, ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, de-alerting, pledge of no first use, and establishment of nuclear free zones.

###

Note to Marie. I've tried to get a URL from Pax Christi International without success. The route is www.paxchrist.net -- resources -- archive (more) -- security & disarmament -- 10/00 -- New Challenges on Nuclear Disarmament Agenda SD04 (EFGDP)00 English. Maybe you can figure out an URL from that. I couldn't.

Further corrections in Religious Statements -- June 13, 2002

1. Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament entree

a. In next to last line of first paragraph, add "associations" after "religious" to read: representatives of denominational offices and religious associations re-grouped..

c. You did a good job with letters and signers.

d. For the signers to the letter to President Bush on National Missile Defense, eliminate extra space after my name.

e. For the signers of the letter to senators/representatives, eliminate extra space after Rev. Eleanor Giddings Ivory.

f. In letter to President Bush on Nuclear Posture Review, use bold face for the six numbered paragraph headings:

(1) Reductions.

(2) Warhead reserve and the terrorist threat.

(3) Mutual assured destruction.

(4) De-alerting.

(5) Expanded role.

(6) Testing.

g. In next to last paragraph of that letter, eliminate the gap at the end of the line following "As a point of".

2. a. After the entree for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament where we come to the statements from denominations, is it necessary to have a new table of contents? Or is it enough to rely on the contents listing at the top of the page? I'm asking, but I'm doubtful because you have arranged to go to top the page after each entree.

b. If you keep this, it is not necessary to list the two statements under Holy See and 1998 NPT PrepCom. It makes it too cluttered. Rather it is enough to list them at the beginning of the actual entrees for these two entities, as you do.

3. U.S Conference of Catholic Bishops.

a. I didn't notice it in my last review, but now I see that the four inset quotes should be in non-italic. That is,

"No use....

"In the words....

"We must continue....

"The eventual elimination...."

This helps them to stand out more.

b. You still need to eliminate the extraneous material from Pax Christi International. See my previous memo.

4. Pax Christi International. I am re-sending the new entree.

5. Islam. You didn't do what I suggested.

a. Change the last line of the introductory paragraph to read:

America, made a statement that included the following remarks:

b. Re-format the quote into three bullets. See previous memo.

6. Union of American Hebrew Congregations. I'm re-sending the new entree.

[logo from www.uahc.org]

Union of American Hebrew Congregations

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

In a 1981 resolution, **Control of Nuclear Arms**, General Assembly of the UAHC urged upon the United States and the USSR a mutually agreed upon freeze of the testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons.

Two years later General Assembly adopted resolution on **Preventing Nuclear Holocaust**, based upon a book with the same titled published by the UAHC Religious Action Center (1983). The resolution recorded UAHC's vision about the nuclear arms race.

This Union, from its inception, has taken seriously the Jewish obligation to "seek peace and pursue it." We have consistently sought to apply the prophetic vision to the urgent contemporary issues of war and peace. Thus we have supported efforts to achieve effective international treaties to limit armaments and in recent years to speak for stable arms control to curb the threat of the nuclear arms race. We have expressed our growing alarm at unchecked nuclear proliferation and we have expressed our horror at both the dangers and the intolerable waste involved in the nuclear arms race, which is exhausting much of the world's resources and impoverishing hundreds of millions of our fellow human beings.

The resolution indicated support for the SALT II and ABM treaties, negotiation of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, halt in development of first-strike nuclear weapons, and other measures of nuclear arms control.

*In 1989 the UAHC General Assembly adopted a resolution appealing to world leaders **To End the Manufacturing and Trade in Fissionable Material Suitable for the Production of Nuclear Arms**.*

*The same General Assembly passed a resolution on **Halting the Nuclear Arms Race** (1989) to:*

- 1. Commend former President Ronald Reagan and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev for the leadership they demonstrated by the signing of the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty.*

2. *Commend President George Bush for taking significant steps toward limiting short range nuclear missiles and urge the American government to intensify its efforts toward achieving a START (Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty) agreement, a comprehensive test ban, and a ban on weapons in space.*
3. *Express appreciation to the Roman Catholic Bishops and the Methodist Bishops for calling for a reassessment of the moral and strategic assumptions of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD).*
4. *Work toward elimination of long term reliance on nuclear armaments as a deterrent and adopt as our goal a multilateral, negotiated, verifiable arms control process to decrease and eventually eliminate all nuclear weapons from the face of the earth.*
5. *Support the concept of limited unilateral cuts in the U.S. arsenal which might encourage further similar cuts by the U.S.S.R. without eliminating a credible level of deterrence.*

*In a 1981 resolution [Control of Nuclear Arms, 1981](#)
remove 1981]*

[Preventing Nuclear Holocaust, 1983](#)

*[To End the Manufacturing and Trade In Fissionable
Material Suitable for the Production of Nuclear Arms,
1989](#)*

[Halting the Nuclear Arms Race, 1989](#)

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
References: <20020613010318.20356.qmail@web13905.mail.yahoo.com>
Subject: How to Get to Zero
Date: Thu, 13 Jun 2002 10:58:47 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="-----_NextPart_000_004B_01C212C9.4AFE4720"
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

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_004B_01C212C9.4AFE4720
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Marie,

Congratulations! The How to Submit Your Ideas box looks great. It's a =
relief to get something on line.

Howard

----- Original Message -----=20
From: Marie Kayser=20
To: Howard W. Hallman=20
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2002 9:03 PM
Subject: Re: Further on How to Get to Zero

Hi Howard,=20

How to Get to Zero page is now live and accessible from the homepage. =
I also made the changes to the email links.=20

Marie=20

"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote:=20

Marie,

The two graphics help. Also the way you boxed How to Submit Your =
Ideas.

As far as I can determine, How to Get to Zero is ready for prime =
time!. Go ahead with the link to our home page.

Howard

----- Original Message -----=20

From: Marie Kayser=20
To: Howard W. Hallman=20
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2002 10:12 AM
Subject: Re: Further on How to Get to Zero

Howard,=20

I just finished making the corrections for How to Get to Zero. =
Please let me know if you have additional changes before I add it as an =
official link from the homepage.=20

Thanks,=20

Marie=20

"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote:=20

Marie,

We're getting close with How to Get to Zero. Here are a few =
further revisions.

1. The introductory paragraph has two almost duplicate bullet =
items, and one was omitted in the last draft. It should be as follows:

This web page explores practical steps for achieving the global =
elimination of nuclear weapons. It offers:=20

- a.. Recommendations from major reports of the past ten years.=20
- a.. Consideration of interim measures, such as de-alerting and =
deep cuts in nuclear arms. =20
- a.. Proposals from military professionals, civilian experts, =
and ordinary citizens for getting to zero.=20
- a.. Opportunity for you to offer your ideas for eliminating =
nuclear weapons.

2. What would you think of some kind of graphic at this point? =
Such as small version of the no-nuke symbol, merged into the =
introductory paragraph.

3. In the contents list, HOW TO SUBMIT YOUR IDEAS should be in =
CAPS, just like REPORTS..., SCENARIOS..., & INTERIM MEASURES.

4. At the very end of the page, the same applies: HOW TO SUBMIT =
YOUR IDEAS should have the same type size and CAPS like INTERIM =
MEASURES.

5. Under HOW TO SUBMIT YOUR IDEAS, I don't like the look of the =
text (which is how I suggested it). It is too blah. It doesn't do enough =
to draw attention to this important part of our web site. Please you =
your design talents to aliven it.

Maybe it should be in box. Maybe bold face. Maybe in arial type =
as a change of pace.

Maybe a graphic, such as one or more sunflowers.

Whatever, the text should be revised as follows: If you have ideas on how to eliminate nuclear weapons, the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament invites you to send your proposal to us. You can present a step-by-step scenario for reaching zero or for carrying out interim measures.

Send your ideas to proposals@zero-nukes.org. To facilitate the process, please send them as a Word attachment or similar format.

We offer no compensation, but we will post your ideas on this web page. We reserve the right to edit submissions for length and format.

Persons who want to comment on proposals of others can reach us through Your Feedback.

Shalom,

Howard

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Lighthouse Support" <support@lighthouse.com>
References: <001301c210bc\$06cd2940\$0455f7a5@default> <007601c210bf\$8ab2b240\$cf254fd8@lighthouse.com>
<000701c21226\$72d64f20\$3b6bf7a5@default> <001b01c2122f\$de479030\$cf254fd8@lighthouse.com>
<000201c2124d\$dd3958e0\$e96ff7a5@default> <004101c21255\$fc900770\$cf254fd8@lighthouse.com>
Subject: Re: Opening mail boxes
Date: Thu, 13 Jun 2002 11:19:12 -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

Thanks,

Now how do I retrieve messages that come to our three mail boxes? How do I send messages using hallman@zero-nukes.org as my sending e-address?

Thanks for further assistance.

Howard Hallman

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

From: "Lighthouse Support" <support@lighthouse.com>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2002 5:13 PM
Subject: Re: Opening mail boxes

> Email accounts created as requested.

>

> Thanks,

> Todd

> ~~~~~

> Lighthouse Support

> support@lighthouse.com

> <http://www.lighthouse.com>

> ~~~~~

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

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

> To: "Lighthouse Support" <support@lighthouse.com>

> Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2002 3:09 PM

> Subject: Re: Opening mail boxes

>

>

>> Todd,

>>

>> Oops! I didn't count.

>>

> > Make the other two mail boxes:
> > hallman
> > proposal
> > For each use epworth as password.
> >
> > Thanks,
> > Howard Hallman
> >
> > ----- Original Message -----
> > From: "Lighthost Support" <support@lighthost.com>
> > To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
> > Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2002 12:40 PM
> > Subject: Re: Opening mail boxes
> >
> >
> > > We could only setup the email account of feedback. The other 2 that
you
> > > have listed is more than 8 characters in length.
> > >
> > > Email address :
> > > feedback@zero-nukes.org
> > > password: epworth
> > >
> > > ::::::::::: EMAIL SETTINGS:
> > > Your email address is feedback@zero-nukes.org
> > > Your pop3 email server is zero-nukes.org
> > > Your smtp email server is Your dial up ISP's SMTP server
> > >
> > > account name: feedback
> > > password: epworth
> > >
> > > Please let us know if you would like to have proposals and moderator
> > > forwarding to feedback@zero-nukes.org
> > >
> > > Thanks,
> > > Todd
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
References: <20020613145511.59283.qmail@web13904.mail.yahoo.com>
Subject: Photo
Date: Thu, 13 Jun 2002 11:20:18 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="-----_NextPart_000_00AD_01C212CC.4C665B40"
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

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_00AD_01C212CC.4C665B40
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Yes, that was it.

Howard
----- Original Message -----=20
From: Marie Kayser=20
To: Howard W. Hallman=20
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2002 10:55 AM
Subject: Re: Religious editing.04

Howard,=20

I just emailed you the photos. Was that the photo you were referring =
to below?=20

thanks,=20

marie=20

=20

Status: U
Return-Path: <support@lighthost.com>
Received: from LightHost.Com ([216.76.5.10])
by bissell.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17iAbu3613Nl3rE0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 13 Jun 2002 15:23:04 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from copper [216.79.37.207] by LightHost.Com
(SMTPD32-5.05) id A117D026E; Thu, 13 Jun 2002 14:23:03 -0500
Message-ID: <003101c21310\$ea895b30\$cf254fd8@lighthost.com>
From: "Lighthost Support" <support@lighthost.com>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
References: <001301c210bc\$06cd2940\$0455f7a5@default> <007601c210bf\$8ab2b240\$cf254fd8@lighthost.com>
<000701c21226\$72d64f20\$3b6bf7a5@default> <001b01c2122f\$de479030\$cf254fd8@lighthost.com>
<000201c2124d\$dd3958e0\$e96ff7a5@default> <004101c21255\$fc00770\$cf2
<00b601c212ee\$3269b4e0\$3d58f7a5@default>
Subject: Re: Opening mail boxes
Date: Thu, 13 Jun 2002 14:31:29 -0500
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

You will need to setup an email program such as Outlook Express or another type of email client of your choice.

::::::::::::: EMAIL SETTINGS:

Your email address is hallman@zero-nukes.org
Your pop3 email server is zero-nukes.org
Your smtp email server is Your dial up ISP's SMTP server

account name: hallman
password: your_password

Same for your other 3 email accounts.

Any questions, let us know.

Thanks,
Todd

~~~~~  
Lighthost Support  
support@lighthost.com  
<http://www.lighthost.com>  
~~~~~

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

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Lighthost Support" <support@lighthost.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2002 10:19 AM
Subject: Re: Opening mail boxes

> Thanks,
>
> Now how do I retrieve messages that come to our three mail boxes? How do

I
> send messages using hallman@zero-nukes.org as my sending e-address?
>
> Thanks for further assistance.
>
> Howard Hallman
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: "Lighthouse Support" <support@lighthouse.com>
> To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
> Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2002 5:13 PM
> Subject: Re: Opening mail boxes
>
>
>> Email accounts created as requested.
>>
>> Thanks,
>> Todd
>> ~~~~~
>> Lighthouse Support
>> support@lighthouse.com
>> http://www.lighthouse.com
>> ~~~~~
>> ----- Original Message -----
>> From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
>> To: "Lighthouse Support" <support@lighthouse.com>
>> Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2002 3:09 PM
>> Subject: Re: Opening mail boxes
>>
>>
>>> Todd,
>>>
>>> Oops! I didn't count.
>>>
>>> Make the other two mail boxes:
>>> hallman
>>> proposal
>>> For each use epworth as password.
>>>
>>> Thanks,
>>> Howard Hallman
>>>
>>> ----- Original Message -----
>>> From: "Lighthouse Support" <support@lighthouse.com>
>>> To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
>>> Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2002 12:40 PM
>>> Subject: Re: Opening mail boxes
>>>
>>>
>>>> We could only setup the email account of feedback. The other 2 that
> you
>>>> have listed is more than 8 characters in length.
>>>>
>>>> Email address :

>>>> feedback@zero-nukes.org
>>>> password: epworth
>>>>
>>>> ::::::::::: EMAIL SETTINGS:
>>>> Your email address is feedback@zero-nukes.org
>>>> Your pop3 email server is zero-nukes.org
>>>> Your smtp email server is Your dial up ISP's SMTP server
>>>>
>>>> account name: feedback
>>>> password: epworth
>>>>
>>>> Please let us know if you would like to have proposals and moderator
>>>> forwarding to feedback@zero-nukes.org
>>>>
>>>> Thanks,
>>>> Todd
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>
>
>

Status: U

Return-Path: <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>

Received: from wesley-exch1.wesleysem.edu ([63.124.223.7])

by nils.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17iAN05gq3Nl3pm0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 13 Jun 2002 16:01:50 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by wesley-exch1.wesleysem.edu with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <1J87W5ZH>; Thu, 13 Jun 2002 16:00:24 -0400

Message-ID: <DC1977460103D311B0DE0060943F439FADD20B@wesley-exch1.wesleysem.edu>

From: STARMAN WENDY <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>

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

Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty

Date: Thu, 13 Jun 2002 16:00:22 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

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

Dear Howard and Colleagues,

As of June 14, 2002, Richard Killmer will be stepping into my position, to become the manager of the Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative, at The Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy. His e-mail address will be rkillmer@wesleysem.edu, and his phone number will be 202/885-8684. His e-mail address should be up and running by the end of the day (Friday, June 14). Please transfer my e-mail to his address as soon as possible.

I have stepped down as manager of the NR/DI to devote myself to my new role as a mother. I am expecting a baby on July 1. Once I get situated, I hope to continue my work in this field on a contractual basis and look forward to future opportunities to work together.

It has been a pleasure to work with you in our quest for nuclear reduction en route to disarmament. I appreciate all of the support that we have received from the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and hope that you will continue your efforts to keep Richard Killmer informed about related programs and news.

Thanks for all!

Sincerely,

Wendy Starman
Manager, Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative

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

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

Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2002 9:41 AM

To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

Subject: [interfaithnd] Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty

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.

----- 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

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

Status: U

Return-Path: <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Received: from web13903.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.29])

by payne.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17iBmj5dQ3Nl3p40
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 13 Jun 2002 16:38:18 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020613203819.89111.qmail@web13903.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13903.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Thu, 13 Jun 2002 13:38:19 PDT

Date: Thu, 13 Jun 2002 13:38:19 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Subject: Religious Statements

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

In-Reply-To: <00b701c212ee\$342d5de0\$3d58f7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-1578014751-1024000699=:88067"

--0-1578014751-1024000699=:88067

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

Howard,

Please recheck Religious Statements page to make sure I captured all the recent changes. I apologize in advance if I missed any of your changes....the page is getting long and once in awhile, I get confused.

Thanks,

Marie

"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote: Yes, that was it. Howard----- Original Message ----- From: Marie Kayser To: Howard W. Hallman Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2002 10:55 AM Subject: Re: Religious editing.04

Howard,

I just emailed you the photos. Was that the photo you were referring to below?

thanks,

marie

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <SusanML@mennoniteusa.org>
References: <001101c212df\$b7ade8b0\$b2008c18@ccssusan>
Subject: Your web site
Date: Thu, 13 Jun 2002 15:54:06 -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 5.50.4807.1700
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Susan,

Thanks for your reply. We are putting the text of your resolution on "Security and the Current Arms Race" on our web site because, as far as I can determined, it isn't available on your current web site for us to link to. If you put this resolution, and related ones on your new web site, let me know. Then we will link rather than reproducing it.

Shalom,

Howard

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

From: "Susan Landis" <SusanML@mennoniteusa.org>
To: "'Howard W. Hallman'" <mupj@igc.org>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2002 9:37 AM
Subject: RE: A new web site

> Howard,
> What you have is fine. While we've passed numerous other statements, none
> use all the words I think you're looking for.
>
> We have more recent statements on war and violence in general, but they
> don't use nuclear terminology so specifically.
>
> Oh, and the ironic thing is that I'm working, just barely, on a new web
site
> with Ron, and so hadn't paid the attention to this note you needed!
>
> Peace,
> Susan
>

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "LUNDGREN, Dwight" <Dwight.Lundgren@abc-usa.org>
References: <F894907F8FEDD411B81B0002A53486A311ACC3@abcex1.abc-usa.org>
Subject: Re: A new web site
Date: Thu, 13 Jun 2002 16:00:20 -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 5.50.4807.1700
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Dwight,

Thanks for your response. I have made the changes you suggested. We will not use your logo.

