

Status: U

Return-Path: [marie\\_kayser@yahoo.com](mailto: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 17I88n2uk3NI3p40 for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 20 Jun 2002 16:02:23 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: [20020620200222.19435.qmail@web13903.mail.yahoo.com](mailto:20020620200222.19435.qmail@web13903.mail.yahoo.com)

Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13903.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Thu, 20 Jun 2002 13:02:22 PDT  
Date: Thu, 20 Jun 2002 13:02:22 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser [marie\\_kayser@yahoo.com](mailto:marie_kayser@yahoo.com)

Subject: Re: New religious statements

To: "Howard W. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)

In-Reply-To: <001201c21792\$f3168a80\$495ef7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-1703433871-1024603342=:19056"

Howard,

Changes for the Religious Statements page are done.

Regards,

Marie

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

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 -----

**From:** [Marie Kayser](#)  
**To:** [Howard W. Hallman](#)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 18, 2002 3:58 PM  
**Subject:** Re: New religious statements

Howard,

I made the additions to the religious page.

Regards,  
Marie

**"Howard W. Hallman" <[mupj@igc.org](mailto: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](mailto:mupj@igc.org)

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

> 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

Reply-To: "Carlee L. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
From: "Carlee L. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
To: "Marie Kayser" [marie\\_kayser@yahoo.com](mailto:marie_kayser@yahoo.com)  
References: [20020620184611.76711.gmail@web13905.mail.yahoo.com](mailto:20020620184611.76711.gmail@web13905.mail.yahoo.com)  
Subject: Re: Military Leaders page  
Date: Thu, 20 Jun 2002 16:45:18 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_00B2\_01C21879.DCC67BE0"  
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. If we use an eagle, it should have arrows and a palm branch in its claws, like the Great Seal of the United States (look on the back of a dollar). That symbolizes war and peace. If you could add these to the first photo, it might work. Otherwise, go to a hawk and a dove, also symbolic of war and peace. They could be stylistic rather than a photographic copy.
2. Good job on the photos.
3. For General Butler all of the third paragraph should be in italic.
- 4 For Admiral Carroll:
  - a. Drop "Rear" in the index and the heading of his entree, but keep it in the first introductory paragraph.
  - b. I found another speech by Admiral Carroll. An excerpt is attached. Insert it after the introductory paragraph that ends "....deputy director."
  - c. The attachment contains a substitute paragraph for the next entree.
  - d. The last two paragraphs taken from the World Federalist speech should be in non-italic.
5. I'm willing to have this go on line even before you work out the graphic, if it causes undue delay.

Howard

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

**From:** [Marie Kayser](#)  
**To:** [Howard W. Hallman](#)  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 20, 2002 2:46 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Military Leaders page

Howard,

I finished adding the links to the military leaders page and also added a few photos.

Marie

*In an address to the Olaf Palme Institute [<http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/carroll-sweden.html>] in Stockholm, Sweden in May 1998, Admiral told of his personal involvement with nuclear weapons and offered his conclusions about their utility. He said:*

First, let me tell you why I am here to advocate the abolition of nuclear weapons. I have been personally involved with these engines of destruction since the beginning of the nuclear era. 42 years ago I was a pilot prepared to destroy a European target with a bomb that would have killed 600,000 people. 20 years ago, as the Director of U.S. Military Operations in Europe, I was the officer responsible for the security, readiness and employment of 7,000 nuclear weapons against Warsaw Pact forces in Europe and Russia, weapons which could never defend anything - only destroy everything.

My knowledge of nuclear weapons has convinced me that they can never be used for any rational military or political purpose. Their use would only create barbaric, indiscriminate destruction.

*In his speech Admiral Carroll outlined a series of steps that could lead to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons. These steps include:*

- Unqualified non-first use guarantees for both strategic and tactical nuclear weapons.
- START III negotiations for deep reductions by the United States and Russia.
- Take thousands of nuclear warheads off of alert status.
- Verification measures with international participation.
- Disassembly of warheads under international supervision.
- Great Britain, France, China, and de facto nuclear states, including Israel, should join the process.
- An international convention should be adopted to prohibit the manufacture, possession or use of nuclear explosive devices.

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Kayser, Marie" <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>  
Subject: New pages?  
Date: Thu, 20 Jun 2002 17:26:19 -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

Marie,

I have successfully created three mail boxes and gained the capability for retrieving messages. They are:

hallman@zero-nukes.org  
feedback@zero-nukes.org  
proposal@zero-nukes.org

Therefore, is it time to create the Feedback page? When I notified the Interfaith Committee that some of the pages were on-line, one of the members tried to reply through Feedback but nothing was available. Why don't you go ahead with it?

You may also want to open the other four pages that don't yet have material ready. You can post the name and offer the message: "This page is under development." The four are: Civil Sector Statements, Arsenals & Treaties, Site Index, What's New. If these were hooked up to the buttons on the Home Page, at least users could find out that the pages don't have material yet.

What's your opinion? Is this customary?

Howard

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
To: "Miller, Phillip H." <millerph@att.net>, "Hipkins, James & Char" <debate44646@yahoo.com>, "Harris, Sherman W." <visionaires@hotmail.com>, "Edwards, Bruce K." <b3ruce@socket.net>, "Rhodes, Schuyler" <srhodes@igc.org>, "Whitmore, Donald C." <3rdM@gte.net>, "Georgieff, Joyce" [jgeorgieff@earthlink.net](mailto:jgeorgieff@earthlink.net)  
Subject: Report to board of directors  
Date: Fri, 21 Jun 2002 13:22:46 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----=\_NextPart\_000\_001D\_01C21926.BC4CDA00"  
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: Board of Directors

We welcome three new members to our board of directors: James Hudson, Joyce Georgieff, and Phil Wilson.

Attached is a list of board members. If I lack complete information for you, please help me fill in the blanks.

We want to hold a meeting of our Board of Directors in the fall, perhaps in October. I propose that we follow our previous pattern of meeting on a Friday in Washington, D.C. What dates would be okay and not all right for you?

For the past two months I have been concentrating on development of a new web site for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. It is partially on line. You can see it at: [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). You can click buttons on the home page to reach three pages: Religious Statements, Military Leaders Speak Out, and How to Get to Zero. (It may be that the Military Leaders page is still in draft form at [www.zero-nukes.org/draft/militaryleaders.html](http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/militaryleaders.html).)

I will be interested in any comments you might have on this web site. We hope to use the web site as a means of reaching out to military leaders, civil sector organizations, and others to form broader coalitions in support of nuclear abolition and opposition to the nuclear posture of the Bush Administration.

I hope the summer is going well for all of 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](mailto:mupj@igc.org)

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

## **NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Richard Deats  
Rev. Dr. Robert Edgar  
Dr. Alan Geyer  
Brenda Hardt  
Bishop Felton Edwin May  
Bishop Joseph Sprague  
Bishop C. Dale White  
Carol Windrum  
Rev. Dr. J. Philip Wogaman

## **BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

### **CHAIR**

Howard W. Hallman

### **VICE CHAIR**

Rev. Bruce Edwards

### **SECRETARY**

Charlotte Hipkins

### **TREASURER**

Phillip H. Miller

### **MEMBERS**

Camille Anders  
Rev. Joy E. Arthur  
Joyce Georgieff

Sherman W. Harris  
James Hudson  
Rev. James Hipkins  
Rev. John Mecartney  
Rev. Schuyler Rhodes  
Donald C. Whitmore  
Phil WilsonJ  
June 2002

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

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <ssidorak@aol.com>  
Subject: Information  
Date: Fri, 21 Jun 2002 15:31:38 -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

Dear Steve,

Thanks for sending me a copy of your Remarks made in Washington on June 5.

Can you tell me more about the Chautauqua Consultation? How does it relate to or differ from the New Abolitionist movement that sometimes meets at Kirkridge?

You can find more about the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament by visiting our new web site: [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org), which is still under development. Click on Religious Statements and then Interfaith Committee. The entree includes four sign-on letters to public officials of the last two years. The last one was to President Bush on the nuclear posture review.

If you would like to join the list serve of ICND, contact [interfaithnd-subscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:interfaithnd-subscribe@yahoogroups.com) and enter "subscribe" in the subject line.

I look forward to our continuing contacts.

Shalom,  
Howard

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

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

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Kayser, Marie" <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>  
Subject: ICND linkage  
Date: Fri, 21 Jun 2002 15:33:50 -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

Marie,

On our home page can you link Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament  
(in bold toward the bottom) to the entree for ICND on the Religious  
Statements page?

You still need to correct the spelling of Pax Christi USA on the sponsors'  
list.

Thanks,  
Howard

Status: U

Return-Path: [katrina.alston@verizon.net](mailto:katrina.alston@verizon.net)

|Received: from out019.verizon.net ([206.46.170.98]) by charles.admin.atl.earthlink.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17INJZLWA3NI3rY1 for <mupj@igc.org>; Sat, 22 Jun 2002 11:27:59 -0500 (EST)Received: from verizon.net ([138.88.77.225]) by out019.verizon.net (InterMail vM.5.01.04.05 201-253-122-122-105-20011231) with ESMTP id [20020622162757.BFPL9617.out019.verizon.net@verizon.net](mailto:20020622162757.BFPL9617.out019.verizon.net@verizon.net) for <mupj@igc.org>; Sat, 22 Jun 2002 11:27:57 -0500

Message-ID: [3D14A671.3289449A@verizon.net](mailto:3D14A671.3289449A@verizon.net)

Date: Sat, 22 Jun 2002 12:31:45 -0400

From: Katrina Alston [katrina.alston@verizon.net](mailto:katrina.alston@verizon.net)

X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 [en]C-CCK-MCD BA45DSL (Win95; U)

X-Accept-Language: en

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)

Subject: Response from C. Anthony Muse

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="-----531DF044CEE88EBDDEA1A20E"

My Brother

Although most of your facts regarding money that the conference gave is not fully correct let me try to answer you. Most of which they must have given after I left. The 600,000 was not forfeited, it was lost because the conference refused to sign for the remainder of the loan which the bank granted, but would not allow anyone to sign for other then a conference representative. I was considered an employee not the owner. Our church budget today exceeds 2 million. I assure you, as I can provide bank documentation, that at the time of the issuance of the bonds we were financially healthy .We had a closing commitment from nations bank to loan us the entire 6 million. Angry conference officials derailed us as a way to punish me for some of my disagreements on the biblical direction of the UMC. They did not believe that there would be a response to their actions from a congregation that was feed up and did offer to stay and pay the entire debt of the building. This I also have in writing. We were told by letter to leave. Also, I have a copy of the banks letter granting us the full loan which as you know is difficult to obtain but we did because of our good financial health. I only stated that to answer your question. I will pray about it and would consider splitting the 2.9 with the conference .I cannot allow our church to pay for the ungodly behavior of the conference toward us .We have suffered also. If I had it all today, out of love ,I would give it without regard to obligation or who is at fault.80% of our present congregation also lost money and will do so in this deal. I will see if there is a way to assist those harmed the most but I cannot fully restore all. If you wish to assist us in determining who and how to go about

this I welcome your assistance. I AM IN PRAYER ABOUT YOUR REQUEST. I believe God will bless us with the funds to do as much as we can. Will you see if the conference is willing to explore this option? If so let us try. God Bless you and feel free to call me at home anytime on 301 203 1282.

sincerely and as your brother in Christ Jesus

C. Anthony Muse

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <rkillmer@wesleysem.edu>  
Subject: Proposed summit  
Date: Sat, 22 Jun 2002 11:48:15 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
 charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Dear Rich,

Below I am appending the memo I sent to the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, suggesting consideration of having a religious summit on nuclear abolition. I will be interested in your comments.

I have entered your name on our list-serve: [interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com](mailto:interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com).

You can see the beginnings of our web site at [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). Click on the Religious Statements button and you will find, among other things, a listing for NRDI. Wendy review this before it went on line. We also refer to the Cathedral statement on the home page and elsewhere link to press statements of certain individuals.

I look forward to meeting with you at noon on Tuesday, July 9. In the interim I will be away on vacation.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

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.

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <rkillmer@wesleysem.edu>  
Subject: ICND  
Date: Sat, 22 Jun 2002 11:49:27 -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

Rich,

Another thought. Information about the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is on the Religious Statement page of the web site: [www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html](http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html). This includes copies of four sign-on letters to public officials during the past two years. The latest was to President Bush on the nuclear posture review.

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](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
To: "Kayser, Marie" [marie\\_kayser@yahoo.com](mailto:marie_kayser@yahoo.com)  
Subject: Two more items from military leaders  
Date: Sat, 22 Jun 2002 17:28:14 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----  
=\_NextPart\_000\_001B\_01C21A12.317240E0"  
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,

In my last fling before leaving on vacation, I have developed two more statements for Military Leaders. They are attached: an addition for Admiral Gayler and a new entree for Admiral John J. Shanahan. The latter requires a new listing at the top of the page.

Please keep the Military Leaders page as a draft rather than putting it on line. I'll look it over when I return on Monday, July 8.

You won't have me to bother you for two weeks! Just kidding. You've been very helpful.

Howard

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

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

Under Military Leaders Speak Out: for Admiral Noel Gayler, add the following to what's already there:

*In The Nuclear Crisis Reader Admiral Gayler contributed a second article, "The Way Out: A General Nuclear Settlement" (pp. 234-243). Writing in 1984 when the Soviet Union and the United States were engaged in intense nuclear rivalry, he presented six elements of a general nuclear settlement:*

- Make an end to the intemperate, childish and threaten rhetoric between us.
- Give up nuclear war-fighting doctrines. The three most dangerous doctrines are:

First use against conventional force.

Counterforce, sometimes called "prompt hard target kill".

Protracted or "winnable" nuclear war. There can be no winners.

- Improve communications of every kind.
- A mutual moratorium on the further development, testing and deployment of new nuclear weapons.
- Avoid the extension of nuclear war capability in to new areas, whether technical or spatial (that is, exporting war to space).
- We and the Soviets need to make deep, fast and continuing cuts in the number of nuclear weapons of all kinds.