I appreciate your considering a financial contribution if funds are available.

What about sponsorship? By ABC as a whole, or by one of your headquarters unit, or by your Washington office. This entails being listed as a sponsor on our home page and designating some one to be on our steering committee. The latter will probably never meet physically, but I will be in touch with members by e-mail from time to time. Steering committee members will provide oversight of the web site and offer me their suggestions.

Shalom,
Howard

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

From: "LUNDGREN, Dwight" <Dwight.Lundgren@abc-usa.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Cc: "CORTEZ, Hector" <Hector.Cortez@abc-usa.org>; "SCHRAMM, Richard" <Richard.Schramm@abc-usa.org>; "Ramsey-Lucas, Curtis" <ograbc@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2002 9:17 AM
Subject: RE: A new web site

> Good morning, Howard.
> The attachment came through this time.
> First, I recommend that you delete the last sentence of the first paragraph;
> our polity operation around selection of the general board is a little more
> complicated.
>
> Second, I can find no ABC Resolution on Peace , such as you refer to in your
> first listing. I suspect that it is an old resolution that was either

> retired or folded into a subsequent document. SO.....delete!
>
> The others are correct.
>
> Third, the Office of Communication of the Office of the General Secretary
> informs me that we do not authorize use of the ABC logo except by directly
> affiliated organizations. Hence, I request that you do not publish it.
>
> Fourth, I appreciate your website and will consider making a contribution
> for its maintenance, but at this time I can not say how much. Since it is
> not budgeted, I need to review where I am with my budget.
> Blessings with your project.
>
> Dwight Lundgren

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Phillip H. Miller" <millerph@att.net>
Subject: MCI bill
Date: Thu, 13 Jun 2002 16:04:38 -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 5.50.4807.1700
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Phi,

MCI is now billing me directly. This month's charge is \$5.72.

Do you want me to send the MCI bill to you for your records, as I do the Verizon? Or would you prefer only an e-mail request and have me retain the records?

Howard

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <wgreene@aol.com>
Subject: Our new web site
Date: Thu, 13 Jun 2002 16:29:54 -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 5.50.4807.1700
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Dear Mr. Greene:

I want to report tangible progress in the effort by the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, to set up a new web site, www.zero-nukes.org. Our design work is being supported by a \$2,000 contribution from an anonymous donor from the Rockefeller family.

You can see our beginning by going to our home page at www.zero-nukes.org. The other page now on line is How to Get to Zero, which you can see by clicking on that button.

Initial Religious Statements are almost ready to go on line and can now be seen at www.zero-nukes.org/draft/religiousstatements.html. In addition to those already in the draft, we have American Baptist, Episcopal, Mennonite, and Unitarian-Universalist statements ready to go. We're working on United Methodist with others not far behind.

Also nearly ready is the initial offering for Military Leaders Speak Out. I'll let you know when that goes on line. Other pages will follow.

Your contribution made this start-up possible. We have since received a \$5,000 grant from the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society to help with operations. Several other denominational offices are making contributions of \$300 or so.

If one or more members of the Rockefeller family find this to be a worthy endeavor, we would welcome a further contribution in the \$10,000 to \$15,000 range to help support site maintenance and enlargement in the coming year.

With best regards,

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

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of

laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
To: "Marie Kayser" marie_kayser@yahoo.com
References: 20020613203819.89111.gmail@web13903.mail.yahoo.com
Subject: Re: Religious Statements
Date: Thu, 13 Jun 2002 22:33:50 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="-----
=_NextPart_000_0014_01C2132A.64D610E0"
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

Marie,

I ran into trouble with my Internet connections. It's been down for four hours.

I don't think I sent you the attached reply, but I'm not sure. Just a few finishing touches on Religious statements. I'm sending it as an attachment so that type and format will come through.

I've decided in fairness to you for all the hard work on Religious Statements, far beyond the usual starting page, we should pay you a \$50 bonus for your good work on this page. Also, I intend to treat additions to this page -- and some more are coming quickly -- as site maintenance and pay you at your \$25/hour rate.

Howard

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

From: [Marie Kayser](#)
To: [Howard W. Hallman](#)
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2002 4:38 PM
Subject: Religious Statements

Howard,

Please recheck Religious Statements page to make sure I captured all the recent changes. I apologize in advance if I missed any of your changes....the page is getting long and once in awhile, I get confused.

Thanks,

Marie

"Howard W. Hallman" <mupi@iqc.org> wrote:

Yes, that was it.

Howard

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

From: [Marie Kayser](#)

To: [Howard W. Hallman](#)

Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2002 10:55 AM

Subject: Re: Religious editing.04

Howard,

I just emailed you the photos. Was that the photo you were referring to below?

thanks,

marie

Marie,

It's close.

1. Thanks for getting the photo into **Nuclear Reductions/Disarmament Initiative**.
2. One new suggestion. At the start of the Catholic section under denominations, put the contents and linkages to the four entities, as follows:

Denominations

Catholic [singular]

**** Holy See***

**** U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops***

**** Pax Christi International***

**** Pax Christi USA***

The Catholic Church is the largest body of Christians in the world....

3. In the U.S. Catholic Bishops section, there is still extraneous material from Pax Christi International. It comes after this heading:

**The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response
A Pastoral Letter on War and Peace**

After this, the PDF reference and the following excerpt from Pax Christi International should be removed.

*In 2000 Pax Christi International published **New Challenges on Nuclear Disarmament Agenda: A Call and Statement on Nuclear Disarmament**. [URL to be supplied]
Signed by bishops from around the world, the statement indicated:*

The need for abolition [of nuclear weapons] exists because of the real possibility that nuclear weapons could be used in anger for the first time since Hiroshima and Nagasaki, with disastrous results for the whole of humanity. In recent years, we have witnessed policies by several states to extend the role of nuclear weapons in their security policies. India and Pakistan are the most prominent examples. The USA and the Russian Federation too are

modernizing and extending the role of nuclear weapons.

We call upon all states to put urgent negotiation of a nuclear disarmament convention at the top of the international agenda.

The Pax Christi International statement then presented a set of immediate steps to move us closer to abolition.

With that gone you then have:

**The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response
A Pastoral Letter on War and Peace**

Summary

[pp. i-viii to be added]

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

4. Union of American Hebrew Congregations. You didn't use the replacement text I sent as an attachment.

Status: U

Return-Path: <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

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

by farley.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17iOSc77M3Nl3pa0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 14 Jun 2002 07:04:08 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020614110407.64880.qmail@web13905.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [209.244.212.164] by web13905.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Fri, 14 Jun 2002 04:04:07 PDT

Date: Fri, 14 Jun 2002 04:04:07 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: Religious Statements

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

In-Reply-To: <001801c2134b\$f1035e80\$0c6cf7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-1795384910-1024052647=:59544"

--0-1795384910-1024052647=:59544

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

Howard,
That's so kind of you - thanks! We also had internet troubles at work yesterday morning. We had no connection for 3 hours which created a big mess and panic.

I will make the new corrections for the religious statements page this morning.

Thanks!

Marie

"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote: Marie, I ran into trouble with my Internet connections. It's been down for four hours. I don't think I sent you the attached reply, but I'm not sure. Just a few finishing touches on Religious Statements. I'm sending it as an attachment so that type and format will come through. I've decided in fairness to you for all the hard work on Religious Statements, far beyond the usual starting page, we should pay you a \$50 bonus for your good work on this page. Also, I intend to treat additions to this page -- and some more are coming quickly -- as site maintenance and pay you at your \$25/hour rate. Howard----- Original Message ----- From: Marie Kayser To: Howard W. Hallman Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2002 4:38 PM Subject: Religious Statements

Howard,
Please recheck Religious Statements page to make sure I captured all the recent changes. I apologize in advance if I missed any of your changes....the page is getting long and once in awhile, I get confused.

Thanks,

Marie

"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote: Yes, that was it. Howard----- Original Message ----- From: Marie Kayser To: Howard W. Hallman Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2002 10:55 AM Subject: Re: Religious editing.04

Howard,
I just emailed you the photos. Was that the photo you were referring to below?

thanks,

marie

Status: U

Return-Path: marie_kayser@yahoo.com

Received: from web13902.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.28]) by
kendall.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17iRotR83NI3pM0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 14 Jun 2002 09:45:37 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: 20020614134537.78696.qmail@web13902.mail.yahoo.com

Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13902.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Fri, 14 Jun
2002 06:45:37 PDT

Date: Fri, 14 Jun 2002 06:45:37 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser marie_kayser@yahoo.com

Subject: Re: Religious Statements

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

In-Reply-To: <001801c2134b\$f1035e80\$0c6cf7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="0-1962419423-1024062337=:76119"

Howard,

The Religious Statements page should now reflect the latest edits. I made the change
to the UAHC section. I used the document you sent me yesterday - see attached.

Thanks,

Marie

[logo from www.uahc.org]

Union of American Hebrew Congregations

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

*In a 1981 resolution, **Control of Nuclear Arms**, General Assembly of the UAHC urged upon the United States and the USSR a mutually agreed upon freeze of the testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons.*

*Two years later General Assembly adopted resolution on **Preventing Nuclear Holocaust**, based upon a book with the same titled published by the UAHC Religious Action Center (1983). The resolution recorded UAHC's vision about the nuclear arms race.*

This Union, from its inception, has taken seriously the Jewish obligation to "seek peace and pursue it." We have consistently sought to apply the prophetic vision to the urgent contemporary issues of war and peace. Thus we have supported efforts to achieve effective international treaties to limit armaments and in recent years to speak for stable arms control to curb the threat of the nuclear arms race. We have expressed our growing alarm at unchecked nuclear proliferation and we have expressed our horror at both the dangers and the intolerable waste involved in the nuclear arms race, which is exhausting much of the world's resources and impoverishing hundreds of millions of our fellow human beings.

The resolution indicated support for the SALT II and ABM treaties, negotiation of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, halt in development of first-strike nuclear weapons, and other measures of nuclear arms control.

*In 1989 the UAHC General Assembly adopted a resolution appealing to world leaders **To End the Manufacturing and Trade in Fissionable Material Suitable for the Production of Nuclear Arms**.*

*The same General Assembly passed a resolution on **Halting the Nuclear Arms Race** (1989) to:*

1. Commend former President Ronald Reagan and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev for the leadership they demonstrated by the signing of the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty.

2. Commend President George Bush for taking significant steps toward limiting short range nuclear missiles and urge the American government to intensify its efforts toward achieving a START (Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty) agreement, a comprehensive test ban, and a ban on weapons in space.
3. Express appreciation to the Roman Catholic Bishops and the Methodist Bishops for calling for a reassessment of the moral and strategic assumptions of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD).
4. Work toward elimination of long term reliance on nuclear armaments as a deterrent and adopt as our goal a multilateral, negotiated, verifiable arms control process to decrease and eventually eliminate all nuclear weapons from the face of the earth.
5. Support the concept of limited unilateral cuts in the U.S. arsenal which might encourage further similar cuts by the U.S.S.R. without eliminating a credible level of deterrence.

In a 1981 resolution [Control of Nuclear Arms, 1981](#)

remove 1981]

[Preventing Nuclear Holocaust, 1983](#)

[To End the Manufacturing and Trade In Fissionable Material Suitable for the Production of Nuclear Arms, 1989](#)

[Halting the Nuclear Arms Race, 1989](#)

Reply-To: "Carlee L. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
From: "Carlee L. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
To: "Marie Kayser" marie_kayser@yahoo.com
References: 20020614134537.78696.gmail@web13902.mail.yahoo.com
Subject: Re: Religious Statements
Date: Fri, 14 Jun 2002 10:30:52 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="-----
=_NextPart_000_004A_01C2138E.8FF0C540"
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

Marie,

1. I must have sent you the wrong document for UAHC. The correct, revised document is attached.
2. For Rabbi Saperstein's statement at the Cathedral signing, you have substituted Dr. Siddiqi's statement of the Islam position. That's wrong. Saperstein's statement, which was okay previously, is as follows. It should be set in a box.

Statement by Rabbi David Saperstein

When the Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement

[<http://www.nrdi.org/nuclear/Nuclear02.html>] by religious and military leaders was issued at the Washington National Cathedral in June 2000, Rabbi David Saperstein, director, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, made a statement [<http://www.nrdi.org/nuclear/NuclearP07.html>] in which he said:

In the Bible it was commanded that before the Israelite army could engage in warfare, the priests needed to read to the assembled the rules of what was ethically permitted in warfare and what was prohibited. That interaction between religion and the military created the first ethical strictures of warfare—the foundation of what later became known as "just war theory."

Today we religious and military leaders continue this tradition. We stand together in this House of God, informed by our values, aware of the horrible human cost of war and conflict, weary of the threat posed by nuclear proliferation—to call upon Congress, the President, the American military, and the American people to lead the way towards a process of nuclear reduction and disarmament.

At this crucial crossroads of history, we join to call on the world to recognize that violence begets violence; that nuclear proliferation benefits no one; that we can, we will, and we must find other ways to protect ourselves, our nations and our future: for it is not sufficient to have peace in our time, but, instead, we must leave a peaceful world to our children.

3. For Dr. Siddiqi's statement, the way the sentences are divided is better in the box that appears with Rabbi Saperstein than the present division under Dr. Siddiqi in the Islam sentence. Please make this adjustment.

4. Thanks for removing the Pax Christi International paragraphs from the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. In looking at Pax Christi International section once more, I note in the second paragraph the reference to "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition". This should be underlined and linked to the statement with that title under 1998 NPT PrepCom on this page. Then you can remove the material in brackets.

5. I still don't know how to handle the URL for the Pax Christi International statement "New Challenges on Nuclear Disarmament Agenda". I find it by going to www.paxchristi.net then clicking: resources -- archive (more) -- security & disarmament -- 10/00 -- New Challenges on Nuclear Disarmament Agenda SD04 (EFGDP)00 English. When this produces the statement, there is no URL on the address line except for www.paxchristi.net. How can this be translated into a linkage on our site? I've asked them for a specific URL but received no answer.

Howard

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

From: [Marie Kayser](#)

To: [Howard W. Hallman](#)

Sent: Friday, June 14, 2002 9:45 AM

Subject: Re: Religious Statements

Howard,

The Religious Statements page should now reflect the latest edits. I made the change to the UAHC section. I used the document you sent me yesterday - see attached.

Thanks,

Marie

[logo from www.uahc.org]

Union of American Hebrew Congregations

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

*In a 1981 resolution, **Control of Nuclear Arms**, General Assembly of the UAHC urged upon the United States and the USSR a mutually agreed upon freeze of the testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons.*

*Two years later General Assembly adopted resolution on **Preventing Nuclear Holocaust**, based upon a book with the same titled published by the UAHC Religious Action Center (1983). The resolution recorded UAHC's vision about the nuclear arms race.*

This Union, from its inception, has taken seriously the Jewish obligation to "seek peace and pursue it." We have consistently sought to apply the prophetic vision to the urgent contemporary issues of war and peace. Thus we have supported efforts to achieve effective international treaties to limit armaments and in recent years to speak for stable arms control to curb the threat of the nuclear arms race. We have expressed our growing alarm at unchecked nuclear proliferation and we have expressed our horror at both the dangers and the intolerable waste involved in the nuclear arms race, which is exhausting much of the world's resources and impoverishing hundreds of millions of our fellow human beings.

The resolution indicated support for the SALT II and ABM treaties, negotiation of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, halt in development of first-strike nuclear weapons, and other measures of nuclear arms control.

*In 1989 the UAHC General Assembly adopted a resolution appealing to world leaders **To End the Manufacturing and Trade in Fissionable Material Suitable for the Production of Nuclear Arms**.*

*The same General Assembly passed a resolution on **Halting the Nuclear Arms Race** (1989) to:*

1. Commend former President Ronald Reagan and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev for the leadership they demonstrated by the signing of the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty.

2. Commend President George Bush for taking significant steps toward limiting short range nuclear missiles and urge the American government to intensify its efforts toward achieving a START (Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty) agreement, a comprehensive test ban, and a ban on weapons in space.
3. Express appreciation to the Roman Catholic Bishops and the Methodist Bishops for calling for a reassessment of the moral and strategic assumptions of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD).
4. Work toward elimination of long term reliance on nuclear armaments as a deterrent and adopt as our goal a multilateral, negotiated, verifiable arms control process to decrease and eventually eliminate all nuclear weapons from the face of the earth.
5. Support the concept of limited unilateral cuts in the U.S. arsenal which might encourage further similar cuts by the U.S.S.R. without eliminating a credible level of deterrence.

In a 1981 resolution [Control of Nuclear Arms, 1981](#)

remove 1981]

[Preventing Nuclear Holocaust, 1983](#)

[To End the Manufacturing and Trade In Fissionable Material Suitable for the Production of Nuclear Arms, 1989](#)

[Halting the Nuclear Arms Race, 1989](#)

Status: U

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

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

by charles.admin.atl.earthlink.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17iUVj1rhJ3Nl3rY0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 14 Jun 2002 12:31:45 -0500 (EST)

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

id <M7F6FZ0M>; Fri, 14 Jun 2002 13:29:50 -0400

Message-ID: <619BD1E95646D311B69D0008C79FE32D72FC2F@church2.umc-gbcs.org>

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

To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>, Jaydee Hanson
<JHanson@UMC-GBCS.ORG>, Vince Isner <VIsner@UMC-GBCS.ORG>

Subject: RE: United Methodist Statement

Date: Fri, 14 Jun 2002 13:29:49 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

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

Howard:

You've done a great job out outlining United Methodist positions on nuclear issues. I think the reason that the full texts of the resolutions and the pastoral letter/In Defense of Creation aren't on the web has to do, at least in part, with copyright issues. Jaydee has been in discussion with Gretchen and may be able to provide more insight. I don't believe it is possible to use the cross and the flame in this instance, due to the disciplinary restrictions..but I'll look it up to be sure. In addition to the link to GBCS, I would like to see a few sentences on the efforts GBCS makes to promote legislation and education on nuclear issues..through Peace with Justice Coordinators, etc.

Janet

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

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

Sent: Friday, June 14, 2002 12:39 PM

To: Jaydee Hanson; Janet Horman; Vince Isner

Subject: United Methodist Statement

Dear Jaydee, Janet, and Vince,

In order to move ahead with a United Methodist entree for the Religious Statements page of our new web site, www.zero-nukes.org, I have drafted the attached statement. Please review it and suggest any changes and additions that you think are desirable.

Because they are not now on any web page, I have included the full text of the pastoral letter from "In Defense of Creation" and of the 2000 General Conference resolution, "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence". If you ever get them on your web site, I will change to a linkage.

Would it be possible to use the UMC symbol as an identity marker? I know

this is a sensitive issue. Some denominations have said, "yes", others "no".

I'm leaving on vacation on June 22. I want to get the UMC statement on line before then. Therefore, I would appreciate a prompt response.

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.

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Subject: Addition for Military Leaders Speak Out
Date: Fri, 14 Jun 2002 11:01:12 -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

Marie,

Now that Religious Statements are about completed, I hope you can turn to Military Leaders Speak Out. I sent you the material a couple of weeks ago.

I have an addition for the section on General Colin Powell. It is as follows:

[first paragraph in italic. make bold "prospects for use of nuclear weapons"]

In 2001 General Colin Powell, now retired from the U.S. Army, became secretary of state in the administration of President George W. Bush. He discussed the prospects for use of nuclear weapons in an interview on the News Hour with Jim Lehrer on May 30, 2002. The focus was the threat of war between India and Pakistan. Lehrer asked him, " If there is, in fact, a conflict, how likely is it that it would eventually lead to the use of nuclear weapons by these two countries?" Powell replied:

[next two paragraphs inset as block in non-italic]

I can't answer that question, but I can say this: In my conversations with both sides, especially with the Pakistani side, I have made it clear that this really can't be in anyone's mind. I mean, the thought of nuclear conflict in the year 2002 -- with what that would mean with respect to loss of life, what that would mean with respect to the condemnation, the worldwide condemnation that would come down on whatever nation chose to take that course of action -- would be such that I can see very little military, political, or any other kind of justification for the use of nuclear weapons.

Nuclear weapons in this day and age may serve some deterrent effect, and so be it, but to think of using them as just another weapon in what might start out as a conventional conflict in this day and age, seems to me to be something that no side should be contemplating.

Shalom,
Howard

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
To: <jhanson@umc-gbcs.org>, <jhorman@umc-gbcs.org>, visner@umc-gbcs.org
Subject: United Methodist Statement
Date: Fri, 14 Jun 2002 12:38:54 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----
=_NextPart_000_0076_01C213A0.724DED80"
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

Dear Jaydee, Janet, and Vince,

In order to move ahead with a United Methodist entree for the Religious Statements page of our new web site, www.zero-nukes.org, I have drafted the attached statement. Please review it and suggest any changes and additions that you think are desirable.

Because they are not now on any web page, I have included the full text of the pastoral letter from "In Defense of Creation" and of the 2000 General Conference resolution, "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence". If you ever get them on your web site, I will change to a linkage.

Would it be possible to use the UMC symbol as an identity marker? I know this is a sensitive issue. Some denominations have said, "yes", others "no".

I'm leaving on vacation on June 22. I want to get the UMC statement on line before then. Therefore, I would appreciate a prompt response.

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.

Draft

[logo of flame and cross from <http://www.umc.org/abouttheumc/symbol/> -- if permission granted]

United Methodist Church

* In Defense of Creation

* Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence

The United Methodist Church [www.umc.org] is a global institution with 8.3 million members in the United States and 1.3 million in other countries, including over one million in Africa. In the U.S. the United Methodist Church brings together churches from the Methodist and the Evangelical United Brethren traditions.

The United Methodist Church is governed by the General Conference, [http://www.umc.org/abouttheumc/organization/general_conference.htm] a body of elected delegates that meets every four years. The Council of Bishops [<http://www.umc.org/abouttheumc/organization/episcopal.htm>] provides episcopal leadership for the denomination. The General Board of Church and Society [<http://www.umc-gbcs>], based in Washington, D.C., implements UMC Social Principles and related statements adopted by General Conference.

*The United Methodist Church has a long history of speaking on issues of peace and war. This was reflected in a two year study on nuclear weapons by the Council of Bishops in the mid-1980s. When completed, the bishops issued a foundation document and pastoral letter, **In Defense of Creation** (1986). [linkage to below] Among other things, the bishops stated:*

we say a clear and unconditional No to nuclear war and to any use of nuclear weapons. We conclude that nuclear deterrence is a position that cannot receive the church's blessing.

*The 1988 General Conference affirmed and supported statements of the Council of Bishops in "In Defense of Creation." Subsequent quadrennial General Conferences have passed resolutions on the subject. In 2000 the resolution was entitled **Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence** [linkage to below] and indicated:*

we affirm the goal of total abolition of all nuclear weapons throughout Earth and space.

The resolution also laid out a set of actions necessary for achieving the goal of nuclear abolition.

[set the following in a box like statements of the Holy See and others]

In Defense of Creation

[PDF document]

*In 1986 after two years of study the United Methodist Council of Bishops issued a foundation document and pastoral letter entitled **In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace**. In the pastoral letter, after summarizing a theology for peace with justice and the threat of nuclear weapons to the human family and planet earth itself, the bishops stated:*

Therefore, we say a clear and unconditional *No* to nuclear war and to any use of nuclear weapons. We conclude that nuclear deterrence is a position that cannot receive the church's blessing.

In the foundation document the United Methodist bishops outlined a set of policies for a just peace, including:

- Comprehensive test ban to inaugurate a nuclear freeze.
- Consolidation of existing treaties and phased reductions leading to the eventual goal of a mutual and verifiable dismantling of all nuclear armaments.
- Bans on space weapons.
- No-first-use agreement as a transitional measure.

Here is the pastoral letter in its entirety.

A Pastoral Letter to All United Methodists

From your brothers and sisters in Christ Jesus, the Council of Bishops, to all those people called United Methodist in every land: Grace to you and peace in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.

With hearts and minds open to Christ, who is our peace;

In obedience to his call to be peacemakers;

And in response to the biblical vision of a wholistic peace, *shalom*, revealed in Scripture to be God's will and purpose for all of creation:

We, the bishops of The United Methodist Church, have been moved by the spirit of Jesus to send you a message that we have titled **IN DEFENSE OF CREATION: THE NUCLEAR CRISIS AND A JUST PEACE**, a message we believe to be of utmost urgency in our time.

This message has been prepared over a span of two years during which time we have earnestly sought to hear the Word of God through the Scriptures. At the same time we have prayerfully and penitently reflected on the continuing buildup of nuclear arsenals by some of the nations. We have become increasingly aware of the devastation that such weapons can inflict on planet earth. We have watched and agonized over the increase in hostile rhetoric and hate among nations. We have seen the threat of a nuclear confrontation increasing in our world. We have been motivated by our own sense of Christian responsibility and stewardship for the world God created.

This brief *Pastoral Letter* is an introduction to a substantial *Foundation Document* that we have produced as the major portion of our message. In our *Foundation Document* we have attempted to state with clarity the biblical basis for our concerns and our conclusions about the issue we are addressing. We have set forth a theology for peace with justice in our time that reflects our understanding of the mind and will of Jesus Christ. This theology for a just peace reflects also our understanding of those insights of both pacifism and just-war theory that speak with relevance to the issues of the present nuclear crisis.

We write in defense of creation. We do so because the creation itself is under attack. Air and water, trees and fruits and flowers, birds and fish and cattle, all children and youth, women and men live under the darkening shadows of a threatening nuclear winter. We call The United Methodist Church to more faithful witness and action in the face of this worsening nuclear crisis. It is a crisis that threatens to assault not only the whole human family but planet earth itself, even while the arms race itself cruelly destroys millions of lives in conventional wars, repressive violence, and massive poverty.

Therefore, we say a clear and unconditional *No* to nuclear war and to any use of nuclear weapons. We concluded that nuclear deterrence is a position that cannot receive the church's blessing. We state our complete lack of confidence in proposed "defenses" against nuclear attack and are convinced that the enormous cost of developing such defenses is one more witness to the obvious fact that the arms race is a social justice issue, not only a war and peace issue.

Our document sets forth a number of policies for a just peace, including such disarmament proposals as a comprehensive test ban, a multilateral and mutually verifiable nuclear weapons freeze and the ultimate dismantling of all such weapons, and bans on all space weapons. However, the nuclear crisis is not primarily a matter of technology; it is a crisis of human community. We encourage independent US and Soviet initiatives to foster a political climate conducive to negotiations. We urge a renewed commitment to building the institutional foundations of common security,

economic justice, human rights, and environmental conservation. And we make appeal for peace research, studies, and training in all levels of education.

This message we are sending to United Methodist people is not meant to be a consensus opinion of our church or a policy statement of our denomination on the nuclear crisis and the pursuit of peace. It is given from the bishops to the church as both a pastoral and a prophetic word. It is *pastoral* in that we as bishops will seek to lead the church in study, prayer, and action related to this issue and this theme, using the *Foundation Document* as a basic resource and guide. It is *prophetic* in that the *Foundation Document* is our response to the Word of God. It faithfully states our understanding of that Word to our world at this moment in history.

Our message is the result of many months of prayerful study, research, and reflection. It is not given to the church with any feeling that it should be the final word on this issue or with the hope that it will silence all contrary opinions; but rather, we are sending this statement to the church seeking the fullest and fairest possible discussion of our understandings and convictions, together with an honest consideration of difference and critical opinions.

Peacemaking is ultimately a spiritual issue. It is a sacred calling of Jesus. All dimensions of church life offer openings for peacemaking: family life, Christian education, the ministry of the laity, pastoral ministry in every respect, political witness, and the great fact of the church as a worldwide company of disciples that transcends all nations, governments, races, and ideologies.

Now, therefore, we ask you, our sisters and brothers, to join with us in a new covenant of peacemaking; to use the Bible together with our Council's *Foundation Document* as basic resources for earnest and steadfast study of the issues of justice and peace. We call upon each local pastor and lay leader to give leadership in a local church study of the issues surrounding the nuclear threat. We ask you all to open again your hearts, as we open our hearts to receive God's gracious gift of peace; to become with us evangelists of *shalom*, making the ways of Jesus the model of discipleship, embracing all neighbors near and far, all friends and enemies, and becoming the defenders of God's good creation; and to pray without ceasing for peace in our time.

Now we draw this *Pastoral Letter* to a close with prayers for all of you and for all the nations and peoples of the earth.

We humbly pray that God will accept and use our lives and resources that we dedicate again to a ministry of peace.

May the love of God, the peace of Christ, and the power of the Holy Spirit be among you, everywhere and always, so that you may be a blessing to all creation and

to all the children of God, making peace and remembering the poor, choosing life and coming to life eternal, in God's own good time.

Amen.

General Conference Endorsement

*In 1988 the General Conference, the official governing body of the United Methodist Church, affirmed and supported **In Defense of Creation**. As part of a resolution on "Christian Faith and Disarmament", the General Conference stated:*

We especially affirm and support the statements of the Council of Bishops in their 1986 pastoral letter, "In Defense of Creation", and the accompanying foundation document. We urge our bishops to keep this concern before the Church. We request that the General Board of Discipleship produce new and updated educational materials for children, youth and adults to study the issues of peace and justice and the effects of the nuclear weapons crisis.

[set the following in a box like statements from the Holy See and others]

Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence

[PDF document]

The 2000 General Conference of the United Methodist Church, its official governing body, reaffirmed its support for the abolition of nuclear weapons and adopted the following resolution.

In 1986, the United Methodist Council of Bishops, after nearly two years of prayerful and penitent study, adopted a pastoral letter and foundation document entitled *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*.ⁱ

The bishops' statement was deeply rooted in biblical faith. They wrote:

At the heart of the Old Testament is the testimony of shalom, that marvelous Hebrew word that means peace. But the peace that is shalom is not negative or one dimensional. It is much more than the absence of war. Shalom is positive peace: harmony, wholeness, health, and well-being in all human relationships. It is the natural state of humanity as birthed by God. It is harmony between humanity and all of God's good creation. All of creation is interrelated. Every creature, every element, every force of nature participates in the whole of creation. If any person is denied shalom, all are thereby diminished....ⁱⁱ

New Testament faith presupposes a radical break with the follies, or much so-called conventional wisdom about power and security, on the one hand, and the transcendent

wisdom of shalom, on the other. Ultimately, New Testament faith is a message of hope about God's plan and purpose for human destiny. It is a redemptive vision that refuses to wallow in doom.ⁱⁱⁱ

Based upon this faith, the bishops in their pastoral letter stated unequivocally that "we say a clear and unconditional No to nuclear war and to any use of nuclear weapons. We conclude that nuclear deterrence is a position that cannot receive the church's blessing."

Based upon this faith, the bishops in their pastoral letter stated unequivocally that "we say a clear and unconditional *No* to nuclear war and to any use of nuclear weapons. We conclude that nuclear deterrence is a position that cannot receive the church's blessing."^{iv}

The implication is clear. If nuclear weapons cannot be legitimately used for either deterrence or war fighting, no nation should possess them. Accordingly, in the foundation document the bishops indicated:

We support the earliest possible negotiation of phased but rapid reduction of nuclear arsenals, while calling upon all other nuclear-weapon states to agree to parallel arms reduction, to the eventual goal of a mutual and verifiable dismantling all nuclear armaments.^v

In 1988, the United Methodist General Conference affirmed and supported the statements of the Council of Bishops contained in *In Defense of Creation*.^{vi} Four years later, in a resolution entitled "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option," the 1992 General Conference stated that "now is the time to exercise the zero option: to eliminate all nuclear weapons throughout the globe,"^{vii} and the conference offered a series of concrete actions for achieving this goal.

Our Commitment

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

Therefore, we reaffirm the goal of total abolition of all nuclear weapons throughout Earth and space.

Recommended Actions

Because we unequivocally reject the use or threatened use of nuclear weapons, we call upon all possessors of nuclear weapons to carry out the following actions as soon as possible:

(1) renounce unconditionally the use of nuclear weapons for deterrence and war-fighting purposes;

(2) pledge never to use nuclear weapons against any adversary under any circumstance;

(3) immediately take all nuclear weapons off alert by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and by other means;

(4) embark upon a program to systematically dismantle all nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles as soon as possible with adequate safeguards and verification, carried out under multilateral treaties and through reciprocal national initiatives;

(5) ratify and implement the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty;

(6) cease all research, development, testing, production, and deployment of new nuclear weapons and refrain from modernizing the existing nuclear arsenal;

(7) halt all efforts to develop and deploy strategic antimissile defense systems because they are illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful;

(8) respect the requirements of nuclear weapon-free zones where they exist;

(9) enter into a multilateral process to develop, adopt, and carry out a nuclear weapons convention that outlaws and abolishes all nuclear weapons under strict and effective international control;

(10) develop and implement a system for control of all fissile material with international accounting, monitoring, and safeguards.

We call upon all nations that do not possess nuclear weapons to:

(1) cease all efforts to develop these instruments of mass destruction and their delivery systems;

(2) ratify and carry out the provisions of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty;

(3) adhere to all provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty; and

(4) respect the requirements of nuclear weapon-free zones and extend this approach to other nations and continents.

Implementation

To promote the achievement of goals and objectives specified in this resolution:

(1) We ask the Council of Bishops to transmit a copy of the resolution to the heads of states of all nations possessing nuclear weapons.

(2) We ask the General Board of Church and Society to publicize the resolution with appropriate governmental officials, legislators, the media, and the general public.

(3) We call upon the Council of Bishops and the General Board of Church and Society to provide leadership, guidance, and educational material to United Methodists, congregations, and conferences in order to assist them in understanding and working for the goal and objectives of nuclear abolition.

(4) We request the Council of Bishops and the General Board of Church and Society to report to the 2004 General Conference the activities they have carried out and the progress achieved by the nations of Earth toward the goal of nuclear abolition.

Conclusion

We fervently believe that these recommendations will greatly enhance global security by eliminating the possibility of nuclear war. Furthermore, the resources of human talent, production capacity, and money released can become available to deal with urgent human problems around the globe. Nuclear abolition provides great hope for global peace and prosperity.

ⁱ *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*, the United Methodist Council of Bishops (Nashville: Graded Press, 1986).

ⁱⁱ *Ibid.*, page 24.

ⁱⁱⁱ *Ibid.*, page 28.

^{iv} *Ibid.*, page 92.

^v *Ibid.*, page 76.

^{vi} *The Book of Resolutions of the United Methodist Church, 1988*, page 503.

^{vii} *Ibid.*, page 601.

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Subject: Religious statements again
Date: Fri, 14 Jun 2002 17:25:57 -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 5.50.4807.1700
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Marie,

Make the following changes and then go on line.

1. Under Union of American Hebrew Congregations, strike the following, which duplicate the text:

Control of Nuclear Arms

Preventing Nuclear Holocaust, 1983

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

Halting the Nuclear Arms Race, 1989

2. For Pax Christi International, make the second paragraph of text to read:

In 2000 Pax Christi International published New Challenges on Nuclear Disarmament Agenda: A Call and Statement on Nuclear Disarmament. (This can be seen at to www.paxchristi.net, then go to resources -- archive (more) -- security & disarmament -- 10/00 -- New Challenges on Nuclear Disarmament Agenda SD04 (EFGDP)00 English.) Signed by 74 bishops from 20 nations on five continents, the statement declared:

Make bold the title: New Challenges....Nuclear Disarmament.

Everything else is okay. Congratulations.

Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
Methodists United for Peace with Justice

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

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

Status: U

Return-Path: <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

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

by niles.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17iXcn11U3Nl3pm0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 14 Jun 2002 15:57:31 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020614195730.87625.qmail@web13904.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13904.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Fri, 14 Jun 2002 12:57:30 PDT

Date: Fri, 14 Jun 2002 12:57:30 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: Religious Statements

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

In-Reply-To: <004e01c213b0\$51b54040\$a75af7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-2008682055-1024084650=:86730"

--0-2008682055-1024084650=:86730

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

Howard,

I made the changes. In regards to the link to pax christi.net. Their web site was created using frames, therefore, you cannot directly go to sublinks on any of their pages. That is why most web developers do not use frames. The only suggestion I have is to provide your users instructions to find the document or link within their website.