*In this article Admiral Gayler advocated a scheme for weapons conversion whereby:*

Each country hands over progressively larger numbers of explosive nuclear fission devices to a single conversion facility, built explicitly for this purpose, at a neutral site.

*Admiral Gayler returned to this subject in recent years in **A Proposal for Achieving Zero Nuclear Weapons** [[http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/00.12/gayler-proposal\\_for\\_achieving\\_zero\\_nuclear\\_weapons.html](http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/00.12/gayler-proposal_for_achieving_zero_nuclear_weapons.html)], posted on the web site of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation. He wrote:*

Process, as opposed to negotiating numbers, is the basic principle of the proposal that I suggest. It is nothing less than drastic: the continuing reduction to zero of weapons in the hands of avowed nuclear powers, plus an end to the nuclear ambitions of others.

**The proposal: Let weapons be delivered to a single point, there to be dismantled, the nuclear material returned to the donors for use or disposal, and the weapons destroyed.**

This process, once underway, will be nearly impossible to stop, since its obvious merits, political and substantive, will compel support. The “single point” may well be a floating platform, at sea, in international waters. A handy platform can be an aircraft carrier that has been removed from “mothballs” and disarmed, yet capable of steaming to the desired location and operating support aircraft and ships to handle heavier loads.

*Admiral Gayler in this article dispels some common illusions about nuclear weapons:*

- **Is physical defense against nuclear weapons possible? No.** What’s more, it’s irrelevant. A half dozen non-technical means of delivery avail.
- **Can nuclear weapons be used in any sensible manner? No.** This includes “tactical.”
- **Does nuclear disarmament imperil our security? No.** It enhances it.
- **Is deterrence of nuclear or other attack by threat of retaliation still possible? No.** The many potential aggressors are scattered — even location unknown. No targets!

## **Admiral John J. Shanahan**

*John J. Shanahan enlisted in the U.S. Navy prior to the outbreak of World War II and retired in 1977 as a vice admiral. He was involved in World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War. He commanded the U.S. Second Fleet in the Atlantic. His shore assignments included staff member for the Joint Chiefs of Staff and director of strategic plans and policy in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations.*

*After his retirement Admiral Shanahan remained active in national security issues. For a number of years he was Director of the Center for Defense Information.*

*In March 1997 Admiral Shanahan presented **Remarks to the Olof Palme International Center** [<http://www.cdi.org/issues/armscontrol/palme.htm>] in Stockholm, Sweden on the subject of nuclear abolition. He recalled his involvement as a junior officer in nuclear tests in the Pacific in 1948 and 1949. He indicated:*

I knew then, but didn't realize it, what I know now, that nuclear weapons have no place in the weapons inventories of any nation and there must be an organized serious international effort to rid the world of this weapon of mass destruction....

The goal must be the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons with near- and mid-term reductions in all nuclear stockpiles.

*In his remarks Admiral Shanahan mentioned several unilateral steps that the United States could take to jumpstart the process. They included:*

- Remove the warheads from all missiles and bombers to be eliminated under the START II Treaty.
- Make U.S. command and control more transparent so as to improve confidence that the United States truly does not target Russia or any non-nuclear weapon state that is a signatory of the NPT Treaty.
- Bring home the more than 400 U.S. Air Force tactical bombs currently deployed in Europe and cancel the subcritical nuclear tests that the Department of Energy plans to conduct at the Nevada Test Site.

*Admiral Shanahan also recommended multilateral efforts, including:*

- Separating warheads from delivery systems;
- Placing those warheads and missiles into safe, internationally-monitored storage;

- Dismantling all tactical nuclear weapons;
- Eliminating the thousands of strategic warheads that the United States and Russia plan to maintain in storage indefinitely;
- Cutting further the deployed strategic arsenals of all five declared nuclear weapons states;
- Banning the production of highly-enriched uranium and plutonium for any purpose;
- Enforcing strict controls on all fissile materials worldwide.

Reply-To: " Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: " Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Miller, Phillip H." <millerph@att.net>  
Subject: Going away  
Date: Sun, 23 Jun 2002 07:32:11 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
 charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Phil.

We're about to leave for a two week trip to Illinois and Kansas to visit relatives.

For the MCI bill, I signed the check and sent it in. Now I notice your cover letter suggests that the check may have been payable to me for reimbursement. You see how carelessly I read! I'll see whether they accept it or send it back.

Shalom,  
Howard

Status: U  
Return-Path: <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>  
Received: from halak.pcusa.org ([65.173.210.8])  
by osgood.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17mAIY7PL3NI3pt0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 24 Jun 2002 16:22:26 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from fire1.pcusa.org ([65.173.210.2]) by halak.pcusa.org  
(Post.Office MTA v3.5.3 release 223 ID# 0-69934U100L100S0V35)  
with SMTP id org for <mupj@igc.org>;  
Mon, 24 Jun 2002 16:18:35 -0400  
Received: from CTR-Message\_Server by gerizim.ctr.lan  
with Novell\_GroupWise; Mon, 24 Jun 2002 16:33:36 -0400  
Message-Id: <sd1749e0.047@gerizim.ctr.lan>  
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 5.5.6.1  
Date: Mon, 24 Jun 2002 16:22:01 -0400  
From: "Catherine Gordon" <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>  
To: <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Proposal for ND summit  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-Disposition: inline

I think this is a great idea. The Presbyterians would be able to =  
participate and advertise it through our network.

I think sometime in October would be the best time for me.

Regards,  
Catherine

Catherine Gordon  
Associate for International Issues  
Washington Office, Presbyterian Church (USA)  
110 Maryland Ave. Suite 104  
Washington, DC 20002  
www.pcusa.org/washington  
tel - 202 543 126  
fax - 202 543 7755

>>> "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> 06/18/02 11:50AM >>>  
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=20

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=20>  
----->

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:  
[interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com)=20

=20

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>=  
=20

Status: U

Return-Path: <Jch1928@aol.com>

Received: from imo-r08.mx.aol.com ([152.163.225.104])

by kendall.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17mEXj4Nf3N13pM0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 24 Jun 2002 21:17:17 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from Jch1928@aol.com

by imo-r08.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v32.21.) id q.125.129c548b (18407)  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 24 Jun 2002 21:17:14 -0400 (EDT)

From: Jch1928@aol.com

Message-ID: <125.129c548b.2a491e9a@aol.com>

Date: Mon, 24 Jun 2002 21:17:14 EDT

Subject: My E-Mail Connection

To: mupj@igc.org

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mailer: AOL 7.0 for Windows US sub 10512

Hi Howard:

Received your list of board of directors members of the Methodists United for Peace and Justice Board of Directors today. After reviewing your web site, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org), and found it to be truly outstanding. You indicated that this is work in process, keep up the good work.

For your plans to hold the Board of Directors meeting in the fall, I will be on vacation from August 20 through September 9, 2002, and scheduled for the Virginia Conference Board of Church and Society meeting September 27-28, 2002. Either of the above dates would not be all right for me, any other dates this fall looks good.

By the way, my e-mail address: [jch1928@aol.com](mailto:jch1928@aol.com).

Peace,

James C. Hudson  
(Jim)

Status: U

Return-Path: <jheim@cc.edu>

Received: from carroll1.cc.edu ([140.104.1.1])

by strange.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17nlBE6CM3Nl3oW0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 26 Jun 2002 18:49:46 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from cc.edu ([140.104.200.208])

by carroll1.cc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id RAA29453  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 26 Jun 2002 17:34:26 -0500 (CDT)

Message-ID: <3D1A45A1.90701@cc.edu>

Date: Wed, 26 Jun 2002 17:52:17 -0500

From: Joel Heim <jheim@cc.edu>

Reply-To: jheim@cc.edu

Organization: Carroll College

User-Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows; U; Win98; en-US; rv:0.9.4) Gecko/20011019 Netscape6/6.2

X-Accept-Language: en-us

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] Proposal for ND summit

References: <001001c216e0\$0fc2b860\$8c5bf7a5@default>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Howard,

I really welcome this proposal! This is my area of expertise and passion.

I have been trying to get Disciples Peace Fellowship (DPF) and the Disciples of Christ in general more involved in nuclear issues. We are hampered by the fact that Disciples do not have a Washington office and so coming for a two hour meeting is not really a possibility. Moreover, DPF has no staff and is run by volunteers with me serving as moderator.

A full day summit is something that I can justify the expense of coming for and would make every effort to do so. In fact, I might want to stay an extra half day to try to have a discussion with you and others about how to activate Disciples on this issue.

Dates that would NOT work for me:

1. Oct. 20-23--DPF Executive Committee meets in Daytona Beach, Florida
2. Nov. 22-27--American Academy of Religion meets in Toronto

Almost any other date would work. But as a college professor, the sooner this is set the better.

Thanks for your work on this!

Joel Heim

Moderator, Disciples Peace Fellowship

Assistant Professor of Religion and Philosophy, Carroll College,  
Waukesha, Wisconsin

P.S. I know you called me earlier in the summer and I have not gotten

back to you. I was out of town at the time. I know you want statements for the web-site (which looks great by the way). I do not think we have anything recent. How far back do you want to go?

Howard W. Hallman 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.

>

>

>

>----- 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](mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com)

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

>  
>  
>  
>

Status: U

Return-Path: <sentto-4736742-72-1025188147-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com>

Received: from n20.grp.scd.yahoo.com ([66.218.66.76])

by payne.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17nAgGYj3Nl3p40  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 27 Jun 2002 10:29:05 -0400 (EDT)

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-4736742-72-1025188147-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com

Received: from [66.218.67.196] by n20.grp.scd.yahoo.com with NNFP; 27 Jun 2002 14:29:07 -0000

X-Sender: Janice.Vera@cliffordchance.com

X-Apparently-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

Received: (EGP: mail-8\_0\_7\_3); 27 Jun 2002 14:29:05 -0000

Received: (qmail 9190 invoked from network); 27 Jun 2002 14:29:04 -0000

Received: from unknown (66.218.66.217)

by m3.grp.scd.yahoo.com with QMQP; 27 Jun 2002 14:29:04 -0000

Received: from unknown (HELO nyc-msg-300.cliffordchance.com) (206.67.130.66)

by mta2.grp.scd.yahoo.com with SMTP; 27 Jun 2002 14:29:04 -0000

Received: from nyc-msg-200.ny.us.cliffordchance.com (nyc-msg-200 [172.16.8.225]) by nyc-msg-300.cliffordchance.com with SMTP (Microsoft Exchange Internet Mail Service Version 5.5.2653.13) id L7BKLDGR; Thu, 27 Jun 2002 10:30:02 -0400

Received: from nyc-msg-200.ny.us.cliffordchance.com (unverified) by nyc-msg-200.ny.us.cliffordchance.com (Content Technologies SMTPRS 4.2.1) with ESMTP id <T5bbd81bfb7ac1008e10de@nyc-msg-200.ny.us.cliffordchance.com>;

Thu, 27 Jun 2002 10:23:40 -0400

Received: by NYC-MSG-200.NY.US.CliffordChance.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19) id <NVWKNM58>; Thu, 27 Jun 2002 10:23:40 -0400

Message-ID: <259A443D7822B44980A4A5525BF008F7743708@nyc-msg-11.NY.RW.COM>

To: mupj@igc.org

Cc: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com, Egbertl4pj@yahoo.com, mriley@uua.org,  
rcavenaugh@uua.org, revchurch@aol.com, jcarlssonb@aol.com,  
jburroughs@lcnp.org

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

X-eGroups-From: Janice.Vera@CliffordChance.com

From: guy.quinlan@cliffordchance.com

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Delivered-To: mailing list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

Precedence: bulk

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

Date: Thu, 27 Jun 2002 10:23:40 -0400

Subject: [interfaithnd] Possible topics for October meeting

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

On behalf of Guy C. Quinlan:

Howard,

In addition to obvious and necessary tasks of opposition to unsound missile defense schemes, the nuclear earth penetrator, etc., are there affirmative arms control measures which could have a realistic chance of success during the remainder of the current Administration? Perhaps the best prospects would be programs which (1) perceptibly contribute to the prevention of terrorism and (2) have some claim to substantial bipartisan support. For starters, three possibilities come to mind:

\* Reduction of, and transparency in locating, tactical nuclear warheads. Because of their generally smaller size, tactical warheads present a more severe risk of theft or diversion than do strategic weapons. Also, this could be presented as a genuinely bipartisan issue, building on partial achievements during the Reagan and first Bush Administrations (Of course, Clinton also endorsed the principle, in his summit with Yeltsin, though he entirely failed to follow through on it.)

\* Implementation of the enhanced verification capabilities recommended in the Shali-Kashvili Report, following defeat of the Test Ban Treaty. Obviously the current Administration will not resubmit the CTBT, but an independent case can be made for the verification upgrades as a means of detecting small tests by "rogue states," and they would put the CTBT in a stronger position when the time does come to revive it.

\* Accelerated efforts to improve the security of fissionable material in the former Soviet Union, as recommended in the Baker-Cutler Report. The case for this can only be strengthened by the report of the National Intelligence Council last February on inadequate security at plutonium and HEU uranium storage sites.

Peace,

Guy

\*\*\*\*\*

This message and any attachment are confidential and may be privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, please telephone or email the sender and delete this message and any attachment from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you must not copy this message or attachment or disclose the contents to any other person.

For further information about Clifford Chance please see our website at <http://www.cliffordchance.com> or refer to any Clifford Chance office.

----- 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](mailto:interfaithnd-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com)

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

Status: U

Return-Path: <lwright@churchworldservice.org>

Received: from blount.mail.mindspring.net ([207.69.200.226])

by nils.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17o1oQ4aZ3Nl3pm1

Fri, 28 Jun 2002 15:27:20 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from user-119b562.biz.mindspring.com ([66.149.148.194] helo=Lisa)

by blount.mail.mindspring.net with smtp (Exim 3.33 #1)

id 17O1NU-0000tg-00; Fri, 28 Jun 2002 15:25:56 -0400

Reply-To: <lwright@churchworldservice.org>

From: "Lisa Wright" <lwright@churchworldservice.org>

To: "Lisa Wright" <lwright@nccusa.org>

Subject: CHANGE OF E-MAIL ADDRESS

Date: Fri, 28 Jun 2002 15:24:56 -0500

Message-ID: <NDBBIPMPILLJDFNEEBCOIEFMEJAA.lwright@churchworldservice.org>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)

Importance: Normal

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4910.0300

Our e-mail addresses are being changed as of July 1. If you have not done so already, please change my e-mail address in your address book to:

[lwright@churchworldservice.org](mailto:lwright@churchworldservice.org)

Thanks!

Lisa Wright

Associate Director, Education & Advocacy Program

Church World Service

110 Maryland Ave., NE

Washington, DC 20002

tel: (202)544-2350

fax: (202)546-6232

[lwright@churchworldservice.org](mailto:lwright@churchworldservice.org)

web: [www.churchworldservice.org](http://www.churchworldservice.org)

Status: U

Return-Path: <vhall110@kscable.com>

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

by hazard.mail.atl.earthlink.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17oKWu1AMA3Nl3qG0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Sun, 30 Jun 2002 15:05:06 -0500 (EST)

Received: from lakemtao06.cox.net (lakemtao06.cox.net [68.1.17.115])

by igcb.igc.apc.org (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTTP id NAA24834  
for <mupj@igc.apc.org>; Sun, 30 Jun 2002 13:04:39 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from MISSY2.kscable.com ([68.102.224.134]) by lakemtao06.cox.net

(InterMail vM.5.01.04.05 201-253-122-122-105-20011231) with ESMTTP  
id <20020630200409.FKEK8234.lakemtao06.cox.net@MISSY2.kscable.com>;  
Sun, 30 Jun 2002 16:04:09 -0400

Message-Id: <4.3.1.2.20020630145901.00b61d18@pop-server.kscable.com>

X-Sender: vhall110@pop-server.kscable.com

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 4.3.1

Date: Sun, 30 Jun 2002 15:04:18 -0500

To: spencbe@opp.51.edu, cpepper@towerhill.org, pgni@aol.com,

"DKNUTSONR@aol.com" <DKNUTSONR@aol.com>, HALLEDEE@aol.com,  
edbruegge@attbi.com, EAABurns@aol.com, JEMSO615@aol.com,  
mupj@igc.apc.org, Spencersage2@aol.com, joanhallman@hotmail.com,  
lisahbriggs@msn.com, lmehall@attglobal.net, mmbuegg@aol.com,  
PAULNLISH@aol.com, SMHallman@att.net

From: Jeanette Hallman <vhall110@kscable.com>

Subject: e-mail

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

As of July 1st my new e-mail address will be vhall110@cox.net. Let me know  
if you receive this information. Thanks

Jeanette Hallman

110 Downing Rd.

Hutchinson, KS 67502

620-663-4355

Status: U

Return-Path: [cergreen@att.net](mailto:cergreen@att.net)

Received: from mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net ([204.127.131.47]) by payne.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17p4934B43NI3p40 for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 1 Jul 2002 12:35:20 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from webmail.worldnet.att.net ([204.127.135.60]) by mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net (InterMail vM.4.01.03.27 201-229-121-127-20010626) with SMTP id

<20020701163522.UFPT19902.mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net@webmail.worldnet.att.net>; Mon, 1 Jul 2002 16:35:22 +0000

Received: from [12.93.208.175] by webmail.worldnet.att.net; Mon, 01 Jul 2002 16:35:07 +0000

From: [cergreen@att.net](mailto:cergreen@att.net)

To: [klcoffice@aol.com](mailto:klcoffice@aol.com), [Bishop@holston.org](mailto:Bishop@holston.org), [bishop\\_dallas@mail.smu.edu](mailto:bishop_dallas@mail.smu.edu)

Cc: [debate44646@yahoo.com](mailto:debate44646@yahoo.com), [jhorman@umc-gbcs.org](mailto:jhorman@umc-gbcs.org), [jhill@umc-gbcs.org](mailto:jhill@umc-gbcs.org), [kfealing@umc-gbcs.org](mailto:kfealing@umc-gbcs.org), [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)

Subject: [stopthebombs] protesters convicted, "improving warheads" (fwd)

Date: Mon, 01 Jul 2002 16:35:07 +0000

X-Mailer: AT&T Message Center Version 1 (May 26 2002)

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed;

boundary="NextPart\_Webmail\_9m3u9jl4l\_11224\_1025541307"

Message-Id:

[20020701163522.UFPT19902.mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net@webmail.worldnet.att.net](mailto:20020701163522.UFPT19902.mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net@webmail.worldnet.att.net)

To Bishops Carder, Chamberlain, White, Oden

To General Board of Church & Society program directors

Janet Horman (Peace With Justice), John Hill (Environmental Justice), Ken Fealing (Civil & Human Rights) To Jim Hipkins and Howard Hallman of Methodists United for Peace With Justice

I wrote to you in March to inform you about the Oak Ridge Environmental Peace Alliance's efforts to STOP THE BOMBS being manufactured at the Y-12 plant. Following is an update on the verdict of the first federal charge of trespassing at the gate during a demonstration.

We hope the sentences will not be steep, even though the "riskers" knew the possible consequences. We hope this trial helps to awaken and educate our community. Our presence in court was respectful and we related positively with the prosecutors, judges,

clerk, court security officer and the star witnesses: the two men responsible for security of the Y-12 plant.

Could we hear from you? A letter of encouragement we could publish in the Holston Conference newspaper, the OREPA news, and the local secular papers?

Seeking Peace With Justice,

Carol E. Green

Peace With Justice Coordinator, Holston Conference

----- Forwarded Message: -----

From: "Paloma Galindo" <[palomagal@earthlink.net](mailto:palomagal@earthlink.net)>  
To: [stopthebombs@lists.riseup.net](mailto:stopthebombs@lists.riseup.net)  
Subject: [stopthebombs] protesters convicted, "improving warheads"  
Date: Fri, 21 Jun 2002 10:12:54 -0400

OREPA news contains;

\* Y-12 protesters convicted

\* Bush administration to explore ways of improving nuclear warheads

---

Jury convicts Y-12 protesters

By Rachel Kovac, News-Sentinel staff writer

June 20, 2002

It took jurors only 30 minutes Thursday to return a guilty verdict for three protesters charged with trespassing at Y-12, the Oak Ridge nuclear weapons plant.

The trial was the first-ever prosecution in federal court of protesters charged with trespassing at the facility.

Mary Elinor Adams, 61, of Bisbee, Ariz.; Elizabeth Ann Lentsch, a Catholic nun known as Sister Mary Dennis, 65, of Apison, Tenn.; and Timothy Joseph Mellon, 46, of Oak Ridge were arrested April 14 and charged with federal trespassing violations after they climbed over a metal barricade blocking an entrance to Y-12.

The jury was given the opportunity to find the defendants guilty of either trespass into an enclosed area or a lesser charge of simple trespass.

Closing arguments were short. U.S. Attorney Harry S. "Sandy" Mattice, asked the jurors to use their "common sense" in deliberation. He said he would trust them to define the term enclosed. Lawyers for the defendants argued that Adams, Lentsch, and Mellon did not trespass into an "enclosed" area. The boundary of the Y-12 plant is surrounded by a barbed wire fence that is open in several places where traffic can pass through.

Sentencing is set for Sept. 20 at 9:30 a.m. before U.S. Magistrate Clifford Shirley. Shirley halted the trial Wednesday afternoon to consider defense arguments that prosecutors led by U.S. Attorney Sandy Mattice Jr. failed to prove the three had trespassed on "enclosed" federal property.

Defense lawyers argued their clients were liable only for lesser trespassing punishments of a maximum \$5,000 fine and no jail time.

Motions for directed verdicts are routine but usually don't succeed. Shirley, named to his judgeship in February, left the courtroom for nearly two hours Wednesday before returning to say he needed the rest of the day to research and consider the motion. "This has obviously lasted far longer than we intended," Shirley said. Before the trial began Tuesday morning, the judge and attorneys for both sides estimated the case would take about a day.

The protesters had hoped the case would allow them to speak out against the production of nuclear weapons and to claim that the work at Y-12 violates international law and the nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty the United States signed in 1970.

Shirley ruled last week they could not make those arguments.

Workers at the Y-12 plant, created as part of the Manhattan Project to manufacture enriched uranium for nuclear weapons, currently disassemble and refurbish so-called "secondaries" or the second stage of retired nuclear warheads. Enriched uranium is also stored at the site.

The Associated Press contributed to this report.

---

Bush administration to explore ways of improving nuclear warheads

By JONATHAN S. LANDAY Knight Ridder Newspapers

WASHINGTON — With the ink barely dry on last month's nuclear arms reduction pact with Russia, the Bush administration is eager to explore new uses and improved designs for the country's ultimate weapons.

Administration officials worry that existing warheads cannot destroy targets such as deeply buried bunkers in Iraq, Iran and North Korea that may house biological or chemical weapons.

The Department of Energy, caretaker of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, wants to form teams of experts to study whether they could modify existing warheads for this kind of target.

Working with the Pentagon and the armed forces, these "advanced warhead concept teams" would also design warheads and conduct tests of components short of full-scale underground blasts.

In a related proposal, the administration wants to look at ways to cut the time needed to restart underground nuclear tests if they're needed to ensure the reliability of the nuclear arsenal. Bush insists that for now he has no plans to end the testing moratorium his father instituted in 1992.

Yet taken together, the two initiatives would move the country closer to being able to design, test and build new nuclear weapons than it has been at any time since the former President Bush ended warhead production in 1990.

That prospect alarms arms control advocates and is at the center of a debate in the Senate that began on Tuesday.

Critics fear that if the United States is perceived to be improving its nuclear weapons, other nuclear powers — such as Russia, China, India and Pakistan — and foes such as Iraq will redouble their own nuclear research and development efforts.

The differences have emerged in a Capitol Hill fight over an administration proposal for a \$15.5 million study to determine whether two existing warheads — the B83 and B61 thermonuclear gravity bombs — could be turned into nuclear bunker-busters.

The study would look at whether the nuclear explosives from the warheads could be repackaged in a new body that could smash into Earth, burrow deep underground and destroy a reinforced bunker or tunnel complex.

The explosives packages would be modified to limit radioactive fallout and damage to nonmilitary targets. Some scientists say that cannot be done.

The study would be the first project for the new teams of scientists the Bush administration wants to set up at the Department of Energy and the Lawrence Livermore, Sandia and Los Alamos nuclear weapons laboratories.

The Republican-controlled House of Representatives approved the study of the so-called Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator, or RNEP, in the version of the 2003 Pentagon budget that it passed last month.

But majority Democrats in the Senate are expected to pass a 2003 Pentagon budget barring the Department of Energy from conducting the RNEP study. The Senate Democrats' measure would require Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham to submit a study justifying the need for the RNEP, how it would be used, the kinds of targets it would attack and whether conventional weapons could be used instead.

The measure would also give Congress more power to block any effort by the administration to modify existing warheads or design new weapons. The Department of Energy would have to win congressional approval for the research and development phases of such programs and then return to Capitol Hill to obtain permission to begin producing modified or new nuclear warheads.

"I think it is entirely appropriate to ask the Department of Energy to come forward and answer very specific questions about the RNEP before we authorize the study or anything else," said Sen. Jack Reed, D-R.I., chairman of the Senate subcommittee that oversees nuclear weapons programs.

A House-Senate conference committee will reconcile differences between the defense budgets passed by the House and Senate. The formation of the advanced warhead concept teams has been delayed until the outcome of the dispute.

The RNEP study and the new teams were proposed as part of a 2001 Pentagon review of nuclear weapons policy, known as the Nuclear Posture Review. Although the review was secret, much of it was leaked in January.

Administration officials said the emergence of new threats that current warheads cannot destroy is not the only reason the RNEP study and the warhead concept teams are needed. They also will allow a dwindling pool of veteran nuclear weapons experts to pass their skills on to a new generation of scientists and engineers, the officials said.

They said these skills must be preserved in case the United States and its allies confront an unforeseen threat that cannot be eliminated by conventional weapons.

"We need to train new designers, and encourage their creativity to ensure our responsiveness to future national security needs, and to provide insurance against technological surprise by new weapons developments in other countries," said John Gordon, a former Air Force general who heads the National Nuclear Security Administration, at a congressional hearing on June 12. Gordon's agency oversees the nuclear arsenal.

Gordon said that increasing congressional oversight would have a "chilling effect" on the "intellectual creativity" of nuclear weapons scientists and constrain them from freely exploring their ideas and research.

Opponents argue that additional congressional oversight is needed so that U.S. nuclear weapons policy keeps the existing arsenal safe and reliable without fueling global proliferation.

--

Paloma Galindo  
Oak Ridge Environmental Peace Alliance  
PO Box 5743  
Oak Ridge, TN 37831  
phone: 865-483-8202  
[<paloma@stopthebombs.org>](mailto:paloma@stopthebombs.org)

Check out our web page at [<http://www.stopthebombs.org>](http://www.stopthebombs.org)

**OREPA news contains;**

\* Y-12 protesters convicted

\* Bush administration to explore ways of improving nuclear warheads

---

**Jury convicts Y-12 protesters**

**By Rachel Kovac, News-Sentinel staff writer**

**June 20, 2002**

It took jurors only 30 minutes Thursday to return a guilty verdict for three protesters charged with trespassing at Y-12, the Oak Ridge nuclear weapons plant.

The trial was the first-ever prosecution in federal court of protesters charged with

trespassing at the facility.

Mary Elinor Adams, 61, of Bisbee, Ariz.; Elizabeth Ann Lentsch, a Catholic nun known as Sister Mary Dennis, 65, of Apison, Tenn.; and Timothy Joseph Mellon, 46, of Oak Ridge were arrested April 14 and charged with federal trespassing violations after they climbed over a metal barricade blocking an entrance to Y-12.