Regards,

Marie

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

Marie,

1. I must have sent you the wrong document for UAHC. The correct, revised document is attached.
2. For Rabbi Saperstein's statement at the Cathedral signing, you have substituted Dr. Siddiqi's statement of the Islam position. That's wrong. Saperstein's statement, which was okay previously, is as follows. It should be set in a box.

Statement by Rabbi David Saperstein

When the Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement [<http://www.nrdi.org/nuclear/Nuclear02.html>] by religious and military leaders was issued at the Washington National Cathedral in June 2000, Rabbi David Saperstein, director, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, made a statement [<http://www.nrdi.org/nuclear/NuclearP07.html>] in which he said:

In the Bible it was commanded that before the Israelite army could engage in warfare, the priests needed to read to the assembled the rules of what was ethically permitted in warfare and what was prohibited. That interaction between religion and the military created the first ethical strictures of warfare—the foundation of what later became known as "just war theory."

Today we religious and military leaders continue this tradition. We stand together in this House of God, informed by our values, aware of the horrible human cost of war and conflict, weary of the threat posed by nuclear proliferation—to call upon Congress, the President, the American military, and the American people to lead the way towards a process of nuclear reduction and disarmament.

At this crucial crossroads of history, we join to call on the world to recognize that violence begets violence; that nuclear proliferation benefits no one; that we can, we will, and we must find other ways to protect ourselves, our nations and our future: for it is not sufficient to have peace in our time, but, instead, we must leave a peaceful world to

our children.

3. For Dr. Siddiqi's statement, the way the sentences are divided is better in the box that appears with Rabbi Saperstein than the present division under Dr. Siddiqi in the Islam sentence. Please make this adjustment.

4. Thanks for removing the Pax Christi International paragraphs from the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. In looking at Pax Christi International section once more, I note in the second paragraph the reference to "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition". This should be underlined and linked to the statement with that title under 1998 NPT PrepCom on this page. Then you can remove the material in brackets.

5. I still don't know how to handle the URL for the Pax Christi International statement "New Challenges on Nuclear Disarmament Agenda". I find it by going to www.paxchristi.net then clicking: resources -- archive (more) -- security & disarmament -- 10/00 -- New Challenges on Nuclear Disarmament Agenda SD04 (EFGDP)00 English. When this produces the statement, there is no URL on the address line except for www.paxchristi.net. How can this be translated into a linkage on our site? I've asked them for a specific URL but received no answer.

Howard

----- Original Message ----- From: Marie Kayser To: Howard W. Hallman Sent: Friday, June 14, 2002 9:45 AM
Subject: Re: Religious Statements

Howard,

The Religious Statements page should now reflect the latest edits. I made the change to the UAHC section. I used the document you sent me yesterday - see attached.

Thanks,

Marie

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Mehall, Lynette" <lmehall@attglobal.net>
Subject: Our plans
Date: Sat, 15 Jun 2002 09:51:48 -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 5.50.4807.1700
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Dear Lynette and Rick,

We're looking forward to seeing you in a couple of weeks. On Friday, July 5 we'll leave Galesburg after lunch and arrive at your house by mid-afternoon. We'll depart early afternoon on Saturday, July 6.

I still have directions from last year when we we thought we were coming but didn't.

Our itinerary is below.

Looking forward to seeing you,
Howard

Itinerary of Howard & Carlee Hallman
June 23 to July 7, 2002

Cell phone: 240 426-0031

Sunday, June 23
Leave home, drive into Indiana on Indiana Turnpike

Monday midday, June 24 to Thursday morning, June 27
With Mary Hallman in Elmhurst, IL 630 279-7578

Drive to Topeka, Kansas on June 27

Thursday evening, June 27 to Monday morning, July 1
With Mary Hurrel in Topeka 785 235-8176

Drive to Galesburg, Illinois on July 1

Monday evening, July 1 to Friday early afternoon, July 5
With Jan and Darlene Bengtson at Lake Bracken cottage: 309 342-4959
Staying at Jumer's Continental Inn in Galesburg 309 343-7151

Drive to Bloomington, IL on Friday afternoon, July 5

Friday mid-afternoon, July 5 to Saturday, early afternoon, July 6

With Lynette and Rick Mehall 309 726-2611

Saturday, July 6 to Sunday, July 7

Travel home. Stay overnight in Ohio along I-70

Status: U
Return-Path: <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Received: from web13902.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.28])
by nils.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17jBJx71C3Nl3pm0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Sun, 16 Jun 2002 11:14:27 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <20020616151426.31315.qmail@web13902.mail.yahoo.com>
Received: from [209.244.224.228] by web13902.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Sun, 16 Jun 2002 08:14:26 PDT
Date: Sun, 16 Jun 2002 08:14:26 -0700 (PDT)
From: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Addition for Military Leaders Speak Out
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
In-Reply-To: <006e01c213b4\$7fc122c0\$a75af7a5@default>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-1467493715-1024240466=:30292"

--0-1467493715-1024240466=:30292
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Howard,
Please resend the original Military Leaders Speak Out file you sent earlier.
Thanks,
Marie
"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote: Marie,

Now that Religious Statements are about completed, I hope you can turn to
Military Leaders Speak Out. I sent you the material a couple of weeks ago.

I have an addition for the section on General Colin Powell. It is as
follows:

[first paragraph in italic. make bold "prospects for use of nuclear
weapons"]

In 2001 General Colin Powell, now retired from the U.S. Army, became
secretary of state in the administration of President George W. Bush. He
discussed the prospects for use of nuclear weapons in an interview on the
News Hour with Jim Lehrer on May 30, 2002. The focus was the threat of war
between India and Pakistan. Lehrer asked him, " If there is, in fact, a
conflict, how likely is it that it would eventually lead to the use of
nuclear weapons by these two countries?" Powell replied:

[next two paragraphs inset as block in non-italic]

I can't answer that question, but I can say this: In my conversations with
both sides, especially with the Pakistani side, I have made it clear that
this really can't be in anyone's mind. I mean, the thought of nuclear
conflict in the year 2002 -- with what that would mean with respect to loss
of life, what that would mean with respect to the condemnation, the
worldwide condemnation that would come down on whatever
nation chose to take that course of action -- would be such that I can see
very little military, political, or any other kind of justification for the
use of nuclear weapons.

Nuclear weapons in this day and age may serve some deterrent effect, and so be it, but to think of using them as just another weapon in what might start out as a conventional conflict in this day and age, seems to me to be something that no side should be contemplating.

Shalom,
Howard

Status: U

Return-Path: <MEHALLLH@unit5.org>

Received: from unit5.org ([209.175.175.6])

by niles.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17jKwe4tu3Nl3pm0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Sun, 16 Jun 2002 20:37:17 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from Internet-Message_Server by unit5.org

with Novell_GroupWise; Sun, 16 Jun 2002 19:36:23 -0500

Message-Id: <sd0ce8b7.076@unit5.org>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 5.5.5.1

Date: Sun, 16 Jun 2002 19:36:11 -0500

From: "LYNETTE MEHALL" <MEHALLLH@unit5.org>

To: <mupj@igc.org>

Subject: Re: Our plans

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

This sounds fine. We have you on our schedule. Have a safe trip! I know =
Mom is looking forward to your visit. Lynette

>>> "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> 06/15/02 08:50 AM >>>

Dear Lynette and Rick,

We're looking forward to seeing you in a couple of weeks. On Friday, July =
5
we'll leave Galesburg after lunch and arrive at your house by mid-afternoon=

.
We'll depart early afternoon on Saturday, July 6.

I still have directions from last year when we we thought we were coming =
but
didn't.

Our itinerary is below.

Looking forward to seeing you,
Howard

Itinerary of Howard & Carlee Hallman
June 23 to July 7, 2002

Cell phone: 240 426-0031

Sunday, June 23
Leave home, drive into Indiana on Indiana Turnpike

Monday midday, June 24 to Thursday morning, June 27
With Mary Hallman in Elmhurst, IL 630 279-7578

Drive to Topeka, Kansas on June 27

Thursday evening, June 27 to Monday morning, July 1

With Mary Hurrel in Topeka 785 235-8176

Drive to Galesburg, Illinois on July 1

Monday evening, July 1 to Friday early afternoon, July 5

With Jan and Darlene Bengtson at Lake Bracken cottage: 309 342-4959

Staying at Jumer's Continental Inn in Galesburg 309 343-7151

Drive to Bloomington, IL on Friday afternoon, July 5

Friday mid-afternoon, July 5 to Saturday, early afternoon, July 6

With Lynette and Rick Mehall 309 726-2611

Saturday, July 6 to Sunday, July 7

Travel home. Stay overnight in Ohio along I-70

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
To: "Marie Kayser" marie_kayser@yahoo.com
References: 20020616151426.31315.gmail@web13902.mail.yahoo.com
Subject: Military Leaders Speak Out
Date: Mon, 17 Jun 2002 08:26:08 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="-----
=_NextPart_000_000D_01C215D8.A25824C0"
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

Marie,

Attached is the initial material for the Military Leaders Speak Out page. It includes the added material for General Powell. As previously indicated 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.

Howard

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

From: Marie Kayser
To: Howard W. Hallman
Sent: Sunday, June 16, 2002 11:14 AM
Subject: Re: Addition for Military Leaders Speak Out

Howard,

Please resend the original Military Leaders Speak Out file you sent earlier.

Thanks,
Marie

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], 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 30th 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.

*In 2001 General Colin Powell, now retired from the U.S. Army, became secretary of state in the administration of President George W. Bush. He discussed the **prospects for use of nuclear weapons** in an interview on the News Hour with Jim Lehrer on May 30, 2002. The focus was the threat of war between India and Pakistan. Lehrer asked him, "If there is, in fact, a conflict, how likely is it that it would eventually lead to the use of nuclear weapons by these two countries?" Powell replied:*

I can't answer that question, but I can say this: In my conversations with both sides, especially with the Pakistani side, I have made it clear that this really can't be in anyone's mind. I mean, the thought of nuclear conflict in the year 2002 -- with what that would mean with respect to loss of life, what that would mean with respect to the condemnation, the worldwide condemnation that would come down on whatever nation chose to take that course of action -- would be such that I can see very little military, political, or any other kind of justification for the use of nuclear weapons.

Nuclear weapons in this day and age may serve some deterrent effect, and so be it, but to think of using them as just another weapon in what might start out as a conventional conflict in this day and age, seems to me to be something that no side should be contemplating.

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.

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Janet Horman" <JHorman@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
References: <619BD1E95646D311B69D0008C79FE32D72FC2F@church2.umc-gbcs.org>
Subject: Re: United Methodist Statement
Date: Mon, 17 Jun 2002 14:21:50 -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 5.50.4807.1700
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Janet,

This is a similar copyright problem with the U.S. Catholic Conference. With Jerry Powers help they have given me permission to use a section from The Harvest of Justice. Permission to use the Summary of The Challenge of Peace is pending and will probably be granted.

I hope that I can work out a similar arrangement with the United Methodist Church. If I need to contact someone, such as at the Graded Press for In Defense of Creation, let me know. Or perhaps you at GBCS can intervene for me. Let me know.

Howard

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

From: "Janet Horman" <JHorman@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>; "Jaydee Hanson" <JHanson@UMC-GBCS.ORG>; "Vince Isner" <VIsner@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2002 1:29 PM
Subject: RE: United Methodist Statement

> Howard:
>
> You've done a great job out outlining United Methodist positions on
> nuclear
> issues. I think the reason that the full texts of the resolutions and the
> pastoral letter/In Defense of Creation aren't on the web has to do, at
> least
> in part, with copyright issues. Jaydee has been in discussion with
> Gretchen
> and may be able to provide more insight. I don't believe it is possible to
> use the cross and the flame in this instance, due to the disciplinary
> restrictions..but I'll look it up to be sure. In addition to the link to
> GBCS, I would like to see a few sentences on the efforts GBCS makes to
> promote legislation and education on nuclear issues..through Peace with
> Justice Coordinators, etc.

>

> Janet

>

>

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <interfaithnd@yahoo.com>
Subject: Web site
Date: Mon, 17 Jun 2002 14:23:07 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

We are now on line with www.zero-nukes.org with two connecting links you can reach through the home page: Religious Statements and How to Get to Zero.

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.

X-POP3-Rcpt: hallman@holliday
Return-Path: <jcoode@Maryknoll.org>
Received: from Maryknoll.org ([216.187.59.51])
by holliday.lighthost.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id NAA32248
for <hallman@zero-nukes.org>; Mon, 17 Jun 2002 13:32:20 -0500
Received: from Judy.maryknoll.org ([12.40.169.116]) by Maryknoll.org with Microsoft SMTPSVC(5.0.2195.4905);
Mon, 17 Jun 2002 14:28:01 -0400
Message-Id: <5.1.0.14.2.20020617142412.00aa2860@pop.maryknoll.org>
X-Sender: jcoode@pop.maryknoll.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1
Date: Mon, 17 Jun 2002 14:28:48 -0400
To: hallman@zero-nukes.org
From: Judy Coode <jcoode@Maryknoll.org>
Subject: website sponsor list
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed
X-OriginalArrivalTime: 17 Jun 2002 18:28:01.0156 (UTC) FILETIME=[B63C1C40:01C2162C]

Hi Howard:

Just a couple of small notes after looking at the website: In the box of sponsors in the lower left corner, Pax Christi USA is misspelled ... seems to have gained a comma where the second "i" should be. Also, I'm not sure what the status of some of the links is supposed to be, but several links for the sponsor groups didn't go through.

Thanks for all your work on this.

peace,
Judy

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
To: "Marie Kayser" marie_kayser@yahoo.com
Subject: New religious statements
Date: Mon, 17 Jun 2002 14:43:31 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----
=_NextPart_000_001F_01C2160D.5A2734E0"
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

Marie,

I have four more entries for the Religious Statements page. Three are attached, and the fourth is sent separately because it is on a different disk.

Their names should be added in alphabetical order to the contents list nearing the beginning of the page, as follows:

American Baptist Churches
Episcopal Church
Mennonite Church USA
Unitarian Universalist Association

The text of their entrees should be in alphabetical order in the denomination section.

If this isn't clear, let me know.

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.

American Baptist Churches in the U.S.A.

American Baptist Churches in the U.S.A. [www.abc-usa.org] (at one time known as the Northern Baptist Convention) has 1.5 million members in 5,800 local congregations. Over the years its General Board at biennial meetings has regularly expressed its concern about nuclear weapons.

In a 1985 Policy Statement on Peace [<http://www.abc-usa.org/resources/resol/peace.htm>] *the General Board stated:*

- We call on all nations to abolish their nuclear weapons and to dispose of such weapons in a manner that is not harmful to either the physical or political environment.

*In 1992 the General Board adopted a lengthy **Resolution on Arms Reduction**,* [<http://www.abc-usa.org/resources/resol/armsred2.htm>] *which its Executive Committee updated in 1996. Among other things the resolution indicated that the General Board of American Baptist Churches:*

1. Supports the substantial nuclear arms reduction steps taken by the U.S. and Russian governments and calls for expeditious fulfillment of those agreements in partnership with other states from the former Soviet Union.
2. Calls on all nuclear powers to take all nuclear weapons off alert status.
3. Calls for all nation states to halt further production, transfer or sale of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons materials.
4. Calls upon nation states and corporations to make substantial reductions in conventional weapons transfers and sales, and for the U.N. to establish systems to monitor and control arms transfers and sales.
5. Calls for the United States and all nuclear nation states to support the expansion of the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty into a Comprehensive Test Ban, and for the universal adoption of such a treaty.
6. Calls for worldwide acceptance and strengthening of the NonProliferation Treaty, including the development of more vigorous verification procedures and a ban on the sale or transfer of nuclear weapons technology and materials.
7. Calls on Congress and the U. S. Administration to make cuts in military spending and deployment commensurate with the changed political and military context.

8. Calls for the U.S. government to halt development of the Strategic Defense Initiative and to abandon all plans for deploying its various components.

9. Calls on Congress to create adequately funded programs for economic conversion and job retraining for workers involved in arms production and for military personnel who are involuntarily discharged.

[logo from <http://www.episcopalchurch.org/eppn/>]

Episcopal Church

***The Episcopal Church** [www.episcopalchurch.org] has 2.3 million members and 7,359 local congregations in the United States. It is governed by a bicameral General Convention consisting of a House of Bishops and a House of Delegates that meets every three years. A 38-member Executive Council is the interim governing body. An elected Presiding Bishop serves as primate.*

*The Episcopal Church has a long record of opposition to nuclear weapons. Resolutions of the past 20 years are on the web site of the **Episcopal Public Policy Network** [<http://www.episcopalchurch.org/eppn/results.asp>] (search for "nuclear"). They include:*

- support for a policy of no first use of nuclear weapons (1982) [<http://www.episcopalchurch.org/eppn/display.asp?DocID=229>]
- support for a bilateral nuclear freeze and an immediate halt in the testing, production and further deployment of all nuclear weapons (1982) [web site to go with "freeze" is <http://www.episcopalchurch.org/eppn/display.asp?DocID=229>]
- opposition to President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative known as "Star Wars" (1985) [<http://www.episcopalchurch.org/eppn/display.asp?DocID=192>]
- support for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (1994) [<http://www.episcopalchurch.org/eppn/display.asp?DocID=416>]

*In 1997 the 72nd General Convention adopted a resolution favoring the **Abolition of Nuclear Weapons** [<http://www.episcopalchurch.org/eppn/display.asp?DocID=333>]. The resolution committed the General Convention to:*

- support the goal of total nuclear disarmament.
- urge the Government of the United States to exercise leadership among the nations, especially the nuclear weapons states, by immediately in initiating negotiations for an International Treaty on Comprehensive Nuclear Disarmament in all its aspects to include a deadline for the completion of nuclear disarmament.

[logo from www.mennonitechurchusa.org]

Mennonite Church USA

Mennonite Church USA [www.mennonitechurchusa.org] with 116,000 members is known for its peace stand, taken because of the belief that Jesus Christ taught the way of peace. Many Mennonites choose not to participate in military service.

Mennonite Church USA is one of 15 sponsors of the **Mennonite Central Committee** [www.mcc.org], a relief, service, community development and peace agency of the North American Mennonite and Brethren in Christ churches.