The jury was given the opportunity to find the defendants guilty of either trespass into an enclosed area or a lesser charge of simple trespass.

Closing arguments were short. U.S. Attorney Harry S. "Sandy" Mattice, asked the jurors to use their "common sense" in deliberation. He said he would trust them to define the term enclosed.

Lawyers for the defendants argued that Adams, Lentsch, and Mellon did not trespass into an "enclosed" area. The boundary of the Y-12 plant is surrounded by a barbed wire fence that is open in several places where traffic can pass through.

Sentencing is set for Sept. 20 at 9:30 a.m. before U.S. Magistrate Clifford Shirley. Shirley halted the trial Wednesday afternoon to consider defense arguments that prosecutors led by U.S. Attorney Sandy Mattice Jr. failed to prove the three had trespassed on "enclosed" federal property.

Defense lawyers argued their clients were liable only for lesser trespassing punishments of a maximum \$5,000 fine and no jail time.

Motions for directed verdicts are routine but usually don't succeed.

Shirley, named to his judgeship in February, left the courtroom for nearly two hours Wednesday before returning to say he needed the rest of the day to research and consider the motion.

"This has obviously lasted far longer than we intended," Shirley said. Before the trial began Tuesday morning, the judge and attorneys for both sides estimated the case would take about a day.

The protesters had hoped the case would allow them to speak out against the production of nuclear weapons and to claim that the work at Y-12 violates international law and the nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty the United States signed in 1970.

Shirley ruled last week they could not make those arguments.

Workers at the Y-12 plant, created as part of the Manhattan Project to manufacture

enriched uranium for nuclear weapons, currently disassemble and refurbish so-called "secondaries" or the second stage of retired nuclear warheads. Enriched uranium is also stored at the site.

The Associated Press contributed to this report.

---

## **Bush administration to explore ways of improving nuclear warheads**

By JONATHAN S. LANDAY Knight Ridder Newspapers

WASHINGTON — With the ink barely dry on last month's nuclear arms reduction pact with Russia, the Bush administration is eager to explore new uses and improved designs for the country's ultimate weapons.

Administration officials worry that existing warheads cannot destroy targets such as deeply buried bunkers in Iraq, Iran and North Korea that may house biological or chemical weapons.

The Department of Energy, caretaker of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, wants to form teams of experts to study whether they could modify existing warheads for this kind of target.

Working with the Pentagon and the armed forces, these "advanced warhead concept teams" would also design warheads and conduct tests of components short of full-scale underground blasts.

In a related proposal, the administration wants to look at ways to cut the time needed to restart underground nuclear tests if they're needed to ensure the reliability of the nuclear arsenal. Bush insists that for now he has no plans to end the testing moratorium his father instituted in 1992.

Yet taken together, the two initiatives would move the country closer to being able to design, test and build new nuclear weapons than it has been at any time since the former President Bush ended warhead production in 1990.

That prospect alarms arms control advocates and is at the center of a debate in the Senate that began on Tuesday.

Critics fear that if the United States is perceived to be improving its nuclear weapons, other nuclear powers — such as Russia, China, India and

Pakistan — and foes such as Iraq will redouble their own nuclear research and development efforts.

The differences have emerged in a Capitol Hill fight over an administration proposal for a \$15.5 million study to determine whether two existing warheads — the B83 and B61 thermonuclear gravity bombs — could be turned into nuclear bunker-busters.

The study would look at whether the nuclear explosives from the warheads could be repackaged in a new body that could smash into Earth, burrow deep underground and destroy a reinforced bunker or tunnel complex.

The explosives packages would be modified to limit radioactive fallout and damage to nonmilitary targets. Some scientists say that cannot be done.

The study would be the first project for the new teams of scientists the Bush administration wants to set up at the Department of Energy and the Lawrence Livermore, Sandia and Los Alamos nuclear weapons laboratories.

The Republican-controlled House of Representatives approved the study of the so-called Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator, or RNEP, in the version of the 2003 Pentagon budget that it passed last month.

But majority Democrats in the Senate are expected to pass a 2003 Pentagon budget barring the Department of Energy from conducting the RNEP study.

The Senate Democrats' measure would require Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham to submit a study justifying the need for the RNEP, how it would be used, the kinds of targets it would attack and whether conventional weapons could be used instead.

The measure would also give Congress more power to block any effort by the administration to modify existing warheads or design new weapons. The Department of Energy would have to win congressional approval for the research and development phases of such programs and then return to Capitol Hill to obtain permission to begin producing modified or new nuclear warheads.

"I think it is entirely appropriate to ask the Department of Energy to come forward and answer very specific questions about the RNEP before we

authorize the study or anything else," said Sen. Jack Reed, D-R.I., chairman of the Senate subcommittee that oversees nuclear weapons programs.

A House-Senate conference committee will reconcile differences between the defense budgets passed by the House and Senate.

The formation of the advanced warhead concept teams has been delayed until the outcome of the dispute.

The RNEP study and the new teams were proposed as part of a 2001 Pentagon review of nuclear weapons policy, known as the Nuclear Posture Review. Although the review was secret, much of it was leaked in January.

Administration officials said the emergence of new threats that current warheads cannot destroy is not the only reason the RNEP study and the warhead concept teams are needed. They also will allow a dwindling pool of veteran nuclear weapons experts to pass their skills on to a new generation of scientists and engineers, the officials said.

They said these skills must be preserved in case the United States and its allies confront an unforeseen threat that cannot be eliminated by conventional weapons.

"We need to train new designers, and encourage their creativity to ensure our responsiveness to future national security needs, and to provide insurance against technological surprise by new weapons developments in other countries," said John Gordon, a former Air Force general who heads the National Nuclear Security Administration, at a congressional hearing on June 12. Gordon's agency oversees the nuclear arsenal.

Gordon said that increasing congressional oversight would have a "chilling effect" on the "intellectual creativity" of nuclear weapons scientists and constrain them from freely exploring their ideas and research.

Opponents argue that additional congressional oversight is needed so that U.S. nuclear weapons policy keeps the existing arsenal safe and reliable without fueling global proliferation.

--

Paloma Galindo

Oak Ridge Environmental Peace Alliance

PO Box 5743

Oak Ridge, TN 37831

phone: 865-483-8202

<paloma@stopthebombs.org>

Check out our web page at <<http://www.stopthebombs.org>>

Status: U

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

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

by bissell.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17p5DBH63Nl3rE0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 1 Jul 2002 14:10:58 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020701181057.57251.qmail@web13906.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13906.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Mon, 01 Jul 2002 11:10:57 PDT

Date: Mon, 1 Jul 2002 11:10:57 -0700 (PDT)

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

Subject: Re: Two more items from military leaders

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

In-Reply-To: <000401c21a48\$5f87d4a0\$0f5af7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-838665151-1025547057=:54514"

--0-838665151-1025547057=:54514

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

Howard,

I added the two new files in the Military page.

Thanks,

Marie

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

In my last fling before leaving on vacation, I have developed two more statements for Military Leaders. They are attached: an addition for Admiral Gayler and a new entree for Admiral John J. Shanahan. The latter requires a new listing at the top of the page.

Please keep the Military Leaders page as a draft rather than putting it on line. I'll look it over when I return on Monday, July 8.

You won't have me to bother you for two weeks! Just kidding. You've been very helpful.

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 Gayler.03.doc > ATTACHMENT part 3  
application/msword name=Admiral Shanahan.02.doc

Status: U

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

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

by payne.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17p5Yt6Qf3Nl3p41  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 1 Jul 2002 14:32:33 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020701183233.61927.qmail@web13907.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13907.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Mon, 01 Jul 2002 11:32:33 PDT

Date: Mon, 1 Jul 2002 11:32:33 -0700 (PDT)

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

Subject: Re: ICND linkage

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

In-Reply-To: <002a01c2195a\$caed5e20\$1150f7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-916937358-1025548353=:61784"

--0-916937358-1025548353=:61784

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

Howard,

I made all the changes you mentioned below.

Marie

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

On our home page can you link Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament  
(in bold toward the bottom) to the entree for ICND on the Religious  
Statements page?

You still need to correct the spelling of Pax Christi USA on the sponsors'  
list.

Thanks,

Howard

Status: U  
Return-Path: <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>  
Received: from web13906.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.69])  
by bissell.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17p6Gm55D3NI3rE0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 1 Jul 2002 15:17:54 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-ID: <20020701191753.70676.qmail@web13906.mail.yahoo.com>  
Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13906.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Mon, 01 Jul 2002 12:17:53 PDT  
Date: Mon, 1 Jul 2002 12:17:53 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Marie Kayser <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Re: Military Leaders page  
To: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
In-Reply-To: <00b601c2189b\$a4e58d20\$4650f7a5@default>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-559965980-1025551073=:69955"

--0-559965980-1025551073=:69955  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Howard,  
I made all the changes below.  
Marie  
"Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote:  
Marie,

1. If we use an eagle, it should have arrows and a palm branch in its claws, like the Great Seal of the United States (look on the back of a dollar). That symbolizes war and peace. If you could add these to the first photo, it might work. Otherwise, go to a hawk and a dove, also symbolic of war and peace. They could be stylistic rather than a photographic copy.

2. Good job on the photos.

3. For General Butler all of the third paragraph should be in italic.

4 For Admiral Carroll:

a. Drop "Rear" in the index and the heading of his entree, but keep it in the first introductory paragraph.

b. I found another speech by Admiral Carroll. An excerpt is attached. Insert it after the introductory paragraph that ends "....deputy director."

c. The attachment contains a substitute paragraph for the next entree.

d. The last two paragraphs taken from the World Federalist speech should be in non-italic.

5. I'm willing to have this go on line even before you work out the graphic, if it causes undue delay.

Howard  
----- Original Message ----- From: Marie Kayser To: Howard W. Hallman Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2002 2:46  
PMSubject: Re: Military Leaders page

Howard,  
I finished adding the links to the military leaders page and also added a few photos.

Marie

> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword name=Admiral Carroll.03.doc

Reply-To: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <cergreen@att.net>  
References: <20020702190608.WCAA5870.mtiwmhc23.worldnet.att.net@webmail.worldnet.att.net>  
Subject: Re: Alan Geyer  
Date: Wed, 17 Jul 2002 22:35:46 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
 charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Carol,

It is Dr. Alan Geyer, 5014 Smallwood Terrace, Bethesda, MD 20816-2830.

Good work at Oak Ridge.

Shalom,  
Howard

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

From: <cergreen@att.net>  
To: <mupj@igc.org>  
Cc: <debate44646@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, July 02, 2002 3:05 PM  
Subject: Alan Geyer

> Howard and Jim & Char,  
> >  
> I appreciated Alan Geyer's article in The Christian  
> Century June 5-12, 2002 "America goes its own way". Can  
> you give me his contact data (postal, e-mail, phone...)?

CArol

Status: U

Return-Path: <nobody@linus.thomasroad.net>

Received: from linus.thomasroad.net ([64.4.114.18])

by runyon.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17puQw4ri3Nl3sj0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 2 Jul 2002 17:06:00 -0400 (EDT)

Received: (from nobody@localhost)

by linus.thomasroad.net (8.11.0/8.11.0) id g62L5x702109;  
Tue, 2 Jul 2002 17:05:59 -0400

Date: Tue, 2 Jul 2002 17:05:59 -0400

Message-Id: <200207022105.g62L5x702109@linus.thomasroad.net>

To: mupj@igc.org

Subject: The Falwell Confidential

From: jch1928@aol.com

I have just signed Dr. Jerry Falwell's Petition to support the Pledge of Allegiance, and I encourage you to do the same  
by visiting this address: [http://www.falwell.com/pledge\\_petition.php](http://www.falwell.com/pledge_petition.php).

Thank you

Jim Hudson

Status: U

Return-Path: <debate44646@yahoo.com>

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

by farley.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17pyXc1pp3Nl3pa0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 2 Jul 2002 21:29:10 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from web10702.mail.yahoo.com (web10702.mail.yahoo.com [216.136.130.210])

by igcb.igc.apc.org (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id SAA01731  
for <mupj@igc.apc.org>; Tue, 2 Jul 2002 18:29:09 -0700 (PDT)

Message-ID: <20020703012908.39691.qmail@web10702.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [24.140.23.16] by web10702.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Tue, 02 Jul 2002 18:29:08 PDT

Date: Tue, 2 Jul 2002 18:29:08 -0700 (PDT)

From: hipkins james <debate44646@yahoo.com>

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

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Howard: Do you have an e-mail address for Al Geyer  
and/or his address. Thanks!

Jim Hipkins

---

Do You Yahoo!?

Sign up for SBC Yahoo! Dial - First Month Free

<http://sbc.yahoo.com>

Reply-To: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "hipkins james" <debate44646@yahoo.com>  
References: <20020703012908.39691.qmail@web10702.mail.yahoo.com>  
Subject: Re:  
Date: Wed, 17 Jul 2002 22:39:11 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
 charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Jim,

It is It is Dr. Alan Geyer, 5014 Smallwood Terrace, Bethesda, MD 20816-2830.

I've sent it to Carol Green.

Howard

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

From: "hipkins james" <debate44646@yahoo.com>  
To: "Howard Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Sent: Tuesday, July 02, 2002 9:29 PM

> Howard: Do you have an e-mail address for Al Geyer  
> and/or his address. Thanks!  
>  
> Jim Hipkins  
>  
>  
> \_\_\_\_\_  
> Do You Yahoo!?  
> Sign up for SBC Yahoo! Dial - First Month Free  
> <http://sbc.yahoo.com>

Status: U  
Return-Path: <edbruegge@attbi.com>  
Received: from rwcrmhc53.attbi.com ([204.127.198.39])  
by payne.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17pRmH7rg3Nl3p40  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 3 Jul 2002 17:08:43 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from [24.147.232.227] by rwcrmhc53.attbi.com  
(InterMail vM.4.01.03.27 201-229-121-127-20010626) with ESMTP  
id <20020703210843.QFFI15755.rwcrmhc53.attbi.com@[24.147.232.227]>  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 3 Jul 2002 21:08:43 +0000  
User-Agent: Microsoft-Outlook-Express-Macintosh-Edition/5.02.2022  
Date: Wed, 03 Jul 2002 17:10:36 -0400  
Subject: FW: Hello  
From: Edward Brueggemann <edbruegge@attbi.com>  
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>  
Message-ID: <B948E08C.1895%edbruegge@attbi.com>  
In-Reply-To: <001f01c222ce\$a1e2d500\$54a2c441@prestige.net>  
Mime-version: 1.0  
Content-type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="MS\_Mac\_OE\_3108561036\_1342387\_MIME\_Part"

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

--MS\_Mac\_OE\_3108561036\_1342387\_MIME\_Part  
Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

for reunion records. edb

-----

From: "Karen Walaitis" <walaitis@adelphia.net>  
Date: Wed, 3 Jul 2002 13:17:13 -0700  
To: "Tim France" <timfrance@hotmail.com>, "Tammy McKenzie"  
<sharkbait625@aol.com>, "Susie Madda" <smadda@profitelgroup.com>, "Stephanie  
Tamaro" <stamaro@microage.com>, "Stacy Novis" <snovis@yahoo.com>, "Serena  
Stapp" <serena@myexcel.com>, "Scott Westrack" <swestrack@cox.net>, "Sara  
Keenan" <keenan@mcao.maricopa.gov>, "Rob Francis" <francisrj@yahoo.com>,  
"Rick Brace" <rickbrace@aol.com>, "Paula Collins" <pagecollins@aol.com>,  
"Pamela Jolley" <pjolley@att.net>, "Mike Cistolo" <mcistolo@msn.com>,  
"Michelle Kirk" <mpskirk@msn.com>, "Michelle Gisler" <geeseinaz@aol.com>,  
"Mark Zimmer" <baldspartan@hotmail.com>, "Lori Leonetti"  
<lorismailaz@aol.com>, "Lisa Westrack" <lwestrack@cox.net>, "Kristine Laws"  
<laws@mcao.maricopa.gov>, "Krista Banke" <wamkb@aol.com>, "Kelley Collins"  
<colliegirl20@aol.com>, "Kathy Grom" <sundevl89@aol.com>, "Julie Taylor"  
<taylorj@mcao.maricopa.gov>, "John Knutson" <knutsonjd@8mcd.usmc.mil>, "Greg  
Walaitis" <gwalaitis@NASCARImages.com>, "Glen Gable"  
<gable70@worldnet.att.net>, "Gary DeCarli" <decarli@prodigy.net>, "Frank  
McKenzie" <foong909@aol.com>, "Edward Brueggemann" <edbruegge@attbi.com>,  
"Doug Tamaro" <tamaro@asu.edu>, "Doug Barks"  
<602distributing@prodigy.net>, "Dorothy King" <dking@cosc.maricopa.gov>,  
"Don Knutson" <dknutsonr@aol.com>, "Diane Gniadek" <dibaby911@aol.com>,  
"Denise Smith" <smithd@mcao.maricopa.gov>, "Cori Knutson"  
<cnjknutson@msn.com>, "Claudia Feldman" <aflac1@myexcel.com>, "Billy  
Walaitis" <benhogan1953@aol.com>

Subject: Hello

As of right now, I can send e-mails but not receive them. In about 6 hours, I should be able to receive also. Here is our new info:

15032 Hugh McAuley Rd.  
Huntersville NC 28078

Home phone 704-948-0039  
Karen's cell 704-996-6984  
e-mail [Walaitis@adelphia.net](mailto:Walaitis@adelphia.net)

Status: U

Return-Path: [david@fcnl.org](mailto:david@fcnl.org)

Received: from local.fcnl.org ([65.207.12.2]) by hazard.mail.atl.earthlink.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17pSrt1TKq3NI3qG0 for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 3 Jul 2002 17:17:39 -0500 (EST)

Received: by local.fcnl.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19) id <N5W97TN6>; Wed, 3 Jul 2002 18:08:29 -0400

Message-ID: [E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF6A85A6D@local.fcnl.org](mailto:E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF6A85A6D@local.fcnl.org)

From: David Culp [david@fcnl.org](mailto:david@fcnl.org)

To: 'Interested Persons' [anon@fcnl.org](mailto:anon@fcnl.org)

Subject: "Usable" nuclear weapons?

Date: Wed, 3 Jul 2002 18:08:27 -0400

Importance: high

X-Priority: 1

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----  
\_=\_NextPart\_000\_01C222DE.28A5E500"

**"Usable" nuclear weapons?**

**We disagree.**

**A small group of men at the Pentagon and in Congress are pushing to develop a new nuclear weapon, called the "bunker buster." It could be used in a pre-emptive strike against non-nuclear countries. Many of the potential targets are located in urban areas in countries like Iraq. If used in such a setting, the bomb would kill over 100,000 people. This program can--and must--be stopped.**

**Already the Senate Armed Services Committee has voted to cut off the funds for the "bunker buster" warhead. On Thursday, July 10, the House Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee will vote on whether to fund the warhead. Rep. Sonny Callahan of Alabama is the chairman of that committee.**

**Please send him a e-mail or fax (free) by clicking [here](#) or call him at (202) 225-4931. Ask him to delete funding for the "bunker buster" nuclear warhead from the energy and water appropriations bill.**

**August 6, 2002 is the 57th anniversary of the Hiroshima bomb. That bomb killed 140,000 people in five months. Rep. Sonny Callahan will decide whether nuclear weapons are used again. Help him make the right decision.**

**This issue is so urgent we ask you to forward this e-mail to your contacts in the Mobile, Alabama area (1st Congressional District).**

**Kathy Guthrie, Field Program Secretary  
Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quakers), 245 Second St., N.E.,  
Washington, D.C. 20002  
Phone: (800) 630-1330. Email: [fcnl@fcnl.org](mailto:fcnl@fcnl.org). Web site: [www.fcnl.org](http://www.fcnl.org).**



Status: U

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

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

by charles.admin.atl.earthlink.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17qzYW1aYC3Nl3rY0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 5 Jul 2002 15:47:10 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <20020705204709.44087.qmail@web13901.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13901.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Fri, 05 Jul 2002 13:47:09 PDT

Date: Fri, 5 Jul 2002 13:47:09 -0700 (PDT)

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

Subject: Re: ICND linkage

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

In-Reply-To: <002a01c2195a\$caed5e20\$1150f7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-44969631-1025902029=:43793"

--0-44969631-1025902029=:43793

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

Howard,

Welcome back and I hope you had a wonderful vacation. It was very hot here so I hope you went to a cooler location. I created the feedback page which is not live yet. I am still working on the codes but you may view the page:

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

I also created "under construction" pages for civil section and arsenal.

Regards,

Marie

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

On our home page can you link Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament (in bold toward the bottom) to the entree for ICND on the Religious Statements page?

You still need to correct the spelling of Pax Christi USA on the sponsors' list.

Thanks,  
Howard

Status: U

Return-Path: <jdi@clw.org>

Received: from mail.clw.org ([63.106.26.66])

by farley.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTMP id 17rAUA1bc3NI3pa0

Mon, 8 Jul 2002 11:58:50 -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 ESMTMP id org; Mon, 8 Jul 2002 11:46:12 -0400

Message-Id: <5.0.0.25.2.20020708114420.02282d78@[63.106.26.66]>

X-Sender: jdi@[63.106.26.66]

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0

Date: Mon, 08 Jul 2002 11:48:53 -0400

To: jdi@clw.org (John Isaacs)

From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>

Subject: Senate begins consideration of nuclear reductions treaty

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Council for a Livable World

July 8, 2002

Senate Begins Consideration of Treaty of Moscow:  
Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty

On May 24, 2002, Russian President Vladimir Putin and American President George W. Bush signed the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT) mandating the reduction of both Russian and U.S. deployed nuclear weapons by almost two-thirds over the course of the next decade, from 6,000 to between 1,700 and 2,200 by the year 2012.

For a copy of the three-page treaty text, see:  
<http://www.clw.org/control/sort/treatytext.html>

On June 5, 2002, President Bush met with the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Joseph Biden (D-Del.) and Richard Lugar (R-Ind.), to express his desire for ratification before the end of the year. According to a June 5 Associated Press story, Bush told the two Senators of his "hope and expectation" that the Senate would complete action "before this Congress was over."

Chairman Biden indicated a willingness to complete the ratification process by the time the Senate adjourns. The target date for adjournment is October 4, although this deadline is expected to slip.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee plans to hold a half-dozen hearings and present the Treaty to the full Senate for a vote by the fall. To date, two hearings have been scheduled:

Tuesday, July 9 - Secretary of State Colin Powell - 10:30 AM - 419 Dirksen

Wednesday, July 17 - Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Richard Myers - 10:30 A.M. - 419 Dirksen

The Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Intelligence Committee are likely to hold a hearing as well.

Mark-up of the resolution of ratification in the Foreign Relations Committee is expected in September. The full Senate may also consider the treaty in September; however, with a very full schedule, it is difficult to see how the Senate can debate the treaty for any great length of time.

There are a number of very important questions that will be discussed in the hearings and perhaps on the Senate floor:

==The treaty includes no timetable for implementation and no mechanisms for verification of compliance. To avoid misunderstandings and prevent cheating, and to foster increased cooperation between the United States and Russia, the Senate may consider methods to ensure compliance with the standards set forth in the Moscow Treaty.

==The Treaty does not require the destruction of decommissioned warheads, providing only that they be stored away from the launch site. The storage of nuclear warheads, as opposed to destruction, poses grave proliferation concerns. In Russia, plagued for years by security problems, the threat of warhead theft from a warehouse is much greater than the threat of warhead theft from a silo. Consequently, with no provisions for the actual dismantling of the weapons, there is an increased risk of nuclear technology falling into the wrong hands. The Senate may consider ways to prevent future redeployment and avoid the risks of warhead theft through dismantling the weapons and associated launch platforms.

==The Treaty is set to expire on the same day when the deployed warheads must reach agreed-upon levels. The Senate may consider establishing a timetable for these reductions, and perhaps prod the Administration to speed up implementation.

==The Treaty does not deal with tactical nuclear weapons. Originally designed for easy deployment and use in battlefield operations, these shorter-range devices remain totally unregulated by existing arms control treaties. Because of their small size and the lack of electronic locks on older such weapons, these arms are especially vulnerable to theft or misuse. The Senate may consider urging the two countries to address this critical issue.

==The Treaty leaves both nations free to continue to improve and modernize their respective weapons stockpiles. The Senate has already begun to address this issue during its consideration of the Defense Authorization bill by refusing funds for a new nuclear earth penetrator weapon.

== The Senate may consider expanding the Cooperative Threat Reduction program to reduce further the Russian nuclear arsenal. This program, known as Nunn-Lugar, represents one of the most successful bilateral regimes ever implemented.

John Isaacs

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

Reply-To: " Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: " Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Edward Brueggemann" <edbruegge@attbi.com>  
References: <B948E08C.1895%edbruegge@attbi.com>  
Subject: Re: Hello  
Date: Mon, 8 Jul 2002 22:08:24 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
    boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_0055\_01C226CB.FA9E7360"  
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\_0055\_01C226CB.FA9E7360  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

FW: HelloEd,

Thanks for sending me this list. However, it appears to contain names =  
that I don't recognize beyond the Hallman clan. Can you clarify?

We spent the Fourth of July on Lake Bracken, Illinois, near Galesburg, =  
where Carlee's brother has a cabin. Before that we visited Mary =  
Hallman in Elmhurst and Mary Hurrel in Topeka. The latter included a =  
trip to the Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve in the Flint Hills, =  
which we greatly enjoyed.

Shalom,  
Howard

Status: U

Return-Path: <edbruegge@attbi.com>

Received: from rwcrmhc51.attbi.com ([204.127.198.38])

by walker.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17rTuC1ur53NI3s70  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 9 Jul 2002 07:49:18 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from [24.147.232.227] by rwcrmhc51.attbi.com

(InterMail vM.4.01.03.27 201-229-121-127-20010626) with ESMTP  
id <20020709114917.EQRQ24728.rwcrmhc51.attbi.com@[24.147.232.227]>  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 9 Jul 2002 11:49:17 +0000

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

Date: Tue, 09 Jul 2002 07:51:15 -0400

Subject: Re: Hello

From: Edward Brueggemann <edbruegge@attbi.com>

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

Message-ID: <B9504673.18C0%edbruegge@attbi.com>

In-Reply-To: <00b101c226f0\$2251fc00\$715ff7a5@default>

Mime-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="MS\_Mac\_OE\_3109045875\_135152\_MIME\_Part"

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

--MS\_Mac\_OE\_3109045875\_135152\_MIME\_Part

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

on 7/8/02 10:08 PM, Carlee L. Hallman at mupj@igc.org wrote:

Ed,

Thanks for sending me this list. However, it appears to contain names that  
I don't recognize beyond the Hallman clan. Can you clarify?

We spent the Fourth of July on Lake Bracken, Illinois, near Galesburg, where  
Carlee's brother has a cabin. Before that we visited Mary Hallman in  
Elmhurst and Mary Hurrel in Topeka. The latter included a trip to the  
Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve in the Flint Hills, which we greatly  
enjoyed.

Shalom,  
Howard

Just ignore the other names. I simply forwarded to you for the single  
address of Marjorie's daughter. The others are irrelevant. edb

Reply-To: " Howard W. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
From: " Howard W. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
To: [redgar@nccusa.org](mailto:redgar@nccusa.org)  
Cc: <[lwright@churchworldservice.org](mailto:lwright@churchworldservice.org)>, [agreenblatt@nccusa.org](mailto:agreenblatt@nccusa.org)  
Subject: Proposed "summit meeting" on nuclear disarmament  
Date: Tue, 9 Jul 2002 11:25:55 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="-----  
=\_NextPart\_000\_001F\_01C2273B.6483ACE0"  
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 Bob,

As you are well aware, the nuclear weapons policy of the Bush Administration is going in the wrong direction. As Monsignor Francis Chullikat, deputy head of the Holy See delegation to the United Nations, told the 2002 NPT PrepCom, "There has been a regression." (see <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html#regression>) The Most Reverend Wilton D. Gregory, president, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, made the same point in a May 24 "Statement on New Nuclear Treaty and U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy" (see <http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/may02fin.htm>) Protestant and Jewish leaders are saying the same thing.