In 1981 the biennial General Assembly of the Mennonite Church (one of two predecessor bodies of Mennonite Church USA) adopted a **Resolution on Security and the Current World Arms Race**, which noted:

We seek to follow Christ in refusal to prepare for war or take life for any reason and do not seek security in weapons. We feel called at this time to a particular witness against nuclear weapons because of the enormous consequences of decisions confronting world leaders regarding the testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons.

PDF document

[Marie: put in a box and indented like Holy See model]

Resolution on Security and the Current World Arms Race

As members of the Mennonite Church in the United States and Canada, we have gathered in biennial General Assembly in Bowling Green, Ohio, August 11-16, 1981, to affirm and celebrate our hope in Jesus Christ. In worship, prayer, and mutual deliberations we have sought the mind of Christ.

While celebrating our hope we are also aware of a growing despair in the world due to the escalation of the arms race. The development of new nuclear weapons proceeds amidst a political mood which is apparently ready to use them. Many are now saying that the question is no longer if nuclear weapons will be used, but when. The probable resulting devastation to human life is beyond comprehension.

Two years ago this Assembly adopted a statement on militarism and conscription. In deploring the arms race observed then, the 1979 Assembly called our members and all people to trust in God rather than military technology, urging the church to “plead and pray for reversal of the world’s collision course in manufacturing and deploying the most destructive weapons in all of history.” The need for prayer is even more urgent today.

We seek to follow Christ in refusal to prepare for war or take life for any reason and do not seek security in weapons. We also feel called at this time to a particular witness against nuclear weapons because of the enormous consequences of decisions confronting world leaders regarding the testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons.

God's commandment that we love our neighbors motivates us to oppose those things that would destroy them. The false god of military security must be challenged by our witness to the sole source of salvation in Jesus Christ. To express our nonresistant faith in the context of the current arms race, we encourage our congregations and members to practice the following forms of faithfulness:

1. To pray regularly for national leaders who have in their hands the fateful power of nuclear weapons.
2. To become informed about the potential of nuclear war and the policies that move in that direction. We encourage congregations to find ways to study the issue and clarify their witness. Conference and churchwide peace committees can suggest helpful resources.
3. To declare our readiness, in the light of our faith in Christ, to live without nuclear weapons in our countries. The World Peace Pledge is one way to record and share this testimony.
4. To enter into discussion and study with other Christians in our communities. Many Christians who have not fully considered the way of love are asking questions about the meaning of the biblical message for issues of war and peace. As an aid for such discussions, we commend the New Abolitionist Covenant, which raises the faith question in regard to nuclear weapons in a manner similar to the way Christians two centuries ago began to question slavery in the light of the Word of God.
5. To invite men and women, including government leaders to that saving faith in Jesus Christ which provides ultimate security and frees from fear.
6. To consider ways to witness to the decision making process in our governments, urging alternatives to military confrontation and supporting the use of scarce resources for human need rather than armaments.

We confess that we have sometimes compromised our loyalty to the Prince of Peace by our silence in the face of preparations for war. We commit ourselves anew to Jesus Christ and the gospel of peace, sharing that gospel by our words and our consistent

living as God's people. We resolve in all our relationships to witness to Christ's reconciling love through proclamation of His good news, through ministries of service, and through sacrificial sharing of our resources.

Our hope is in the gospel; our strength is in God. We rely upon the promise found in Zechariah 4:6: Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, says the Lord of Hosts.

frequently

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
To: "Marie Kayser" marie_kayser@yahoo.com
Subject: Unitarian Statement
Date: Mon, 17 Jun 2002 14:47:09 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----
=_NextPart_000_002A_01C2160D.DC8CDC00"
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

Marie,

Here is the attachment for the Unitarian Statement.

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.

[logo from www.uua.org/uuawo]

Unitarian Universalist Association

The Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations in North America

[www.uua.org]

represents the interests of more than 1,000 local congregations. Since merger of the Unitarians and the Universalists in 1961, UUA has supported peace and disarmament in over 84 resolutions [<http://www.uua.org/actions/#peace>] passed by its annual General Assembly and its Board of Trustees. One of the resolutions passed the first year affirmed "belief in total, universal disarmament under controls" because "weapons of mass destruction are inconsistent with our moral and religious principles."

A 1983 resolution on Halting the Arms Race

[<http://www.uua.org/actions/peace/83race.html>] urged the United States Congress to:

1. Persuade the President to initiate serious disarmament discussions with the USSR; and
2. Defeat appropriation bills for the MX and Pershing II missiles; and
3. Pass a bilateral and verifiable Nuclear Weapons Freeze resolution; and
4. Take all other necessary action to end the arms race, including support for the United Nations World Disarmament Campaign; and
5. Continuing from the McCloy-Zhorin agreements of 1961, initiate talks aimed at replacing armed threats and confrontation with serious negotiation between the US and the USSR to attain peaceful coexistence without regard to ideological differences.

In 1985 the General Assembly, in declaring UUA properties nuclear free zones, [<http://www.uua.org/actions/peace/85zone.html>], summarized its beliefs as follows:

Affirming our conviction that serving life demands the selfless promotion of peace, the GA of the UUA has resolved to seek an end to the nuclear arms race....Believing that humankind is free to choose life, we denounce the blasphemy against life which is represented by the development, production, deployment and threatened use of nuclear weapons. Pledging, in our religious principles, to protect the Earth and interdependence of its living system we choose to create hope and the vision of a better world. We fulfill this pledge through our efforts to abolish all nuclear weapons from the face of the earth.

In 1989 the UUA Board of Trustees adopted The Citizens Agenda for Common Security and Disarmament By the Year 2000

[<http://www.uua.org/actions/peace/89disarmament.html>]. This agenda include a call to the President and Congress to:

1. Redirect national resources away from the military and toward meeting human needs. Fund jobs and housing.
2. Declare a halt to nuclear testing. Negotiate a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Stop funding the Star Wars. Honor existing arms control treaties.
3. Negotiate a 50% reduction in strategic nuclear arms (START Treaty). Halt production and deployment of new nuclear weapons.

Status: U
Return-Path: <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Received: from web13904.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.67])
by payne.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17kiFr7Ba3NI3p40
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 18 Jun 2002 09:05:05 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <20020618130505.80973.qmail@web13904.mail.yahoo.com>
Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13904.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Tue, 18 Jun 2002 06:05:05 PDT
Date: Tue, 18 Jun 2002 06:05:05 -0700 (PDT)
From: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: New religious statements
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
In-Reply-To: <002201c2162f\$1f0fd340\$5a52f7a5@default>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-914726813-1024405505=:79951"

--0-914726813-1024405505=:79951
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Howard,
Just a quick note, the military leaders page is up but I haven't finished putting the links and the photo of the eagle.
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/militaryleaders.html>
Thanks,
Marie
"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote: Marie,

I have four more entries for the Religious Statements page. Three are attached, and the fourth is sent separately because it is on a different disk.

Their names should be added in alphabetical order to the contents list nearing the beginning of the page, as follows:

American Baptist Churches
Episcopal Church
Mennonite Church USA
Unitarian Universalist Association

The text of their entrees should be in alphabetical order in the denomination section.

If this isn't clear, let me know.

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=American Baptist statement.doc > ATTACHMENT part 3 application/msword name=Episcopal statement.01.doc > ATTACHMENT part 4 application/msword name=Mennonite statement.doc

Status: U

Return-Path: <csjp@igc.org>

Received: from granger.mail.mindspring.net ([207.69.200.148])

by runyon.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17kjpG1T83Nl3sj0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 18 Jun 2002 09:52:52 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from user-uiver72.dsl.mindspring.com ([165.247.108.226] helo=DC5MWJ11)

by granger.mail.mindspring.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #1)
id 17KJPe-0006Kr-00

for mupj@igc.org; Tue, 18 Jun 2002 09:52:50 -0400

Reply-To: <csjp@igc.org>

From: "Charlotte Davenport" <csjp@igc.org>

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

Subject: RE: [interfaith] Web site

Date: Tue, 18 Jun 2002 09:52:57 -0400

Message-ID: <000a01c216cf\$7495f060\$e26cf7a5@DC5MWJ11>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="US-ASCII"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook, Build 10.0.3416

Importance: Normal

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000

In-Reply-To: <001701c2162c\$0d2fbe40\$5a52f7a5@default>

Dear Howard,

The site looks great!!!. However, some of the bottoms don't seem to be activated yet... such as the Your Feedback one... I was going to try to send a message via it but no luck. Thank you for all you are doing to help us in the faith community to continue to work for the removal of nuclear arms from our defense system.

Charlotte Davenport, csjp

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

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

Sent: Monday, June 17, 2002 2:23 PM

To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

Subject: [interfaithnd] Web site

We are now on line with www.zero-nukes.org with two connecting links you can reach through the home page: Religious Statements and How to Get to Zero.

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.

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

Free \$5 Love Reading

Risk Free!

<http://us.click.yahoo.com/3PCXaC/PfREAA/Ey.GAA/nJ9qlB/TM>

----->

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

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

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com>
Subject: Proposal for ND summit
Date: Tue, 18 Jun 2002 11:50:53 -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 5.50.4807.1700
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

PROPOSAL. I propose that we have a full-day summit meeting of the faith community to develop a coordinated effort to step up our advocacy for nuclear disarmament.

* The session should seek to draw in not only persons who usually attend meetings of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament but also heads of Washington offices, headquarters staff located elsewhere, and if possible some heads of communion, bishops, ecumenical representatives.

* It should be scheduled far enough in advance to get on appointment calendars, say, in late October.

What do you think of this possibility?

THE CHALLENGE. Going through statements of religious organizations for our new web site, I am struck by how much they are the opposite of the policies of the Bush Administration.

* Although Bush's commitment to take about two-thirds of the strategic arsenal out of service is a positive step, it is compromised by the intent to keep large numbers in reserve. This contrasts with previous arms control agreements that required dismantlement of delivery systems.

* Both Russia and the United States will be allowed to have multi-warhead missiles, which were to be outlawed under now-renounced START II.

* Bush has repudiated his campaign promise to de-alert the deployed force.

* Bush's policy is nuclear weapons forever.

* The cold war doctrine of Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) continues because the United States and Russia will look at each other's capability to launch at attack with the 1,700 to 2,200 actively deployed warheads.

* The prospective role of nuclear weapons is expanding to possible use against non-nuclear-weapon states and in response to attacks by biological and chemical weapons.

* The Bush Administration wants to develop new nuclear weapons, such as a bunker buster, and to prepare to reopen the nuclear weapons test site.

* Enormous amounts of funds are committed to missile defense while the Bush Administration refuses to fully fund efforts to secure Russian nuclear weapons and fissile material, as recommended by the Baker-Cutler Commission. This increases the risk of terrorist acquisition of nuclear weapons and

missile material.

In sum, nuclear policy, which wasn't all that great in the Clinton Administration, has become significantly worse under President Bush from the perspective of the faith community. We are challenged to respond. That's why I am proposing a one-day summit meeting.

PREPARATION. To get the most out of a one-day gathering, we need careful preparation. I suggest three issue papers, to be circulated at least three weeks in advance. Drafts of the paper should be circulated to a key group even earlier. The suggested topics are:

- (1) Defining the issue: the nature of the nuclear arsenal and current flaws in public policy.
- (2) Public policy outcomes that we desire (the web site is a major source for this)
- (3) Plan of action
 - (a) Within faith community
 - (b) Building a broader working coalition, especially with "unusual partners", such as military leaders, scientists; and with linkage to civil-sector initiatives.

RESOURCE PERSONS. With an eye to developing a broader campaign, I suggest that we bring in one or more military leaders and scientists as speakers. We might also have selective participation from civil-sector organizations, such as the New Call initiative, as observers and resource persons.

OUTCOME. The desired outcome of this summit meeting would be a renewed commitment to work together for nuclear disarmament, a renewal of our prophetic call, and a plan of action that both mobilizes the faith community and links it to a much broader coalition.

QUERY. What do you think of this proposal? Would your office or organization participate? What refinements would you suggest? What dates should be avoid in the October-December 2002 period?

I will be on vacation from June 22 to July 6. By the time I return I hope that my e-mail box is full of replies from you.

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: <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>

Received: from web11104.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.131.151])

by kendall.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17kllw7nc3Nl3pM0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 18 Jun 2002 11:56:42 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020618155642.66641.qmail@web11104.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [216.193.47.8] by web11104.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Tue, 18 Jun 2002 08:56:42 PDT

Date: Tue, 18 Jun 2002 08:56:42 -0700 (PDT)

From: Egbert Lawrence <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>

Subject: Reply from Larry Egbert re: Proposal for ND summit

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

In-Reply-To: <001001c216e0\$0fc2b860\$8c5bf7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Hi, Howard,

Great idea. When? I will see Meg Riley at our continental meeting of the Unitarian Universalists and will bring up the idea.

Be back early July.

PEACE! Larry

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

> To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

>

> Dear Colleagues:

>

> PROPOSAL. I propose that we have a full-day summit

> meeting of the faith

> community to develop a coordinated effort to step up

> our advocacy for

> nuclear disarmament.

> * The session should seek to draw in not only

> persons who usually attend

> meetings of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear

> Disarmament but also heads

> of Washington offices, headquarters staff located

> elsewhere, and if possible

> some heads of communion, bishops, ecumenical

> representatives.

> * It should be scheduled far enough in advance to

> get on appointment

> calendars, say, in late October.

>

> What do you think of this possibility?

>

> THE CHALLENGE. Going through statements of

> religious organizations for our

> new web site, I am struck by how much they are the

> opposite of the policies

> of the Bush Administration.

> * Although Bush's commitment to take about

> two-thirds of the strategic

> arsenal out of service is a positive step, it is

- > compromised by the intent
- > to keep large numbers in reserve. This contrasts
- > with previous arms
- > control agreements that required dismantlement of
- > delivery systems.
- > * Both Russia and the United States will be allowed
- > to have multi-warhead
- > missiles, which were to be outlawed under
- > now-renounced START II.
- > * Bush has repudiated his campaign promise to
- > de-alert the deployed force.
- > * Bush's policy is nuclear weapons forever.
- > * The cold war doctrine of Mutual Assured
- > Destruction (MAD) continues
- > because the United States and Russia will look at
- > each other's capability to
- > launch at attack with the 1,700 to 2,200 actively
- > deployed warheads.
- > * The prospective role of nuclear weapons is
- > expanding to possible use
- > against non-nuclear-weapon states and in response to
- > attacks by biological
- > and chemical weapons.
- > * The Bush Administration wants to develop new
- > nuclear weapons, such as a
- > bunker buster, and to prepare to reopen the nuclear
- > weapons test site.
- > * Enormous amounts of funds are committed to missile
- > defense while the Bush
- > Administration refuses to fully fund efforts to
- > secure Russian nuclear
- > weapons and fissile material, as recommended by the
- > Baker-Cutler Commission.
- > This increases the risk of terrorist acquisition of
- > nuclear weapons and
- > missile material.
- >
- > In sum, nuclear policy, which wasn't all that great
- > in the Clinton
- > Administration, has become significantly worse under
- > President Bush from the
- > perspective of the faith community. We are
- > challenged to respond. That's
- > why I am proposing a one-day summit meeting.
- >
- > PREPARATION. To get the most out of a one-day
- > gathering, we need careful
- > preparation. I suggest three issue papers, to be
- > circulated at least three
- > weeks in advance. Drafts of the paper should be
- > circulated to a key group
- > even earlier. The suggested topics are:
- > (1) Defining the issue: the nature of the nuclear
- > arsenal and current flaws

> in public policy.
> (2) Public policy outcomes that we desire (the web
> site is a major source
> for this)
> (3) Plan of action
> (a) Within faith community
> (b) Building a broader working coalition,
> especially with "unusual
> partners", such as
> military leaders, scientists; and with linkage to
> civil-sector
> initiatives.
>
> RESOURCE PERSONS. With an eye to developing a
> broader campaign, I suggest
> that we bring in one or more military leaders and
> scientists as speakers.
> We might also have selective participation from
> civil-sector organizations,
> such as the New Call initiative, as observers and
> resource persons.
>
> OUTCOME. The desired outcome of this summit meeting
> would be a renewed
> commitment to work together for nuclear disarmament,
> a renewal of our
> prophetic call, and a plan of action that both
> mobilizes the faith community
> and links it to a much broader coalition.
>
> QUERY. What do you think of this proposal? Would
> your office or
> organization participate? What refinements would
> you suggest? What dates
> should be avoid in the October-December 2002 period?
>
> I will be on vacation from June 22 to July 6. By
> the time I return I hope
> that my e-mail box is full of replies from you.
>
> 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.

>
>
>

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! - Official partner of 2002 FIFA World Cup

<http://fifaworldcup.yahoo.com>

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
References: <20020618130505.80973.qmail@web13904.mail.yahoo.com>
Subject: Military Leaders page
Date: Tue, 18 Jun 2002 10:31:40 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0012_01C216B3.555228C0"
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

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_0012_01C216B3.555228C0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Marie,

That page looks good. I'm looking forward to see what you can do with =
the eagle.

One needed correction that I notice is under Admiral Turner: in the =
second paragraph after "wrote that" the line needs to be filled out.

At the bottom I clicked hallman@zero-nukes.org and got the web site of =
the Nuclear Reductions/Disarmament Initiative. The same thing happened =
on Religious Statements and How to Get to Zero, but not the home page.

Howard=20

----- Original Message -----=20
From: Marie Kayser=20
To: Howard W. Hallman=20
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2002 9:05 AM
Subject: Re: New religious statements

Howard,=20

Just a quick note, the military leaders page is up but I haven't =
finished putting the links and the photo of the eagle.=20

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/militaryleaders.html>=20

Thanks,
Marie

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <csjp@igc.org>
References: <000a01c216cf\$7495f060\$e26cf7a5@DC5MWJ11>
Subject: Re: [interfaith] Web site
Date: Tue, 18 Jun 2002 11:57:07 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Charlotte,

Thanks for your comments.

Yes, several of the buttons don't work yet. We are going on line in stages.

Howard

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

From: "Charlotte Davenport" <csjp@igc.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2002 9:52 AM
Subject: RE: [interfaith] Web site

> Dear Howard,
> The site looks great!!!. However, some of the bottoms don't seem to be
> activated yet... such as the Your Feedback one... I was going to try to
> send a message via it but no luck. Thank you for all you are doing to
> help us in the faith community to continue to work for the removal of
> nuclear arms from our defense system.
> Charlotte Davenport, csjp

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <support@earthlink.net>
Subject: Switching identities
Date: Tue, 18 Jun 2002 12:15:47 -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 5.50.4807.1700
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Dear Support:

I am moderator of a web site called www.zero-nukes.org. On this site I have opened three mail boxes: hallman@zero-nukes.org, feedback@zero-nukes.org, and proposal@zero-nukes.org. In an attempt to access them, I have put these three identities in the switch identity file of my account with you: mupj@igc.org. However, this hasn't provided me access. What should I do?

Thanks for your help.

Howard Hallman

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
References: <20020618164339.36034.qmail@web13901.mail.yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: New religious statements
Date: Tue, 18 Jun 2002 12:48:32 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0089_01C216C6.73F70760"
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

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_0089_01C216C6.73F70760
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Yes

Howard
----- Original Message -----=20
From: Marie Kayser=20
To: Howard W. Hallman=20
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2002 12:43 PM
Subject: Re: New religious statements

Do I add them with the denominations list?=20

"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote:=20

Marie,

I have four more entries for the Religious Statements page. Three =
are
attached, and the fourth is sent separately because it is on a =
different
disk.

Their names should be added in alphabetical order to the contents =
list
nearing the beginning of the page, as follows:

American Baptist Churches
Episcopal Church
Mennonite Church USA
Unitarian Universalist Association

The text of their entrees should be in alphabetical order in the

denomination section.

If this isn't clear, let me know.

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=3DAmerican Baptist =
statement.doc > ATTACHMENT part 3 application/msword name=3DEpiscopal =
statement.01.doc > ATTACHMENT part 4 application/msword name=3DMennonite =
statement.doc=20

Status: U
Return-Path: <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Received: from web13901.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.27])
by payne.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17km4V6cl3Nl3p40
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 18 Jun 2002 12:43:37 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <20020618164339.36034.qmail@web13901.mail.yahoo.com>
Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13901.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Tue, 18 Jun 2002 09:43:39 PDT
Date: Tue, 18 Jun 2002 09:43:39 -0700 (PDT)
From: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: New religious statements
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
In-Reply-To: <002201c2162f\$1f0fd340\$5a52f7a5@default>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-903090721-1024418619=:35252"

--0-903090721-1024418619=:35252
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Do I add them with the denominations list?
"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote: Marie,

I have four more entries for the Religious Statements page. Three are attached, and the fourth is sent separately because it is on a different disk.

Their names should be added in alphabetical order to the contents list nearing the beginning of the page, as follows:

American Baptist Churches
Episcopal Church
Mennonite Church USA
Unitarian Universalist Association

The text of their entrees should be in alphabetical order in the denomination section.

If this isn't clear, let me know.

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=American Baptist statement.doc > ATTACHMENT part 3 application/msword name=Episcopal statement.01.doc > ATTACHMENT part 4 application/msword name=Mennonite statement.doc

Status: U

Return-Path: <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Received: from web13906.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.69])

by walker.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17knXu8Hi3N13s70
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 18 Jun 2002 14:44:04 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020618184403.27497.qmail@web13906.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13906.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Tue, 18 Jun 2002 11:44:03 PDT

Date: Tue, 18 Jun 2002 11:44:03 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: New religious statements

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

In-Reply-To: <002201c2162f\$1f0fd340\$5a52f7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-2095361804-1024425843=:24887"

--0-2095361804-1024425843=:24887

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

Howard,

What would be an alternative illustration for the eagle? This is for the military leaders page.

thanks,

marie

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

I have four more entries for the Religious Statements page. Three are attached, and the fourth is sent separately because it is on a different disk.

Their names should be added in alphabetical order to the contents list nearing the beginning of the page, as follows:

American Baptist Churches

Episcopal Church

Mennonite Church USA

Unitarian Universalist Association

The text of their entrees should be in alphabetical order in the denomination section.

If this isn't clear, let me know.

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=American Baptist statement.doc > ATTACHMENT part 3 application/msword name=Episcopal statement.01.doc > ATTACHMENT part 4 application/msword name=Mennonite statement.doc

Status: U

Return-Path: <support@earthlink.net>

Received: from mail15a.boca15-verio.com ([208.55.91.57])

by bissell.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17koMm21w3Nl3rE0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 18 Jun 2002 15:36:38 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from www.knoahinc.com (168.143.143.169)

by mail15a.boca15-verio.com (RS ver 1.0.63s) with SMTP id 085183;
Tue, 18 Jun 2002 15:36:34 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Wed, 19 Jun 2002 01:03:12 +0530

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

Subject: Re: Switching identities (KMM2128029V28776L0KM)

From: "support@earthlink.net" <support@earthlink.net>

Reply-To: "support@earthlink.net" <support@earthlink.net>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

X-Mailer: Kana 6.0

X-Loop-Detect: 1

Message-Id: <200206181536.17koMm21w3Nl3rE0@bissell.mail.mindspring.net>

Dear Mr. Hallman ,

Thank you for contacting us.

We suggest you to configure these accounts with the appropriate POP3 =
and
SMTP Server settings of the zero-nukes.org domain.

The following will guide you through checking the configuration of
Outlook Express 5 for checking an email account:

1. Open Outlook Express 5.
2. Click on Tools menu and go down to Accounts.
3. Click the Mail tab.
4. If there are any email accounts for email addresses you no longer access, select each unused account and click on the Remove button. Otherwise, please skip to the next step.
5. Highlight your appropriate email account as it appears that you =
have
configured them and click the Properties button.
(If you have not configured the email accounts, under the mail tab, =
click
on "Add", Choose "Mail" option and click on it and follow the wizard.) =
6. Type the email address of the appropriate account in the Email Address field.
7. Click the Servers tab.
8. In the Incoming Mail Server POP3 field, type type the POP3 settings =

provided by the zero-nukes.org domain.
9. In the Outgoing Mail Server SMTP field, type the SMTP settings provided by the zero-nukes.org domain.
10. In the Account Name field, type the appropriate email username.

11. Retype the password in the password field. Please keep in mind =
that
all passwords are case sensitive.
12. Check to make sure Log On Using Secure Password Authentication is
not checked.
13. Check to make sure My Server Requires Authentication is not =
checked.
14. Click the Advanced tab.
15. For Server Port Numbers, type the appropriate port number for the
Outgoing Mail (SMTP) field and type appropriate port number for the
Incoming Mail (POP3) field.
Check to make sure This Server Requires A Secure Connection (SSL) is =
not
checked.
16. Click OK.
17. Click Close.

We have further information about Internet access through EarthLink at =
our customer support site:

<http://support.earthlink.net>

(Also accessible from the "Support" link on the top right of your
Personal Start Page.)

If you need any further assistance, please let us know.

--

Ravi I.
Electronic Support
EarthLink, Inc.
The #1 Provider of the Real Internet

Email Case ID: K 912328

Original Message Follows:

Dear Support:

I am moderator of a web site called www.zero-nukes.org. On this site =
I
have opened three mail boxes: hallman@zero-nukes.org,
feedback@zero-nukes.org, and proposal@zero-nukes.org. In an attempt =
to
access them, I have put these three identities in the switch identity
file
of my account with you: mupj@igc.org. However, this hasn't provided =
me

access. What should I do?
Thanks for your help.
Howard Hallman

.

Status: U
Return-Path: <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Received: from web13905.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.68])
by runyon.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17kp7Y79h3Nl3sj0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 18 Jun 2002 15:58:58 -0400 (EDT)
Message-ID: <20020618195857.12116.qmail@web13905.mail.yahoo.com>
Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13905.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Tue, 18 Jun 2002 12:58:57 PDT
Date: Tue, 18 Jun 2002 12:58:57 -0700 (PDT)
From: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: New religious statements
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
In-Reply-To: <002201c2162f\$1f0fd340\$5a52f7a5@default>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-2126798977-1024430337=:11884"

--0-2126798977-1024430337=:11884
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Howard,
I made the additions to the religious page.
Regards,
Marie
"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote: Marie,

I have four more entries for the Religious Statements page. Three are attached, and the fourth is sent separately because it is on a different disk.

Their names should be added in alphabetical order to the contents list nearing the beginning of the page, as follows:

American Baptist Churches
Episcopal Church
Mennonite Church USA
Unitarian Universalist Association

The text of their entrees should be in alphabetical order in the denomination section.

If this isn't clear, let me know.

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=American Baptist statement.doc > ATTACHMENT part 3 application/msword name=Episcopal statement.01.doc > ATTACHMENT part 4 application/msword name=Mennonite statement.doc

Status: U
Return-Path: <notify-return-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com>
Received: from n8.grp.scd.yahoo.com ([66.218.66.92])
by bissell.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17kvnT6Tj3Nl3rE0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 18 Jun 2002 22:39:48 -0400 (EDT)
X-eGroups-Return: notify-return-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com
Received: from [66.218.67.201] by n8.grp.scd.yahoo.com with NNFMP; 19 Jun 2002 02:39:48 -0000
X-Sender: notify@yahoogroups.com
X-Apparently-To: interfaithnd-owner@yahoogroups.com
Received: (qmail 57491 invoked by uid 7800); 19 Jun 2002 02:39:46 -0000
Date: 19 Jun 2002 02:39:46 -0000
Message-ID: <1024454386.454.57464.m9@yahoogroups.com>
From: Yahoo! Groups Notification <interfaithnd-acceptsub-BL5rDB3RYSg9Vr2U@yahoogroups.com>
Reply-To: interfaithnd-acceptsub-BL5rDB3RYSg9Vr2U@yahoogroups.com
To: interfaithnd-owner@yahoogroups.com
Subject: APPROVE -- tiller64@starpower.net wants to join interfaithnd
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-eGroups-Moderators: interfaithnd

Hello,

A user with the following email address would like to subscribe to the interfaithnd group:

tiller64@starpower.net

This subscription request requires your approval because the interfaithnd group is configured to restrict membership. This means that a moderator must approve each new member. This user will not become a member of the interfaithnd group unless you approve.

To approve or reject this pending subscription using the web, please visit

<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/interfaithnd/members?group=pending>

To approve this subscription using email, reply to this message.

To reject this subscription using email, forward this message to

interfaithnd-rejectsub-BL5rDB3RYSg9Vr2U@yahoogroups.com

Thank you for choosing Yahoo! Groups as your email group service for the interfaithnd group.

Regards,

Yahoo! Groups Customer Care

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

From: "Howard W. Hallman" <hallman@zero-nukes.org>
To: "Judy Coode" <jcoode@Maryknoll.org>
References: <5.1.0.14.2.20020617142412.00aa2860@pop.maryknoll.org>
Subject: Re: website sponsor list
Date: Tue, 18 Jun 2002 12:38:40 -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

Judy,

Thanks for the corrections. We're putting a lot on line. Inevitably errors will occur.

We don't have all of our sponsors linked. Not all buttons are working because we have only a couple of pages on line. But we're making progress.

Howard

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

From: "Judy Coode" <jcoode@Maryknoll.org>
To: <hallman@zero-nukes.org>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2002 2:28 PM
Subject: website sponsor list

> Hi Howard:

>
> Just a couple of small notes after looking at the website: In the box of
> sponsors in the lower left corner, Pax Christi USA is misspelled ... seems
> to have gained a comma where the second "i" should be. Also, I'm not sure
> what the status of some of the links is supposed to be, but several links
> for the sponsor groups didn't go through.

>
> Thanks for all your work on this.

>
> peace,
> Judy

>
>

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
References: <20020618184403.27497.qmail@web13906.mail.yahoo.com>
Subject: Military leaders illustration
Date: Tue, 18 Jun 2002 16:18:10 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0021_01C216E3.BD2B1620"
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

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_0021_01C216E3.BD2B1620
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Marie,

Another possibility would be a hawk and dove together, such as sitting =
on the same branch. This could be a drawing and symbolic or photos of =
real birds. For the latter I found a site: =
<http://www.mbr-pwrc.usgs.gov/id/pictlist.html>. I liked Swainson's hawk, =
identified as id/hi3420pi.ipg and the mourning dove -- h3160, also =
possible the Harris hawk -- 3350. To use those photos we would need the =
photographer's permission. The site has an e-mail connection with =
them.

You may have a better idea. Good luck.

Howard

----- Original Message -----=20
From: Marie Kayser=20
To: Howard W. Hallman=20
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2002 2:44 PM
Subject: Re: New religious statements

Howard,=20

What would be an alternative illustration for the eagle? This is for =
the military leaders page.=20

thanks,=20

marie=20

"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote:=20

Marie,

I have four more entries for the Religious Statements page. Three =
are
attached, and the fourth is sent separately because it is on a =
different
disk.

Their names should be added in alphabetical order to the contents =
list
nearing the beginning of the page, as follows:

American Baptist Churches
Episcopal Church
Mennonite Church USA
Unitarian Universalist Association

The text of their entrees should be in alphabetical order in the
denomination section.

If this isn't clear, let me know.

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=3DAmerican Baptist =
statement.doc > ATTACHMENT part 3 application/msword name=3DEpiscopal =
statement.01.doc > ATTACHMENT part 4 application/msword name=3DMennonite =
statement.doc=20

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
References: <20020618195857.12116.qmail@web13905.mail.yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: New religious statements
Date: Wed, 19 Jun 2002 09:11:42 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="-----_NextPart_000_000F_01C21771.54168320"
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

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_000F_01C21771.54168320
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Marie,

Thanks. A couple of corrections.

We may not use the logo of the American Baptist Churches, so please =
remove it.

We can use the logo of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. You =
can find it on the UAHC home page. It's the menorah found on the lower =
left.

I couldn't make some of the connections on the Episcopal page. It may =
be a problem with their web site. I'll asked them. But be sure that =
the link to Nuclear Abolition resolution is right.

One of our users noted that we left out the final "i" in Pax Christi USA =
in the sponsors listing.

Howard

----- Original Message -----=20
From: Marie Kayser=20
To: Howard W. Hallman=20
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2002 3:58 PM
Subject: Re: New religious statements

Howard,=20

I made the additions to the religious page.=20

Regards,
Marie=20

"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote:=20

Marie,

I have four more entries for the Religious Statements page. Three =
are
attached, and the fourth is sent separately because it is on a =
different
disk.

Their names should be added in alphabetical order to the contents =
list
nearing the beginning of the page, as follows:

American Baptist Churches
Episcopal Church
Mennonite Church USA
Unitarian Universalist Association

The text of their entrees should be in alphabetical order in the
denomination section.

If this isn't clear, let me know.

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=3DAmerican Baptist =
statement.doc > ATTACHMENT part 3 application/msword name=3DEpiscopal =
statement.01.doc > ATTACHMENT part 4 application/msword name=3DMennonite =
statement.doc=20

Status: U

Return-Path: ng59@umail.umd.edu

Received: from umailsrv2.umd.edu ([128.8.10.76])

by bissell.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17kHmG1fA3NI3rE0

for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 19 Jun 2002 11:27:22 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from spacissm1 (vmh-pa-145.umd.edu [129.2.74.145])

by umailsrv2.umd.edu (8.11.3/8.11.3) with ESMTP id g5JFRLQ12401 for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 19 Jun 2002 11:27:21 -0400 (EDT)

From: "Nancy Gallagher" ng59@umail.umd.edu

To: mupj@igc.org

Subject: Churches' Center talk

Date: Wed, 19 Jun 2002 11:27:20 -0400

Message-ID: [003101c217a5\\$cd9c2400\\$914a0281@umd.edu](mailto:003101c217a5$cd9c2400$914a0281@umd.edu)

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----

=_NextPart_000_0032_01C21784.468A8400"

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook, Build 10.0.2627

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000

Importance: Normal

Thank you for attending the dinner last month. If I remember correctly, you asked me to send you a copy of the text once it was cleaned up. Here it is -- I hope you can put it to good use!

Best wishes, Nancy

Nancy Gallagher, Ph.D.

Associate Director for Research

Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland

University of Maryland

College Park, MD 20742

phone: (301) 405-7610/ fax: (301) 403-8107

Nuclear Weapons and New Security Challenges

2002 Cynthia Wedel Distinguished Lecture

Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy

May 30, 2002

Nancy Gallagher
University of Maryland

I am delighted to be here tonight with a group that is so distinguished and so welcoming. I am especially pleased that Wendy Starman was selected for the Distinguished Service Award. Since the end of the Cold War, trying to educate religious groups and other citizen organizations about nuclear weapons has often been a thankless task because people would prefer to believe that the danger disappeared with the Soviet Union. So while I hope that Wendy has a few blissful months in which nothing else matters but her new baby, I also hope that she returns to the cause with renewed energy because she has one more very important reason to reduce nuclear weapons, stop proliferation, and prevent nuclear war.

When Andrew Young delivered the 2001 Wedel lecture, he spoke extensively about the relationship between religion, business, and poverty alleviation. Rarely do security experts speak so openly about the relationship between religion and nuclear weapons policy. Too often, one's credibility as a nuclear expert is judged by one's perceived ability to think about the unthinkable in a purely "rational" fashion, without regard to religious beliefs or emotional considerations.

Religious leaders have made strong and influential statements about nuclear weapons at critical moments. The 1983 Pastoral Letter on War and Peace from the National Conference of Catholic Bishops was released shortly before I started working as a first-year teacher at Our Lady Queen of Peace School in Madison Wisconsin. I found that statement very empowering even though I was not a Catholic, and did not even consider myself to be especially religious at that time. It helped channel my own amorphous fears of nuclear war into a more focused plan of action. It provided cogent analysis and moral authority which increased my confidence when I spoke about nuclear issues to parents and the principal at my school. It strengthened my commitment to teaching about war and peace in the nuclear age, which is one reason why I returned to graduate school and devoted my professional life to nuclear arms control.

More typically, a different type of theology shapes debates about nuclear weapons. When I accompanied General Shalikashvili and Ambassador Goodby to speak with U.S. Senators, government officials, and others about the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, we were often told that controversies surrounding the Treaty stemmed from basic “theological disagreements.” Of course, nobody was suggesting that attitudes toward nuclear weapons are necessarily determined by people’s religious affiliation. Instead, they meant that ideas about nuclear weapons are heavily influenced by worldviews – i.e. fundamental beliefs about human nature and about how people should behave in a world that lacks an overarching secular authority.