The faith community in the United States needs to speak out on this issue and mobilize its strength to influence public policy in another direction. This should be more than another joint statement. Action needs to be guided by a carefully developed strategy. Therefore, I have proposed a one-day "summit meeting" to develop an action program, to be held in Washington, D.C. in the fall. This is laid out in the attached proposal to the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

Would you be willing to participate in such a meeting in the fall? Or if not you, other top staff from the National Council of Churches? It might occur some time between your Executive Committee in September and your National Council meeting in November.

I'm trying to get Jerry Powers from the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops involved. He is going to Africa the second half of October, then has a USCCB meeting on November 11-14. He would probably be available on Thursday or Friday, October 10 or 11. Would either of these dates be suitable to you or your staff? If not, what other dates would you suggest. I also need to clear the date to avoid major meetings of Washington denominational staff.

Related to this is a suggestion I made to you in early June that the National Council of Churches might want to update its policy statement on nuclear disarmament. I am willing to use my contacts in member denominations to encourage them to work with you and your in developing such a statement.

I'd like to call you in a few days to discuss these matters.

Shalom,

Howard

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

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

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

Status: U

Return-Path: <redgar@bruno.nccusa.org>

Received: from bruno.nccusa.org ([205.187.116.2])

by payne.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17rWT66os3Nl3p40  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 9 Jul 2002 11:26:47 -0400 (EDT)

Received: (from redgar@localhost)

by bruno.nccusa.org (Pro-8.9.2/Pro-8.9.2) id KAA07803  
for mupj@igc.org; Tue, 9 Jul 2002 10:19:55 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Tue, 9 Jul 2002 10:19:55 -0400 (EDT)

From: "Dr. Robert W. Edgar" <redgar@nccusa.org>

Message-Id: <200207091419.KAA07803@bruno.nccusa.org>

User-Agent: Vacation/1.2.3 <http://vacation.sourceforge.net>

To: mupj@igc.org

Subject: Bob Edgar will be on vacation from June 29 until July 12.

I will not be reading my mail for a while.

Your mail concerning "Proposed "summit meeting" on nuclear disarmament"

You may contact his assistant, Vicki Manning, at [vmanning@nccusa.org](mailto:vmanning@nccusa.org) or  
212-970-2025 or David Smyth, at [jfw@nccusa.org](mailto:jfw@nccusa.org) or 212-870-2298.

Bob will be back in the New York office on Wednesday, July 17, 2002.

Reply-To: " Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: " Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <gpowers@usccb.org>  
Subject: May statement  
Date: Tue, 9 Jul 2002 15:56:36 -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

Jerry,

I looked up your May statement on nuclear policy. It is excellent. I want to referrence it from our web page.

Howard

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

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

Reply-To: " Howard W. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
From: " Howard W. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
To: [vmanning@nccccusa.org](mailto:vmanning@nccccusa.org)  
Subject: Message to Dr Edgar  
Date: Tue, 9 Jul 2002 11:33:49 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----  
=\_NextPart\_000\_0041\_01C2273C.7F5FC8E0"  
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

In case you are not reading Bob Edgar's mail, I am sending you a copy because it involves his fall schedule. I'll give you a call.

Howard Hallman

Dear Bob,

As you are well aware, the nuclear weapons policy of the Bush Administration is going in the wrong direction. As Monsignor Francis Chullikat, deputy head of the Holy See delegation to the United Nations, told the 2002 NPT PrepCom, "There has been a regression." (see <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html#regression>) The Most Reverend Wilton D. Gregory, president, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, made the same point in a May 24 "Statement on New Nuclear Treaty and U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy" (see <http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/may02fin.htm>) Protestant and Jewish leaders are saying the same thing.

The faith community in the United States needs to speak out on this issue and mobilize its strength to influence public policy in another direction. This should be more than another joint statement. Action needs to be guided by a carefully developed strategy. Therefore, I have proposed a one-day "summit meeting" to develop an action program, to be held in Washington, D.C. in the fall. This is laid out in the attached proposal to the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

Would you be willing to participate in such a meeting in the fall? Or if not you, other top staff from the National Council of Churches? It might occur some time between your Executive Committee in September and your National Council meeting in November.

I'm trying to get Jerry Powers from the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops involved. He is going to Africa the second half of October, then has a USCCB meeting on November 11-14. He would probably be available on Thursday or Friday, October 10 or

11. Would either of these dates be suitable to you or your staff? If not, what other dates would you suggest. I also need to clear the date to avoid major meetings of Washington denominational staff.

Related to this is a suggestion I made to you in early June that the National Council of Churches might want to update its policy statement on nuclear disarmament. I am willing to use my contacts in member denominations to encourage them to work with you and your in developing such a statement.

I'd like to call you in a few days to discuss these matters.

Shalom,

Howard

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

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

Reply-To: " Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: " Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Miller, Phillip H." <millerph@att.net>  
Subject: payment request  
Date: Wed, 10 Jul 2002 15:21:33 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
 charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Phil,

I'm now back from a pleasant vacation visiting relatives in Illinois and Kansas.

I have a bill from Verizon for \$23.55 that's due soon. Please make me a check for that amount payable to Verizon. Would you like their statement? Or would you want me to keep such statements in my MUPJ file? I'm happy to mail them to you if you want them for your records.

In a few days I'll bill your for internet service, a half-share of my computer's phone line used for MUPI, and some 37cent stamps I bought.

Meanwhile, will you please pay me \$500 in consulting services on our web site for June 2002. It should come from the UM GBCS grant.

Thanks.

Howard

Reply-To: " Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: " Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <interfaithnd@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Fw: Senate begins consideration of nuclear reductions treaty  
Date: Wed, 10 Jul 2002 16:05:42 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
 charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Dear Colleagues,

You may be interested in some of the questions that need to be raised during Senate hearings and debate on the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty.

Howard

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

From: "John Isaacs" <jdi@clw.org>  
To: "John Isaacs" <jdi@clw.org>  
Sent: Monday, July 08, 2002 11:48 AM  
Subject: Senate begins consideration of nuclear reductions treaty

> Council for a Livable World  
> July 8, 2002  
>  
> Senate Begins Consideration of Treaty of Moscow:  
> Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty  
>  
>  
> On May 24, 2002, Russian President Vladimir Putin and American President  
> George W. Bush signed the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT)  
> mandating the reduction of both Russian and U.S. deployed nuclear weapons  
> by almost two-thirds over the course of the next decade, from 6,000 to  
> between 1,700 and 2,200 by the year 2012.  
>  
> For a copy of the three-page treaty text, see:  
> <http://www.clw.org/control/sort/treatytext.html>  
>  
> On June 5, 2002, President Bush met with the chairman and ranking member  
of  
> the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Joseph Biden (D-Del.) and Richard  
> Lugar (R-Ind.), to express his desire for ratification before the end of  
> the year. According to a June 5 Associated Press story, Bush told the two  
> Senators of his "hope and expectation" that the Senate would complete  
> action "before this Congress was over."  
>  
> Chairman Biden indicated a willingness to complete the ratification

process

> by the time the Senate adjourns. The target date for adjournment is

October

> 4, although this deadline is expected to slip.

>

> The Senate Foreign Relations Committee plans to hold a half-dozen hearings

> and present the Treaty to the full Senate for a vote by the fall. To date,

> two hearings have been scheduled:

>

> Tuesday, July 9 - Secretary of State Colin Powell - 10:30 AM - 419 Dirksen

>

> Wednesday, July 17 - Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and Chairman of

> the Joint Chiefs of Staff Richard Myers - 10:30 A.M. - 419 Dirksen

>

> The Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Intelligence Committee

> are likely to hold a hearing as well.

>

> Mark-up of the resolution of ratification in the Foreign Relations

> Committee is expected in September. The full Senate may also consider the

> treaty in September; however, with a very full schedule, it is difficult

to

> see how the Senate can debate the treaty for any great length of time.

>

> There are a number of very important questions that will be discussed in

> the hearings and perhaps on the Senate floor:

>

> ==The treaty includes no timetable for implementation and no mechanisms

for

> verification of compliance. To avoid misunderstandings and prevent

> cheating, and to foster increased cooperation between the United States

and

> Russia, the Senate may consider methods to ensure compliance with the

> standards set forth in the Moscow Treaty.

>

> ==The Treaty does not require the destruction of decommissioned warheads,

> providing only that they be stored away from the launch site. The storage

> of nuclear warheads, as opposed to destruction, poses grave proliferation

> concerns. In Russia, plagued for years by security problems, the threat

of

> warhead theft from a warehouse is much greater than the threat of warhead

> theft from a silo. Consequently, with no provisions for the actual

> dismantling of the weapons, there is an increased risk of nuclear

> technology falling into the wrong hands. The Senate may consider ways to

> prevent future redeployment and avoid the risks of warhead theft through

> dismantling the weapons and associated launch platforms.

>

> ==The Treaty is set to expire on the same day when the deployed warheads

> must reach agreed-upon levels. The Senate may consider establishing a

> timetable for these reductions, and perhaps prod the Administration to

> speed up implementation.

>

> ==The Treaty does not deal with tactical nuclear weapons. Originally

> designed for easy deployment and use in battlefield operations, these

> shorter-range devices remain totally unregulated by existing arms control



Reply-To: " Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: " Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <rkillmer@wesleysem.edu>  
Subject: ICND list serve  
Date: Thu, 11 Jul 2002 09:43:20 -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

Dear Rich,

I enjoyed our conversation the other day. I'm looking forward to a fruitful relationship.

If you received an e-mail through interfaithnd about questions on SORT, you were successfully entered into the list serve. This enables you to communicate to the list by posting your own message to [interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com](mailto:interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com). If you would like me to introduce you to the list before you write about the Urgent Call, I'm willing to do so. But you're free to go ahead on your own.

Shalom,  
Howard

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

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

Reply-To: " Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: " Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "LUNDGREN, Dwight" <Dwight.Lundgren@abc-usa.org>  
References: <F894907F8FEDD411B81B0002A53486A311ACF3@abcex1.abc-usa.org>  
Subject: Re: A new web site  
Date: Thu, 11 Jul 2002 11:38:36 -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 Dwight,

I am pleased that we can list your office as a sponsoring organization. Can you provide a web address that we can use as a linkage on the sponsors' list?

We have no set contribution requirement. We have had several \$300 contributions, one of \$100, and a \$5,000 grant from the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society. You can choose in that range.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair has a list serve to keep participants informed on legislative issues and to facilitate exchange among members on nuclear disarmament issues. Would you like to subscribe? If so, contact: [interfaithnd-subscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:interfaithnd-subscribe@yahoogroups.com) and write "subscribe" on the subject line. You may want to sample it. If it doesn't meet your needs, you can unsubscribe.

Shalom,  
Howard

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

From: "LUNDGREN, Dwight" <Dwight.Lundgren@abc-usa.org>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Sent: Thursday, July 11, 2002 11:12 AM  
Subject: RE: A new web site

> I am willing to have you use "Office of Reconciliation Ministries,  
ABC/USA",  
> ie, my office, as a sponsoring organization. How much of a donation do  
you  
> require?  
> Dwight  
> PS Sorry I am so late getting back to you on this.  
>

Reply-To: " Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: " Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>  
Subject: UUA web address  
Date: Thu, 11 Jul 2002 11:40:09 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
 charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Larry,

I didn't save the web contact you sent for use on the sponsors' list of our web site. Please send it again.

Thanks,  
Howard

Status: U

Return-Path: [J. Daryl Byler@mail.mcc.org](mailto:J._Daryl_Byler@mail.mcc.org)

Received: from igcb.igc.apc.org ([192.82.108.46]) by strange.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17sFce6zl3NI3oW0 for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 11 Jul 2002 10:45:30 -0400 (EDT)Received: from mail.mcc.org (mail.mcc.org [24.229.80.113]) by igcb.igc.apc.org (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id HAA00288 for <mupj@igc.apc.org>; Thu, 11 Jul 2002 07:45:26 -0700 (PDT)

From: [J. Daryl Byler@mail.mcc.org](mailto:J._Daryl_Byler@mail.mcc.org)

Received: by mail.mcc.org(Lotus SMTP MTA v4.6.5 (863.2 5-20-1999)) id 85256BF3.005134E7 ; Thu, 11 Jul 2002 10:46:59 -0400

X-Lotus-FromDomain: MCC

To: [webmaster@mennomedia.org](mailto:webmaster@mennomedia.org)

cc: Jose\_Ortiz@mail.mcc.org, Rachel\_B\_Miller@mail.mcc.org, [mupj@igc.apc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.apc.org), [Mark E Beach@mail.mcc.org](mailto:Mark_E_Beach@mail.mcc.org)

Message-ID: [85256BF3.00513493.00@mail.mcc.org](mailto:85256BF3.00513493.00@mail.mcc.org)

Date: Thu, 11 Jul 2002 10:56:10 -0400

Subject: Thirdway Cafe column - Nuclear weapons

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/mixed;

Boundary="0\_\_=MloVPU7kFKmi7Hr0567aCpCKbUaryBFp93gsEJ4Qlb2AFUgbgsAJNhEA" Content-Disposition: inline

Dear Thirdway friends:

Here's the column for this week.

Warm regards,

Daryl Byler

(See attached file: Nuclearnews.july10.doc)(See attached file: Nuclearnews.july10.wpd)

The news behind the nuclear news

by J. Daryl Byler

U.S. President George W. Bush and Russian President Vladimir Putin made the headlines six weeks ago when they signed a treaty committing the United States and Russia to slash their nuclear arsenals by two-thirds during the next decade.