Tonight, I want to start by talking about how the interplay between different worldviews during the Cold War led to a grand bargain and what is sometimes called the “nuclear restraint regime.” I will say a few words about why the new security challenges that have emerged since make a legally based nuclear restraint regime more, not less, important. I will then make the case that the Bush Administration has responded to these new security challenges by systematically repudiating the grand bargain and undermining central elements of the nuclear restraint regime. Finally, I will conclude by suggesting that the situation today is much like it was in 1983, in that the security policies being pursued by the government are spreading fear, increasing hatred, and producing actions that degrade the quality of life as they raise the risk of nuclear war. What is missing now is any serious democratic debate or sustained opposition to rhetoric and policies that reflect an extreme version of one worldview and a narrow conception of national interests while violating key tenets of other worldviews and more comprehensive conceptions of the global good.

Worldviews and Attitudes toward Nuclear Weapons

Beliefs about nuclear weapons are heavily influenced by abstract worldviews because we have little empirical evidence about what makes deterrence work or fail, let alone about the consequences of using nuclear weapons in war. Moreover, nuclear weapons can cause almost incomprehensible destruction, so it is hard to relate them to any more familiar form of weapon, warfare, or security policy.

The divergent worldviews that have shaped a half century of nuclear debates have much older origins. They can be traced back to philosophical and religious traditions that shaped the earliest arguments about security in a world of sovereign states. One perspective may dominate temporarily, but none has drowned out the other voices for long. Nor do I believe that any one perspective will remain triumphant in the future, for the simple reason that each perspective contains some elements of truth and some serious weaknesses.

Unilateralists are the intellectual descendents of Thomas Hobbes, the seventeenth century theorist who maintained that life in an anarchic world is necessarily “nasty, brutish, and short.” Key elements of this world view are that:

- Humans and states are inherently self-interested and competitive.
- World politics is fundamentally conflictual – it is a zero sum game between “us” and “them,” or between “good” and “evil.”
- All politics is about coercive power, and nuclear weapons are the ultimate source of coercive power. They offer potentially unlimited destructive capabilities, but are not qualitatively different from other weapons. They can be used not only for deterrence, but also for many other political and military goals.
- Arms control is a dangerous illusion in a world where peace is a pause for rearming between wars. The “bad guys” will cheat, while the “good guys” are prevented from taking steps necessary to deter attack or prevail in the next war. Symbolic arms control can be useful for public relations purposes, but leaders must be careful that it does not lull citizens and allies into reduced vigilance.

Cautious Cooperators are the intellectual descendants of Hugo Grotius, who is known as the seventeenth century “father of international law.” This tradition also includes strong elements of Just War Theory, with earlier antecedents in Catholic thought. Cautious Cooperators believe that:

- Humans and states have a mix of common and conflicting interests. In particular, they have common interest in avoiding lengthy, massively destructive wars fueled by religious or ideological disagreements. They can co-exist by agreeing to let each sovereign do as he wishes within his own territory, then negotiating rules to facilitate interactions among states.
- In the nuclear age, states face an extreme security dilemma. Most states are defensive rather than aggressive, but because they lack a central protector, they need arms as insurance against the possibility that somebody else might try to exploit them. Since no other state can be sure that the first state’s aims are purely defensive, prudence dictates that they must increase their arms in response. The result is a dangerous and costly arms race that neither side wants, but that is difficult to avoid.

- It is possible to have the benefits of nuclear deterrence without excessive costs or risks by negotiating agreements to coordinate behavior and minimize unintended consequences. During the Cold War, Cautious Cooperators favored arms control to set agreed force levels, stabilize deterrence, and avert proliferation.

Globalists are the philosophical descendants of Immanuel Kant, who is known best for his eighteenth century book, Perpetual Peace. They believe that:

- Economic interdependence and other mutually beneficial interactions mean that people have far more common interests than conflicting ones.
- The world functions as a universal community in which states are important players, but scientific experts, business leaders, non-governmental organizations, and many other types of non-state actors are also important.
- Military power is ineffective, if not counter-productive, in the pursuit of many important goals.
- Nuclear weapons do more to threaten security than they do to protect it. Most globalists assume that there are no real threats to security that cannot be addressed as well or better through other means. They also maintain that the practice of deterrence carries high risk that nuclear weapons will eventually be used due to escalation during a conventional war, launch in response to a mistaken perception of impending attack, or increased proliferation.
- Arms control should be used not only to stabilize deterrence, but also to transform political relationships and reorient security policies in a more cooperative direction.

The Grand Bargain and the Nuclear Restraint Regime

Proponents of all three world views were influential in public debates and policy deliberations over nuclear weapons during the Cold War. The result was a philosophical “checks and balances” system which kept U.S. policy from going too far in any one direction for too long. This produced a type of grand bargain to the effect that U.S. nuclear weapons policy should contain three elements which appealed in varying degrees to proponents of the three worldviews:

1. Nuclear weapons are needed for deterrence, at least in the short term.
2. The United States should be a proponent for progressive mutual restraint to slow, then reverse, the superpower arms race and to avert proliferation.
3. The long term objective is a transformed world in which nuclear weapons are no longer necessary and everyone enjoys a stable, just peace.

Negotiations between the United States, the Soviet Union (which had counter-balancing power), and various other countries, many of which also had their own internal debates and uneasy compromises, produced the nuclear restraint regime – a patchwork of more or less formal agreements that played an important role in keeping the Cold War cold and minimizing proliferation:

- The 1968 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which is essentially a bargain between those countries that already had nuclear weapons and those that did not. The Non-Nuclear Weapons States Parties promised not to acquire nuclear weapons if the Nuclear Weapons States Parties promised to share peaceful nuclear technology and to negotiate in good faith on the reduction and ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons.
- The 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty acknowledged that any attempt to defend against nuclear weapons could be easily overcome by offensive counter-measures. It underscored that ballistic missile defense should only be by mutual agreement and should be linked to agreed limits on offensive capabilities.
- The SALT and START accords, which capped, and then reduced, offensive strategic weapons and reshaped arsenals to reduce first-strike incentives.
- The 1996 Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, which outlawed all nuclear explosions. Negotiating this Treaty was a key element in the political bargain that secured the indefinite extension of the NPT in 1995. It increases the scientific challenges facing proliferators, especially ones that want not just basic fission weapons but also more powerful and efficient designs. It also forecloses the possibility of third-generation nuclear weapons, such as nuclear x-ray lasers and enhanced radiation weapons.

These and numerous other agreements reinforced the global norm that nuclear weapons are fundamentally different from other weapons, that they should be governed by special rules, and that they should be used only as a last resort, if at all. Although this norm is not embodied in a formal treaty, the “nuclear taboo” and the associated imperative to preserve a very high, clear threshold between conventional and nuclear weapons, form a fifth important component of the nuclear restraint regime.

New Security Challenges Increase Importance of Cooperative Nuclear Restraint

The end of the Cold War removed the fear of a massive attack by the Soviet Union as the central threat around which the United States could organize its security policy. It also left the United States as the sole remaining superpower with no peer competitor to provide a near-automatic check on U.S. exercises of power.

The first ten years of the new era brought no agreement on organizing principles for U.S. security policy. The proponents of the three worldviews had very different ideas about the nature of the new security environment and the implications for U.S. nuclear policies. With the superpower confrontation over and the fear of nuclear war receding, there seemed to be no urgent need for action. So most people turned their attention to other issues and tolerated a situation where forward movement on each element of the nuclear restraint regime was blocked by a few committed unilateralists who opposed any constraints on U.S. nuclear might.

Political paralysis inside the Beltway did not stop the world from changing; it just stopped the United States from adapting its policies in response to changes wrought by critical trends associated with globalization. I will only touch briefly on some of these trends tonight. Anyone who wants to know more should read Principles of Global Security by John Steinbruner, my colleague at the University of Maryland.¹

- Decades of rapid population growth. The world currently has over 7 billion inhabitants, and the number will probably rise by several billion more before it stabilizes in the next century. It is important to note that 97% of that population growth is occurring at the lowest income levels.
- Rapid advances in information technology are making it possible for economics, politics, and socio-cultural movements to operate on a global scale in near-real time.
- Breakthroughs in other fields, such as biotechnology, offer tremendous life-saving and life-enhancing benefits to those that can afford them, but also make it possible for a small group of people or a weak state to acquire tremendous destructive power using materials and knowledge that is widely available around the world.

- The economic benefits of globalization are very unevenly distributed. A United Nations Development Program study found that in 1970, the income of the richest fifth of the world's population was thirty-two times that of the poorest fifth. If current trends continue, the disparity between the top and bottom fifths will be 100 fold by 2025 and nearly 200 fold by 2050.ⁱⁱ

These long-term trends have important implications for security policy. On the one hand, there is less reason to worry about a massive deliberate attack from a clearly defined peer competitor. On the other hand, there is more reason to be concerned about diffuse threats that are difficult to anticipate or identify. Furthermore, we need to pay attention not only to the possibility that a terrorist group or small hostile state will deliberately launch an "asymmetrical attack" against the United States, but also to the potentially catastrophic unintended consequences of individual actions in a world where things are tightly wired together, happen nearly instantaneously, and involve immensely powerful technologies.

The changing nature of threats requires a corresponding transformation of security policy. In a global world, defense of territory is less important than defense of legal order. Nobody is seriously worried that terrorists or hostile states will try to seize and govern New York or Washington, D.C. Instead, we fear that they will use small scale attacks or weapons of mass destruction to sow panic; disrupt financial, communication, and transportation systems; and cause widespread disorder or a suspension of civil liberties. Laws and less formal understandings about appropriate behavior are essential to the smooth functioning of market systems and democratic politics inside states. They are increasingly important worldwide as economics, politics, and culture occurs on a global scale.

In a world of diffuse dangers, misperceptions and mistakes could be as destructive as deliberate attacks. Security policies should place more emphasis on reassurance and systematic prevention of dangerous situations, not just deterrence or contingency response after another, potentially much more devastating attack. The objectives of arms control also need to be broadened from quantitative limits and access controls to include more refined agreements about appropriate activities with dangerous dual-use technologies.

As U.S. military planners have already recognized, adroit management of information is now more important than firepower. The information revolution can be exploited for cooperative ends by creating sophisticated ways to verify that disclosed information is correct and complete, plus reliable arrangements to ensure that information which is revealed for cooperative purposes does not compromise security or hurt commercial interests.

We also need stronger, more trusted international institutions that can work effectively with national governments and non-state actors. These institutions need the resources and expertise to create incentives for cooperation and to help countries that want to follow the rules, but lack the capacity to do so. They also need the authority and power to help organize the international community for an effective response should violations threaten global security.

Current U.S. Policy Undermines Cooperative Nuclear Restraint

The changes to security policy that I have just outlined are clearly not what Defense Secretary Rumsfeld has in mind when he speaks about military transformation. For the first eight months of new administration, a rough balance existed between the Unilateralist faction led by Secretary Rumsfeld and the Cautious Cooperator faction led by Secretary of State Powell. The Bush administration relied heavily on vague rhetoric that would appeal for different reasons to different parts of the political spectrum, such as calling for a new security framework based on “more than the grim premise that we can destroy those who seek to destroy us.”ⁱⁱⁱ There were several intense internal policy debates over nuclear arms control issues, but in each instance, the Administration stopped short of decisive decisions that only Unilateralists would favor, such as announcing an intent to abrogate the ABM Treaty or ending all U.S. funding for the organization charged with building the Test Ban Treaty monitoring system. The vague rhetoric and internal policy compromises kept open the prospect that the Bush administration would muddle along and end up reproducing the stalemate that characterized nuclear policy debates during the Clinton years.

The events of September 11, 2001 and the subsequent anthrax attacks changed all that. They underscored that we are operating in a new security environment. They restored a strong sense of urgency: with another attack potentially immanent, a continuation of the security stalemate was no longer acceptable, regardless of whether that stalemate resulted from legitimate differences in world views or partisan politics. Cautious Cooperators and Globalists hoped that the Bush administration would adopt a more multilateral approach to security policy because the war on terrorism required other countries’ cooperation for practical purposes such as intelligence sharing and basing rights. They also hoped it might generate a broader recognition that members of the “civilized world” needed to accommodate each other’s’ interests in order to present a united front against terror.

Although the Bush administration used a fair amount of multilateralist rhetoric, it insisted that it would and could act unilaterally whenever international support was not forthcoming. In December 2001, President Bush gave notice that the United States would withdraw from the ABM Treaty even though Russia and NATO allies still valued that accord and considered it to be compatible with the logical next stages of U.S. work

on missile defense. A series of such actions suggest that Unilateralists in the Bush administration decided to take advantage of a time when domestic critics were remaining silent for the sake of national unity and when most other countries also wanted to show solidarity with the United States.

Current U.S. security policy is framed in essentially Unilateralist terms. Top officials depict the war against terrorism as a zero sum conflict between good and evil, in which other countries are either “with us or against us.” There is no effort to see others’ perspectives or to consider that they might have legitimate grievances; anyone who attempts to do so is denounced as an apologist for the attackers. Likewise, there is no room for compromise or accommodation in dealing with terrorists or rogue states.

The Administration’s huge increases in defense spending are premised on the belief that U.S. security necessitates “full spectrum military dominance” -- i.e. the ability, operating alone or with allies, to defeat any adversary and control any situation across the range of military operations. Defense planners assume that military superiority can be used to accomplish a wide range of ambitious objectives. For example, the 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review specifies that the U.S. military must be able to dissuade future competitors, deter threats and coercion, and decisively defeat any adversary – including imposing a change of regime if the President orders.^{iv}

Despite military and intelligence capabilities that dwarf those of any other country, top Administration officials assert that our enemies are so highly motivated to harm the United States that they will “inevitably” acquire and use weapons of mass destruction. Tighter export controls might complicate efforts to acquire dangerous materials, while improved intelligence sharing might disrupt some planned operations. Rather than placing increased emphasis on preventive measures, though, the Administration stresses their inadequacies and favors contingency response through counter-proliferation, pre-emption, defense, and preparations to manage the consequences of a WMD attack.

Although the Administration voices support for existing non-proliferation accords, it operates from the premise that the United States should not be bound by any agreement that interferes with self-defense. Its November 2001 decision to repudiate long-standing international efforts to add a verification and enforcement protocol to the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention, like its subsequent rejection of the ABM Treaty, stem from the Unilateralists’ opposition to anything that prevents the United States from taking full advantage of its military, economic, and scientific prowess. Although the Administration often depicts arms control as an “outmoded relic of the Cold War,” the basic objection is one that Unilateralists have used for decades: arms control constrains the “good guys” without reducing the dangers they face because the “bad guys” either remain outside the regime, or join for political cover while they cheat.

The Bush administration sees no need to preserve the grand bargain because it thinks that no one at home or abroad can currently mount an effective challenge to purely Unilateralist policies. In effect, it wants to broaden the first element of grand bargain, such that nuclear weapons become necessary not only for deterrence, but also for a range of other political and military goals. It wants to weaken the second element by moving from advocacy for progressive mutual restraint to supporting one round of reciprocal unilateral reductions, undertaken if and when the United States decides the time is right, with no expectation of further reductions. It has largely repudiated the third element, and no longer even pays lip service to the idea that the United States should be actively working toward a world free of nuclear weapons, where a stable and just peace depends on something other than having a benign hegemon impose it through military and economic superiority.

The Bush administration also appears to be working systematically to dismantle the nuclear restraint regime – at least as it applies to the United States:

- **Strategic Defense** – U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty will take effect on June 13, 2002. The Administration has shown no interest in developing an alternative legal framework to help countries pursue missile defenses without threatening each others' legitimate security interests and provoking a dangerous counter-reaction. Instead, it has offered vague reassurances about wanting only a "limited" system that will not undermine Russia's deterrent and being willing to cooperate on some aspects of the program.
- **Strategic Offense** – The press has been referring to the recent agreement between Presidents Bush and Putin as the "Treaty of Moscow" because the two sides could not agree on what the accord should be called. The name that the Administration is using – the "Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty" -- has the acronym of SORT, which is embarrassingly appropriate given that this is only sort of a treaty and only sort of arms control. Administration spokespeople are depicting the accord as a historic breakthrough, but in reality:

It is barely legally binding. There are no requirements for reductions on a fixed schedule. The only obligation is to reduce deployed strategic nuclear warheads to no more than 2200 on December 31st, 2012, the day when the Treaty expires unless extended by mutual consent. At any point before then, either side can withdraw after 90 days notice.

The numbers do not represent real reductions below what the Clinton administration had hoped to achieve. The difference between 2200 and START III's proposed upper

limit of 2500 reflects an accounting gimmick of excluding nuclear warheads based on submarines that are in port.

The Treaty does not require the dismantlement of any weapons. In moving from the START I limit of 6000 accountable deployed strategic warheads to the future limit of 2200 accountable deployed strategic warheads, the Administration plans to put most, if not all, of the excess warheads into a responsive force that can be quickly reloaded onto existing delivery systems, as well as an inactive stockpile that could be returned to operational status if needed.^v

The Treaty provides no new verification measures. By stating that START I will remain in force in accordance with its terms, the new Treaty preserves the earlier accord's verification provisions only through 2009, when START I will expire unless extended by mutual agreement.

The Treaty represents backwards movement from major accomplishments of START II. By failing to mention START II, the new Treaty reflects a tacit agreement to let Russia reduce the cost of keeping large numbers of strategic warheads by continuing to place multiple warheads on intercontinental ballistic missiles, something considered highly destabilizing during the Cold War. Important verification provisions will also be lost. Russian ratification of START II depended on full U.S. compliance with the ABM Treaty, and the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs has already indicated that it will withdraw from START II when the United States withdraws from the ABM Treaty.