That's the good news. But behind the news is another story: The treaty is largely smoke and mirrors.

Stored, Not Destroyed The treaty does not require that a single nuclear weapon actually be dismantled.

Some nuclear warheads would be removed from their launchers, but neither the launchers nor the warheads must be destroyed.

The process is akin to removing bullets from a loaded gun and storing them in the closet for future use. It should be called what it is -- storing -- not disarmament.

President Bush has announced that the United States will reduce its nuclear arsenal from more than 6,000 to between 1,700 and 2,200 weapons. But Secretary of State Colin Powell told Congress this week that the Pentagon plans to keep some 4,600 warheads as either immediately available for use or in "active reserve." This "fuzzy math" is permitted under the treaty.

### **No Teeth**

The two-page treaty lacks procedures for verifying reductions of either U.S. or Russian nuclear weapons. Furthermore, it lapses after 10 years and neither country is required to make any reductions until 2012. Either party can withdraw from the treaty with three months' notice.

### **Request to Congress**

President Bush has asked U.S. Senate leaders to ratify the treaty -- officially known as the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT) -- before the 107<sup>th</sup> Congress adjourns in October. Congress is likely to do so.

The president has also asked Congress to include \$15.5 million in next year's military budget to begin work on a new earth-penetrating nuclear weapon called a "bunker buster." Significantly, SORT allows both countries the freedom to modernize their nuclear forces.

The House version of the defense authorization bill includes the president's request. But the Senate version does not.

Some analysts close to the process believe this year's final bill will not include funding for new nuclear weapons. But the Bush administration is not likely to abandon its quest.

### **Nuclear Posture Review**

The administration recently conducted a major review of U.S. nuclear policy. Its 56-page classified report -- leaked to several major newspapers -- calls for a new generation of miniature nuclear weapons and suggests that the United States may need to resume nuclear testing in order to produce them.

The report also says that the United States should be prepared to launch pre-emptive nuclear attacks to destroy stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons.

### **Mennonite Statements**

A 1979 Mennonite Church General Assembly statement says: "Modern militarism . . . tempts the nations to assume the power of God. With their devastating arsenals of nuclear weapons, nations today hold destructive power over every living cell on earth."

Two years later, another Assembly statement -- which could well have been written in 2002 -- says, "We . . . feel called at this time to a particular witness against nuclear weapons because of the enormous consequences of decisions confronting world leaders regarding [their] testing, production, and deployment . . ."

August 6 marks the 57th anniversary of Hiroshima where 140,000 people were killed by a U.S. nuclear bomb.

### **Advocacy Needed**

Urge your senators to add guidelines that give teeth to the SORT treaty before they ratify it. Ask all members of Congress to oppose a resumption of nuclear testing and funds for developing new nuclear weapons.

Status: U

Return-Path: <Dwight.Lundgren@abc-usa.org>

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

by pickering.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17sFCR4jX3Nl3p20 for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 11 Jul 2002 11:13:01 -0400 (EDT)

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

id <NL4MKB6L>; Thu, 11 Jul 2002 11:12:17 -0400

Message-ID: <F894907F8FEDD411B81B0002A53486A311ACF3@abcex1.abc-usa.org>

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

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

Subject: RE: A new web site

Date: Thu, 11 Jul 2002 11:12:16 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

I am willing to have you use "Office of Reconciliation Ministries, ABC/USA", ie, my office, as a sponsoring organization. How much of a donation do you require?

Dwight

PS Sorry I am so late getting back to you on this.

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

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

Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2002 4:00 PM

To: LUNDGREN, Dwight

Subject: Re: A new web site

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

Status: U

Return-Path: <GPowers@usccb.org>

Received: from peter.nccbuscc.org ([207.32.122.194])

by runyon.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17sHTW7It3Nl3sj0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 11 Jul 2002 13:38:47 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from peter.nccbuscc.org (peter [207.32.122.194])

by peter.nccbuscc.org (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id NAA12468  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 11 Jul 2002 13:31:47 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from NCCB-Message\_Server by usccb.org

with Novell\_GroupWise; Thu, 11 Jul 2002 13:36:31 -0400

Message-Id: <sd2d89df.075@usccb.org>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5.2

Date: Thu, 11 Jul 2002 13:39:10 -0400

From: "Gerard Powers" <GPowers@usccb.org>

To: <mupj@igc.org>

Subject: May statement -Reply

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Content-Disposition: inline

Thanks for the kind words about our statement. You can reference it on =  
your page or put the whole thing on there, if you'd like to. This one is =  
not copyrighted.

Status: U  
Return-Path: <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>  
Received: from web13903.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.29])  
by runyon.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17sIKq2ib3Nl3sj0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 11 Jul 2002 14:33:01 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-ID: <20020711183300.32977.qmail@web13903.mail.yahoo.com>  
Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13903.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Thu, 11 Jul 2002 11:33:00 PDT  
Date: Thu, 11 Jul 2002 11:33:00 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Marie Kayser <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Are you back?  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
In-Reply-To: <000b01c218a1\$22ef3ae0\$136ef7a5@default>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-1171580825-1026412380=:32867"

--0-1171580825-1026412380=:32867  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Hi,  
Are you back from vacation? Have you seen the new pages?  
Thanks,  
Marie  
"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote: Marie,

I have successfully created three mail boxes and gained the capability for retrieving messages. They are:  
hallman@zero-nukes.org  
feedback@zero-nukes.org  
proposal@zero-nukes.org

Therefore, is it time to create the Feedback page? When I notified the Interfaith Committee that some of the pages were on-line, one of the members tried to reply through Feedback but nothing was available. Why don't you go ahead with it?

You may also want to open the other four pages that don't yet have material ready. You can post the name and offer the message: "This page is under development." The four are: Civil Sector Statements, Arsenals & Treaties, Site Index, What's New. If these were hooked up to the buttons on the Home Page, at least users could find out that the pages don't have material yet.

What's your opinion? Is this customary?

Howard

Status: U

Return-Path: <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>

Received: from web11108.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.131.155])

by farley.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17sK0v2z53Nl3pa0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 11 Jul 2002 15:53:43 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020711195342.21523.qmail@web11108.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [216.193.39.58] by web11108.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Thu, 11 Jul 2002 12:53:42 PDT

Date: Thu, 11 Jul 2002 12:53:42 -0700 (PDT)

From: Egbert Lawrence <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>

Subject: Reply from Larry: UUA web address

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

In-Reply-To: <003101c228f2\$2a611f80\$016ff7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Howard,

The web address I use to start out is [www.uua.org](http://www.uua.org).

All of the sub-ideas that I know of can be found from  
that.

Holler if that does not work.

PEACE! Larry

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

> Larry,

>

> I didn't save the web contact you sent for use on

> the sponsors' list of our

> web site. Please send it again.

>

> Thanks,

> Howard

>

>

---

Do You Yahoo!?

Sign up for SBC Yahoo! Dial - First Month Free

<http://sbc.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: <20020711183300.32977.qmail@web13903.mail.yahoo.com>  
Subject: Re: Are you back?  
Date: Fri, 12 Jul 2002 09:53:07 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
    boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_0008\_01C22989.EC6FBF40"  
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\_0008\_01C22989.EC6FBF40  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Marie,=20

Yes, I'm back. I've looked at the new pages but otherwise haven't had =  
time yet to get back to this project.

Your eagle gives me what I asked for. I want to get a couple of =  
opinions to be certain that others are comfortable with this symbol.

I have another sponsor and more contact information for the home page. =  
I hope to get it to you today. I also have some additional religious =  
statements to give you.

I'll be in touch.

Howard=20

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

From: Marie Kayser=20

To: Howard W. Hallman=20

Sent: Thursday, July 11, 2002 2:33 PM

Subject: Are you back?

Hi,=20

Are you back from vacation? Have you seen the new pages?=20

Thanks,  
Marie

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Kayser, Marie" <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Home page corrections  
Date: Sat, 13 Jul 2002 12:57:21 -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,

As I am getting back to work on zero-nukes.org, I have checked the home page and found the need for corrections.

First, where I am listed as moderator at hallman@zero-nukes.org, clicking it addresses an e-mail to moderator@zero-nukes.org. That was my initial designation but I had to change it because it had nine letters, one too many. Please correct this.

Second, the sponsors are not linking to their sites, as should happen. Here is the revised sponsors list with web address. New are American Baptist Churches and Friends Committee for National Legislation. Changed is the Unitarian Universalist Association Washington Office for Advocacy (rather than Faith in Action).

#### Sponsors

American Baptist Churches USA  
Office of Reconciliation Ministries  
<http://www.nationalministries.org/mission/reconciliation/index.cfm>

Church of the Brethren,  
Washington Office  
[www.brethren.org/genbd/washofc](http://www.brethren.org/genbd/washofc)

Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quaker)  
[www.fcnl.org](http://www.fcnl.org)

Mennonite Central Committee,  
Washington Office  
<http://www.mcc.org/us/washington/index.html>

National Council of Churches  
[www.nccusa.org](http://www.nccusa.org)

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

Presbyterian Church (USA)  
Washington Office  
[www.pcusa.org/washington/issuenet/gs.htm](http://www.pcusa.org/washington/issuenet/gs.htm)

Union of American Hebrew Congregations  
[www.rac.org](http://www.rac.org)

Unitarian Universalist Association  
Washington Office for Advocacy  
<http://www.uua.org/uuawo/>

United Church of Christ  
Justice & Witness Ministries  
[www.ucc.org](http://www.ucc.org)

United Methodist General Board  
of Church and Society  
[www.umc-gbcs.org](http://www.umc-gbcs.org)

These changes will, of course, carry through to where you have the sponsors and moderator listed at the end of content pages.

Thanks for making these changes.

Howard

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <interfaithnd@yahoo.com>  
Subject: ICND meeting for Sept. -- reply requested  
Date: Mon, 15 Jul 2002 09:16:58 -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:

I would like to hold a meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament during the first half of September. The purpose would be to develop an action strategy to counter the retrogressive Bush policies on nuclear disarmament. The potential agenda is covered in a separate communication.

We used to meet on Tuesday afternoons. But since the schedule quickly thickens by the second week in September, maybe we should meet soon after Labor Day. Therefore, I suggest three choices, each from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.  
Friday, September 6  
Tuesday, September 10  
Tuesday, September 17

Please reply immediately about which of these dates you can and cannot attend.

As to further alternatives, I know about commemoration and heightened security on the Hill on 9/11, heads of offices on the afternoon of Sept. 12, Yom Kippur on the 16th, Churches for Middle East Peace on the 18th, the meeting on trade and investment on the 19th and 20th. Are there other meetings to avoid or specific dates when you cannot attend?

Thanks for our reply,

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: <jheim@cc.edu>  
Received: from carroll1.cc.edu ([140.104.1.1])  
by strange.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17ub0R4cN3N13oW0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 15 Jul 2002 14:56:00 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from cc.edu ([140.104.200.208])  
by carroll1.cc.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id NAA10251  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 15 Jul 2002 13:53:57 -0500 (CDT)  
Message-ID: <3D331B74.4020302@cc.edu>  
Date: Mon, 15 Jul 2002 13:59:00 -0500  
From: Joel Heim <jheim@cc.edu>  
Reply-To: jheim@cc.edu  
Organization: Carroll College  
User-Agent: Mozilla/5.0 (Windows; U; Win98; en-US; rv:0.9.4) Gecko/20011019 Netscape6/6.2  
X-Accept-Language: en-us  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] ICND meeting for Sept. -- reply requested  
References: <000001c22c06\$f4591560\$506ef7a5@default>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; format=flowed  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Howard,

As I have indicated before, it is hard to justify a trip to DC for a 2-hour meeting, so I probably could not come for this. I might be able to do it on Friday, Sept. 6th, the other two would not be possible.

While it makes sense to have this sort of meeting first, I do hope a more complete full-day summit happens and will do everything possible to come to it.

Joel Heim  
DPF, Moderator

Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

>

>Dear Colleagues:

>

>I would like to hold a meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear  
>Disarmament during the first half of September. The purpose would be to  
>develop an action strategy to counter the retrogressive Bush policies on  
>nuclear disarmament. The potential agenda is covered in a separate  
>communication.

>

>We used to meet on Tuesday afternoons. But since the schedule quickly  
>thickens by the second week in September, maybe we should meet soon after  
>Labor Day. Therefore, I suggest three choices, each from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.

> Friday, September 6

> Tuesday, September 10

> Tuesday, September 17

>

>Please reply immediately about which of these dates you can and cannot  
>attend.

>  
>As to further alternatives, I know about commemoration and heightened  
>security on the Hill on 9/11, heads of offices on the afternoon of Sept. 12,  
>Yom Kippur on the 16th, Churches for Middle East Peace on the 18th, the  
>meeting on trade and investment on the 19th and 20th. Are there other  
>meetings to avoid or specific dates when you cannot attend?

>  
>Thanks for our reply,

>  
>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 ----->  
>Save on REALTOR Fees  
><http://us.click.yahoo.com/Xw80LD/h1ZEAA/Ey.GAA/nJ9qIB/TM>  
>----->

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

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

>  
>  
>  
>

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com>  
Subject: ICND Agenda  
Date: Mon, 15 Jul 2002 09:19:07 -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

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues,

In a separate communication I have proposed some alternative dates for a September meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Here I want to discuss the agenda.

## OVERALL

The overall agenda is intended to discuss action strategies to promote a broader and deeper approach to nuclear disarmament to counter the retrogressive policies of the Bush Administration. This is becoming a matter of urgency because of consideration being given to use of nuclear weapons against Iraq and other non-nuclear weapon states.

## SUMMIT

On June 18 I sent you a proposal for a "summit meeting" in October that would be an all-day session with wider participation than the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament to develop a broad action strategy. I've talked with a number of you about this and concluded that first we need the kind of strategy meeting that I am calling for September.