- **The Test Ban Treaty** is in severe trouble. The Bush Administration has never supported this Treaty, but has not yet nullified U.S. signature as it did for the accord establishing the International Criminal Court. The Administration says that it has no immediate plans to end the ten-year-old moratorium on U.S. nuclear testing. However, its Nuclear Posture Review discussed test resumption not only to ensure the reliability of the existing stockpile, but also to develop new types of nuclear weapons to attack hardened and deeply buried targets or to neutralize biological weapons without spreading radioactive fallout over large distances.^{vi} The Administration wants to improve "test site readiness" – i.e. to shorten the time between a Presidential decision to resume testing and a fully instrumented explosion. However, it is hard to distinguish between efforts to increase test site readiness and evidence that someone is conducting secret nuclear explosions instead of the sub-critical experiments that both U.S. and Russia routinely use to preserve stockpile reliability. The Washington Times often carries allegations of Russian cheating at their test site in Novaya Zemlya. Russian officials routinely deny that they are doing anything more than sub-critical experiments, which are not

prohibited by the Test Ban Treaty. The most recent exchange involved a new development. A senior Russian Atomic Energy Ministry Official reiterated Russian compliance with the Test Ban Treaty, but justified activities at Novaya Zemlya as necessary to make sure the infrastructure and experts at the test range are “fully prepared to conduct full-blown nuclear tests” should a political decision be made to do so.^{vii}

- **The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty** is at risk. At the Spring 2002 meeting to prepare for the NPT Review Conference in 2005, there was mounting frustration about policy developments by the Nuclear Weapons States, particularly the United States, that are inconsistent with the NPT and the political commitments made at the Review Conferences in 1995 and 2000. Nobody wanted to press their concerns very hard this year, either because they felt that it would be wasted effort or they feared appearing like a disloyal ally or a terrorist sympathizer. Outside the formal meetings, though, there were angry comments by states that felt cheated, and growing concern that dissatisfaction with the NPT review process could erode confidence in the wider nuclear restraint regime.^{viii}
- **The Nuclear Taboo** – Although the Bush Administration claims that it is trying to reduce the salience of nuclear weapons by developing alternatives to deterrence – i.e. missile defenses and precision-guided conventional weapons, its actions may have the opposite effect. Saying that 2200 deployed strategic warheads is the lowest possible number consistent with the security of the world’s strongest conventional power is no way to tell weaker states that nuclear weapons are not useful. By blurring distinctions between nuclear and conventional weapons, the Administration is effectively lowering the nuclear threshold. Even if it ultimately decides not to develop or test new types of nuclear weapons, loose talk about the potential utility of nuclear weapons can seriously weaken the nuclear taboo.

The sum of these actions suggests that the Bush administration is following a classic Unilateralist strategy of using symbolic arms control to lull the U.S. public and its allies while the country rearms.

The Need to Resume Debate, Restore Balance, and Return to Nuclear Restrain

Why does it matter if the United States wants to withdraw support from the nuclear restraint regime as long as the Cold War is over and the chances for a massive nuclear exchange are slim? At least four arguments against nuclear complacency come quickly to mind:

1. If the threat that justified huge arsenals is gone, then it is no longer rational or morally acceptable to run any risk that large numbers of nuclear weapons maintained on ready-alert status might be launched due to a mistaken perception of attack, a computer malfunction, or any other scenario for inadvertent nuclear war between the United States and Russia.
2. Our first line of defense against terrorist attack with nuclear or radiological weapons is to safeguard the security of Russian nuclear weapons and materials. The United States is engaged in cooperative threat reduction programs with Russia, but the problem could be addressed much more systematically and effectively if undertaken in the context of equitable agreements that require the verified dismantlement of strategic weapons and address tactical nuclear weapons.
3. India and Pakistan, both nuclear-armed states, stand on the brink of war over Kashmir. Both countries are using belligerent language and the Pakistani press alleges that both countries have moved tactical nuclear warheads close to the line of control. Neither seems fully aware of the devastation that could be caused by a nuclear war. For example, India claims to have shelters that could protect 30 people from WMD agents for up to 96 hours, but U.S. intelligence estimates that a full-scale nuclear conflict between India and Pakistan could kill 12 million people immediately and injure 7 million more. The United States is reportedly making plans to evacuate 1000 U.S. troops and 63,000 U.S. citizens from the region, if necessary. Of course, neither side wants nuclear war, but neither is yet willing to forego the bargaining leverage that they think will come from increasing the salience of nuclear weapons in the current crisis.
4. In addition to these immediate dangers, there are also real reasons to be concerned about what changes in U.S. nuclear policy could do to our political and military relationship with China. Over the longer term, one should also worry about the damaging effects on global security if countries like Japan lose faith in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the larger nuclear restraint regime.

It is possible to change course and return to cooperative nuclear restraint as the guiding principle for security policy. The underlying problem is that the United States has such disproportionate economic and military power that no other country feels it can afford to raise strong public objections. I had hoped that Russia might refuse to legitimate U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty and U.S. plans to retain a nuclear

arsenal far larger than anything Russia can afford, but I understand why President Putin concluded that holding out for a more equitable agreement would not be a prudent course of action.

I was in a recent discussion with some Scandinavian defense officials where the American arms control supporters expressed hope that Denmark would withhold approval for U.S. use of an ABM radar in Greenland until the Bush Administration provided firmer reassurances about limits on missile defense and other steps to address Russian and Chinese concerns. Only later did I realize what a sad day it is when citizens of the strongest country on earth feel that they cannot influence their over government directly, but must ask little Denmark to stand up on their behalf.

We each need to do what we can to revive democratic debate about security principles and policies. We must restore philosophical checks and balances to make sure that the United States exercises self-control. We cannot expect any other country to do it for us unless we wait for U.S. unilateralism to provoke an extreme counter-reaction.

Given the importance of worldviews in shaping nuclear policy, religious leaders who think long and hard about the fundamental questions of life have as much expertise to contribute as do weapons scientists or security experts. It may actually be easier for you to speak up and be heard without being accused of being unpatriotic or seeking partisan advantage.

It is essential to reiterate why any use of nuclear weapons remains unacceptable even though it might not lead to full scale nuclear war. It is equally important to provide a positive vision, along with concrete benchmarks for progress toward a world where peace depends not on nuclear weapons, but on cooperative mechanisms for mediating conflicts and meeting human needs.

Tonight there are many people in this country and around the world who are like the first-year teacher that I was in the mid-1980s ... scared; convinced in an inarticulate fashion that my life need not inevitably be nasty, brutish, and short; and eager for people who were older and wiser than I to provide both a vision of a better world and a conviction that each individual can help accomplish that goal.

Endnotes

- ⁱ John Steinbruner, Principles of Global Security (Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 2000).
- ⁱⁱ In Allen Hammond, Which World, (Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 1998), p. 80.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Remarks by the President to Students and Faculty at National Defense University, May 1, 2001.
- ^{iv} U.S. Department of Defense, Quadrennial Defense Review Report, September 20, 2001, p. 13.
- ^v See Jack Mendelson, “The US Nuclear Posture Review: Plus ça change, plus c’est la même chose,” Disarmament Diplomacy 64 (May-June 2002) and the Natural Resources Defense Council, “Faking Nuclear Restraint: The Bush Administration’s Secret Plan for Strengthening U.S. Nuclear Forces,” (February 13, 2002).
- ^{vi} Excerpts from the classified Nuclear Posture Review (January 2002) can be found at www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/policy/dod/npr.htm.
- ^{vii} Russian First Deputy Atomic Minister Ryabev, reported by Global Security Newswire on May 28, 2002.
- ^{viii} Rebecca Johnson, “The 2002 PrepCom: Papering over the Cracks?” Disarmament Diplomacy 64 (May-June 2002).

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org

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

To: "Marie Kayser" marie_kayser@yahoo.com

Subject: Military Leaders page

Date: Wed, 19 Jun 2002 17:00:05 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0011_01C217B2.C31D73A0"

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

Marie,

I'm going on vacation from Sunday, June 23 to Sunday, July 7. Before I go I would like to get the Military Leaders Speak Out page on line.

I hope you can work out the graphic.

I have one addition: for Admiral Carroll, which is attached.

Going over the draft of Military Leaders Speak Out, I note the following needed corrections:

1. International Generals and Admirals Speak Out:

- a. underline Global Security Institute, provide linkage.
- b. capitalize: Statement by General Andrew J. Goodpaster and General Lee Butler
- c. introductory paragraph in italics

2. General Lee Butler: all descriptive paragraphs in italics; all inset quotes, non-italic.

3. General Charles A. Horner -- bold face

4. General Powell. second descriptive paragraph -- Three months latter.... -- in italic.

5. Admiral Turner:

- a. 2nd paragraph -- "wrote that it is time..." on same line.
- b. "When Admiral Turner joined...." in italic

Keep up your good work.

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.

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <GRACEGENERATION@aol.com>
Cc: <bishopmay@bwcumc.org>
References: <7B93B3EE.02BADA40.DB494252@aol.com>
Subject: Re: The Truth About Gibbons-Resurrection (Brandywine, MD)
Date: Thu, 20 Jun 2002 10:12:19 -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 5.50.4807.1700
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Dear Rev. Muse:

I would like to respond to your e-mail of June 4, 2002 regarding Gibbons-Resurrection United Methodist Church. You emphasize details of a settlement agreement, which I haven't seen. I am more interested in the underlying moral issue.

My wife and I are bondholders. She is a retired United Methodist minister. I am retired from a career in public service working for nonprofit organizations. We are not wealthy, so we try to invest wisely but with a social conscience. In 1997 we purchased a 10-year first mortgage bond from Mill Creek Parish United Methodist Church, a congregation I knew from my peace with justice work in Montgomery County. When Bishop May embarked upon his Holy Boldness initiative, I attended a series of meetings at Asbury United Methodist Church in downtown Washington. There I heard the children's chorus from the Resurrection Prayer Worship Center and learned about your enterprising congregation. When we saw a bond advertisement in the conference newspaper, we decided to invest \$10,000. Since we made our investments, Mill Creek Parish hasn't missed a payment. In contrast, Resurrection Prayer Worship Center went into default after you and 90 percent of your followers left.

Here's where the moral issue arises. My father, who was a small town banker and a dedicated Methodist layman, taught me that one has moral obligations that often exceeds technically legal obligations. If he were alive today, he would be appalled at the way people enter into personal bankruptcy to get out of debt that they unwisely accumulated. He insisted that one is morally obligated to pay every penny of debt that one incurs.

I know nothing of the dispute that led you and most of your followers to leave the United Methodist Church. As an investor, though, I see a congregation that encountered cost overruns in construction, sold mortgage bonds that in total probably exceeded the value of the property, and faced a repayment schedule may have exceeded their capacity to pay. I see a minister and a congregation which walked away from its financial obligations.

Since then the Washington-Baltimore Conference has stepped in and tried to pick up these obligations. The Board of Child Care made a grant of \$350,000 for a child care center. The Conference raised over \$300,000 from member churches to pay the bondholders. The church I belong to donated \$6,000 from our outreach and advocacy fund, an amount that would have otherwise gone to such endeavors as Africa University and Casa del Pueblo in Washington, D.C. Volunteers donated their time and supplies to work on the unfinished Gibbons-Resurrection Church. The General Board of Global Ministries posted \$600,000 in collateral for a bridge loan, and that collateral was seized to repay the loan.

Now we learn that your new congregation, the Ark of Safety Christian Church, wants to buy the property for \$3,200,000. This amount is approximately \$1,600,000 less than the amount due for principal and interest on the bonds that you issued when you were in charge of the Resurrection Prayer Worship Center. This may be a shrewd offer to get the property back at a discounted price. But don't you believe that you have a moral obligation to repay bondholders, many of them retired, dedicated people who trusted you and your leadership when they purchased the bonds?

I ask you to share my letter with your trustees and together prayer and discuss what is the right thing to do. My own view is that if you succeed in purchasing the property at your offering price, you should then find out how much is due each bondholder beyond what they will gain from the sale (approximately a total of \$2,900,000 after various fees are paid). Then you should raise money for a "moral obligation" fund and pay the bondholders for their losses, even if it takes five to ten years.

Please give this some thought. I believe that this would be the honorable thing to do.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman

6508 Wilmet Road
Bethesda, MD 20817

phone: 301 897-3668
e-mail: mupj@igc.org

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Ron" <HolRonFos@aol.com>
Subject: Bulletin announcement
Date: Thu, 20 Jun 2002 11:11:02 -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

Ron,

If it's not too late and if there's room, here's a bulletin announcement for Sunday.

PENNIES-INTO-POTATOES. In the first five months of 2002 we've collected \$117 for the pennies-into-potatoes project. We sent the money to the Society of St. Andrew to help pay the cost of shipping donated potatoes to food kitchens and needy persons. Our contribution translates into 11,700 servings of potatoes. Keep the pennies coming!

Carlee and I are leaving this weekend to visit relatives in Illinois and Kansas. We'll miss the next three Sundays at BUMC.

Shalom,
Howard

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 1715F82WG3N13oW0
Thu, 20 Jun 2002 13:23:59 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from JDIWORKSTATION.clw.org ([63.106.26.107]) by mail.clw.org
(Post.Office MTA v3.5.3 release 223 ID# 0-57746U100L2S100V35)
with ESMTTP id org; Thu, 20 Jun 2002 13:17:21 -0400
Message-Id: <5.0.0.25.2.20020620131253.023de770@[63.106.26.66]>
X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0
Date: Thu, 20 Jun 2002 13:18:43 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: 20 experts urge Senate to reject nuclear earth penetrator funds
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

June 20, 2002

Dear Senator:

We are writing to urge you to support the Senate Armed Services Committee=20 decision to reject funds to develop a robust nuclear earth penetrator=20 (RNEP). Developing this new nuclear weapon will have dangerous=20 consequences for U.S. national security.

Nuclear earth penetrators pose serious operational employment=20 problems. First, they would produce extensive nuclear fallout. According= =20 to Princeton University physicist Robert Nelson, even a very small warhead= =20 in the 0.1-kiloton range would have to penetrate some 230 feet underground= =20 to fully contain the blast. That is many times the depth achievable by any= =20 current earth penetrator warhead. In addition to the fallout issue, it=20 would be too risky to employ U.S. forces to target such a weapon, as has=20 been done in Afghanistan, while stand-off use raises the danger of missed=20 or mistaken targets.

There are broader national security issues that call into question the=20 wisdom of such a development program. It is possible that a nuclear earth=20 penetrator =96 or the similarly small-yield anti-ballistic missile warhead = =96=20 would require resuming nuclear testing in Nevada, testing likely to=20 undermine current U.S. treaty obligations. Both of these concepts and=20 their implicit premise that nuclear weapons can be made =93useable=94 would= =20 deal a serious blow to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), a cornerstone of= =20

international security since 1968.

By developing nuclear weapons that are intended for battlefield use rather than deterrence, we are encouraging non-nuclear nations to acquire nuclear weapons and increasing the chance that conventional conflicts could escalate well beyond the established nuclear threshold, with unpredictable results. Developing useable nuclear weapons would tear down the conventional/nuclear firewall and may encourage others to develop and use them.

We urge you to support the action of the Senate Armed Services Committee to eliminate funds for nuclear earth penetrator weapons, and instead request a report to Congress by February 3, 2003 on the necessity and effects of such weapons.

Sincerely,

J. Brian Atwood
President, Citizens International
Former Administrator, USAID

Hans A. Bethe, Manhattan Project scientist, 1967 Nobel Laureate in Physics
George Bunn
Former General Counsel US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and one of the negotiators of the NPT

Matthew Bunn
Former adviser, White House Office of Science and Technology Policy
Assistant Director, Science, Technology, and Public Policy Program, Harvard University

Anne Cahn
Former U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and Defense Department official

Rear Admiral Eugene J. Carroll, Jr, U.S. Navy (Ret)

Jonathan Dean
former arms control negotiator
U.S. Department of State

Dr. Hugh E. DeWitt
Staff physicist (retired)
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

Peter W. Galbraith
Former United States Ambassador

Nancy Gallagher
Former Executive Director of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Task Force,
=20
Department of State
Associate Director for Research, Center for International and Security=20
Studies at Maryland, University of Maryland

Dudley Herschbach
Nobel Laureate
Harvard University

Lawrence J. Korb
Assistant Secretary of Defense in the Reagan Administration

Katherine Magraw
Former State and ACDA official.

John B. Rhinelander
Legal Adviser, US SALT I Delegation

Jack Ruina
Professor Emeritus of Electrical Engineering MIT
Former Director of The Advanced Research Agency, Dept of Defense

Sarah Sewall
Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense

Ivo Spalatin
International Consultant, Former ACDA official

John Steinbruner
Director, International & Security Studies, University of Maryland

Kosta Tsipis
Director of the Program in Science & Technology for International Security,=
MIT

Jane Wales
Former Associate Director of the White House Office of Science
and Technology Policy and former Senior Director of the National Council for
Science and Technology

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: <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

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

by runyon.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17l6WF3ly3Nl3sj0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 20 Jun 2002 14:46:13 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020620184611.76711.qmail@web13905.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13905.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Thu, 20 Jun 2002 11:46:11 PDT

Date: Thu, 20 Jun 2002 11:46:11 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: Military Leaders page

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

In-Reply-To: <001401c217d4\$7d74afe0\$245df7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-2129201404-1024598771=:76097"

--0-2129201404-1024598771=:76097

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

Howard,

I finished adding the links to the military leaders page and also added a few photos.

Marie

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

I'm going on vacation from Sunday, June 23 to Sunday, July 7. Before I go I would like to get the Military Leaders Speak Out page on line.

I hope you can work out the graphic.

I have one addition: for Admiral Carroll, which is attached.

Going over the draft of Military Leaders Speak Out, I note the following needed corrections:

1. International Generals and Admirals Speak Out:

- a. underline Global Security Institute, provide linkage.
- b. capitalize: Statement by General Andrew J. Goodpaster and General Lee Butler
- c. introductory paragraph in italics

2. General Lee Butler: all descriptive paragraphs in italics; all inset quotes, non-italic.

3. General Charles A. Horner -- bold face

4. General Powell. second descriptive paragraph -- Three months latter.... -- in italic.

5. Admiral Turner:

- a. 2nd paragraph -- "wrote that it is time..." on same line.
- b. "When Admiral Turner joined...." in italic

Keep up your good work.

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=Admiral Carroll.doc

Status: U

Return-Path: <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Received: from web13906.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.69])

by strange.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 1717FL4aw3N13oW0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 20 Jun 2002 15:32:49 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020620193248.9060.qmail@web13906.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13906.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Thu, 20 Jun 2002 12:32:48 PDT

Date: Thu, 20 Jun 2002 12:32:48 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: Military Leaders page

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

In-Reply-To: <001401c217d4\$7d74afe0\$245df7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="0-906652419-1024601568=:6656"

--0-906652419-1024601568=:6656

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-1304324241-1024601568=:6656"

--0-1304324241-1024601568=:6656

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

Howard,

Do you like any of these eagles?