I've received a suggestion that we should look for a window of opportunity for national religious leaders, such as heads of communion, to make a public statement calling for specific steps for nuclear disarmament and to seek a meeting with President Bush and/or his top aides. One occasion might be when the Senate ratifies the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT), which is likely to occur some time this fall. The religious leaders could praise President Bush for negotiating the treaty as a first step toward nuclear disarmament and praise the Senate for ratifying it. The religious leaders could then say that much more needs to be done and could lay out an agenda for next steps. In the process they could specifically oppose the use of nuclear weapons in dealing with Iraq and other non-nuclear weapon states.

I tried this out on one person who suggested that because of the uncertainty

of when the Senate will ratify SORT and the length of time it takes to set up a meeting with the president and/or his top aides, the two should be handled separately.

This and other possibilities will be considered at our September meeting. Meanwhile, let me and others know what you think.

## JOINT STATEMENT

We all know how hard it is to work out a consensus statement in the faith community. Because of the way that the Catholic polity works, it is particularly difficult to gain Catholic endorsement of a joint statement. Also, the Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative has in the works a reaffirmation of the statement originally issued at the Washington National Cathedral in June 2000.

Therefore, rather than developing another statement, I'm wondering whether we could simply build on the "Statement on New Nuclear Treaty and U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy", made by the Most Reverend Wilton D. Gregory, President, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops on May 24, 2002. (See <http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/may02fin.htm>) This statement welcomes the new treaty but calls for policies that "move away from reliance on nuclear weapons as a central part of our nation's military doctrine." In discussing issues of particular importance, the statement indicates:

- \* "Much deeper, more irreversible cuts, in both strategic and tactical weapons, are both possible and necessary."
- \* "We oppose the continued readiness of the United States to use nuclear weapons, especially against non-nuclear threats, and the potential development of new weapons for this purpose. . . . We abhor any use of nuclear weapons."
- \* "We urge the President to support the ratification of the comprehensive test ban treaty."
- \* "More must be done to assist nuclear nations, particularly Russia, in dismantling and safeguarding their weapons and nuclear materials."

If we staged a news conference, other heads of communion could endorse the statement of Bishop Gregory, who we hope would participate. The four items could also serve as an agenda for a meeting with President Bush. They cover essential points, though one of the participants might also raise the matter of de-alerting, which isn't covered in the Catholic statement.

Heads of communion would have the liberty of making available to the press their own policy statements on nuclear disarmament. Press information could reference [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org) for further religious statements.

What do you think of this approach?

## GRASSROOTS MOBILIZATION

At our September meeting, we should consider how to mobilize the grassroots constituencies of the faith community for a broader nuclear disarmament agenda. We can build upon our experience working together for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. If we could obtain additional resources, we could consider the experience of Jubilee 2000 and other

faith-based campaigns.

## URGENT CALL

One piece of a grassroots campaign could be use of a faith-based version of an "Urgent Call to End the Nuclear Danger" that has recently been initiated by David Cortright, Randy Forsberg, and Jonathan Schell. It is modeled on the experience of the Freeze Campaign in the 1980s, though now making much greater use of the Internet. Information is available at [www.urgentcall.org](http://www.urgentcall.org).

Richard Killmer, who has taken Wendy Starman's place at the Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative, will be communicating to you about the Urgent Call.

We will consider these and other ideas when the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament meets in September. Meanwhile, please share your observations by replying to all.

Shalom,  
Howard

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

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

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
To: "Kayser, Marie" [marie\\_kayser@yahoo.com](mailto:marie_kayser@yahoo.com)  
Subject: Your Feedback  
Date: Mon, 15 Jul 2002 09:40:17 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----  
=\_NextPart\_000\_0017\_01C22BE3.A0E18520"  
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,

You made a good start in the Your Feedback page. I have further developed it as shown in the attachment.

I want this page to be used particularly to provide substantive comments on various statements found on the web site. I would like to post them in order received. At one time you suggested that we can do this by month with the latest received on top.

I don't want to offer to reply to all feedback. That would be too time consuming.

Unless you have further suggestions for me, go ahead and open the Your Feedback page as revised.

Howard

## ***Your Feedback***

Thanks for visiting the zero-nukes web site. We welcome your feedback.

You can send us:

- Brief comments on specific articles and statements posted on the site.
- Your evaluation of the site.
- Your suggestions on how we can improve zero-nukes.org.

We will post all relevant feedback, subject to limits on length, unless you request us not to.

If you want to offer your own ideas on how to eliminate nuclear weapons, see [How to Submit Your Ideas](#) on the [How to Get to Zero](#) page.

Your Name

[box]

Your City, State or Province, Country

[box]

Your E-Mail Address (will not be posted)

[box]

Please enter your comments below.

[box]

Submit Reset

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
To: "Kayser, Marie" [marie\\_kayser@yahoo.com](mailto:marie_kayser@yahoo.com)  
Subject: Religious statements  
Date: Mon, 15 Jul 2002 09:45:32 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----  
=\_NextPart\_000\_0021\_01C22BE4.5C705A00"  
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 am now ready to post statements by the Canadian Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches (USA). They are attached. You already have a place reserved for them on the Religious Statement page.

While you are working on that page, there are two corrections to make.

(1) In the opening paragraph, eliminate the blank space in the second line after "nuclear".

(2) Under the Holy See statement "There Has Been Regression", PDF version, you omitted the name of " Monsignor Francis Chullikat". Please add it.

Howard

logo

## **Canadian Council of Churches**

*The Canadian Council of Churches is a community of 19 churches (denominations) that functions as a forum for working together. Its Governing Board is drawn from the member churches. An Executive Committee consists of the Council's officers and chairs of commissions and standing committees.*

*The Canadian churches have long worked for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Their policy position is regularly expressed in letters to Canadian prime ministers. For instance, in 1982 they wrote to Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau to affirm that:*

nuclear weapons in any form and in any number cannot ultimately be accepted as legitimate components of national armed forces.

*In 1998 the leaders of the 19 member denominations wrote Prime Minister Jean Chrétien:*

The willingness, indeed the intent, to launch a nuclear attack in certain circumstances bespeaks spiritual and moral bankruptcy. . . .

Nuclear weapons do not, cannot, deliver security -- they deliver only insecurity and peril through their promise to annihilate that which is most precious, life itself and the global ecosystem upon which all life depends. Nuclear weapons have no moral legitimacy, they lack military utility, and, in light of the recent judgment of the World Court, their legality is in serious question.

*In April 2002 the Canadian Council of Churches again expressed its views in **Letters to the Prime Minister on the Question of Nuclear Disarmament** [<http://www.ccc-cce.ca/english/jp/index.html>] in response to the Nuclear Posture Review released by the U.S. Department of Defense. On behalf of the Council's Executive Committee, the Most Rev. André Vallée, president of the Council, wrote to Prime Minister Chrétien:*

We have consistently expressed our conviction that governments and citizens should work as expeditiously as possible toward the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

Canada should adhere to and courageously promote its long-held goal of global nuclear disarmament. . . .We need to say very clearly to our neighbours that Canada opposes any widening of the role of nuclear weapons, in any country or in any alliance.

*This view was elaborated by Ernie Regehr, director of Project Ploughshares, a national peace and disarmament agency of the Canadian Council of Churches. He asked Canada to:*

Call on the United States and NATO to explicitly reject all nuclear first-use options and to issue unequivocal public commitments to a policy of no-first-use.

Advocate measures to remove nuclear weapons from alert status, to support de-mating (separating warheads from delivery systems), and in the case of tactical weapons to keep them out of the control of operating units.

Indicate strong support for the concerns of non-aligned parties to the NPT and back their demand for unequivocal negative security assurances from all nuclear weapon states. [That is, pledge never to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries that are party to the NPT.]

[logo]

## **National Council of Churches**

*The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. is an ecumenical body involving 35 Protestant and Orthodox denominations in the United States with a total membership of 52 million members with 140,000 congregations. For more than four decades it has opposed nuclear weapons and favored their elimination.*

*Its current policy framework is based upon **Pillars of Peace for The 21<sup>st</sup> Century** [<http://www.nccusa.org/about/pillars.html>], A Policy Statement On The United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly of the National Council of Churches on November 11, 1999. The fifth of seven pillars deals with peace issues, as follows:*

**5) Peace and Conflict Resolution.** Peace rooted in justice requires the nurturing of a culture of peace in homes, communities, religious institutions, nations and across the world; the use of non-violent means of resolving conflict; appropriate systems of common security; and the end of the unrestrained production, sale and use of weapons worldwide.

*The Rev. Dr. Robert Edgar, General Secretary, National Council of the Churches, expanded upon this pillar in a paper offered to Millennium Peace Summit at the United Nations in August 2000. He stated (emphasis added):*

In an age of higher military spending for weapons that feed deadly civil as well as international wars that mostly displace, wound or kill noncombatants, and create urgent needs for large international relief and reconstruction efforts, religious communities play important peacemaking roles. **The churches continue to be advocates for reduction and nonproliferation of both nuclear and convention weapons**, teachers of conflict resolution techniques that are applicable in many local communities, leaders in Reconciliation Commissions following warfare and repression, and pioneers in crossing lines of hostility between countries, such as the outmoded impasse between the U.S. and Cuba.

*When India and Pakistan conducted nuclear weapons tests in 1998, the two top officers of the National Council of Churches at that time, Bishop Craig B. Anderson, President, and The Rev. Dr. Joan B. Campbell, General Secretary, issued a statement in which they said:*

These events point to the urgency on the global level to develop binding agreements on nuclear, chemical, biological and conventional armaments, seeking restraint on development, production, sale and transfer, so that the

existence and trafficking of such weapons does not become a stimulus for tension and conflict. They also point to the necessity of developing alternate security systems and effective means of conflict resolution.

***These recent statements are based upon long-standing policies of the National Council of Churches, including a policy statement on "Defense and Disarmament: New Requirements for Security", adopted by the General Board in September 1968 and updated in November 1977.***

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <Howerb261@cs.com>  
Subject: Looking for Sunday Box  
Date: Mon, 15 Jul 2002 10:00:19 -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

I am looking for a wooden puzzle known as Sunday Box or snake puzzle. I didn't see one on your web site. I'm wondering if you might stock it or know where I can find one. If you have them, what is the cost?

Sunday Box consists of twenty seven connected cubes that look like a snake when spread out. It folds into a solid cube that has 3x3x3 small cubes. It is said to have originated with a religious group as a puzzle to keep children busy during religious service. It may have been Amish or Mennonite or some similar group. Therefore, possibly some one in Lancaster County makes and sells them.

Thanks for your assistance,  
Howard Hallman

Status: U  
Return-Path: <david@fcnl.org>  
Received: from local.fcnl.org ([65.207.12.2])  
by kendall.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17u6lD4wP3Nl3pM0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 15 Jul 2002 09:57:09 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: by local.fcnl.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
id <N5W97ZD1>; Mon, 15 Jul 2002 09:47:23 -0400  
Message-ID: <E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF6A85ADB@local.fcnl.org>  
From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>  
To: "'Howard W. Hallman'" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] ICND meeting for Sept. -- reply requested  
Date: Mon, 15 Jul 2002 09:47:22 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="-----\_=\_NextPart\_001\_01C22C06.256C0FA0"

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

-----\_=\_NextPart\_001\_01C22C06.256C0FA0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

I vote for September 17.

I doubt I can come on September 10; we have a day-long event on September 11.

David

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2002 9:17 am  
To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
Subject: [interfaithnd] ICND meeting for Sept. -- reply requested

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

I would like to hold a meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament during the first half of September. The purpose would be to develop an action strategy to counter the retrogressive Bush policies on nuclear disarmament. The potential agenda is covered in a separate communication.

We used to meet on Tuesday afternoons. But since the schedule quickly thickens by the second week in September, maybe we should meet soon after Labor Day. Therefore, I suggest three choices, each from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.  
Friday, September 6

Tuesday, September 10  
Tuesday, September 17

Please reply immediately about which of these dates you can and cannot attend.

As to further alternatives, I know about commemoration and heightened security on the Hill on 9/11, heads of offices on the afternoon of Sept. 12, Yom Kippur on the 16th, Churches for Middle East Peace on the 18th, the meeting on trade and investment on the 19th and 20th. Are there other meetings to avoid or specific dates when you cannot attend?

Thanks for our reply,

Howard

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

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

Status: U

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

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

by bissell.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17u6Dt7A53Nl3rE0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 15 Jul 2002 10:15:35 -0400 (EDT)

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

id <3KJ0P9VB>; Mon, 15 Jul 2002 10:12:37 -0400

Message-ID: <619BD1E95646D311B69D0008C79FE32D72FCC0@church2.umc-gbcs.org>

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

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

Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] ICND meeting for Sept. -- reply requested

Date: Mon, 15 Jul 2002 10:12:27 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="-----\_=\_NextPart\_001\_01C22C09.A62ED4D0"

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

-----\_=\_NextPart\_001\_01C22C09.A62ED4D0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

All dates work well for me.

Janet

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

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

Sent: Monday, July 15, 2002 9:17 AM

To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

Subject: [interfaithnd] ICND meeting for Sept. -- reply requested

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

I would like to hold a meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear  
Disarmament during the first half of September. The purpose would be to  
develop an action strategy to counter the retrogressive Bush policies on  
nuclear disarmament. The potential agenda is covered in a separate  
communication.

We used to meet on Tuesday afternoons. But since the schedule quickly  
thickens by the second week in September, maybe we should meet soon after  
Labor Day. Therefore, I suggest three choices, each from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.

Friday, September 6

Tuesday, September 10

Tuesday, September 17

Please reply immediately about which of these dates you can and cannot

attend.

As to further alternatives, I know about commemoration and heightened security on the Hill on 9/11, heads of offices on the afternoon of Sept. 12, Yom Kippur on the 16th, Churches for Middle East Peace on the 18th, the meeting on trade and investment on the 19th and 20th. Are there other meetings to avoid or specific dates when you cannot attend?

Thanks for our reply,

Howard

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

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

Status: U

Return-Path: <BPinguel@afsc.org>

Received: from national.afsc.org ([12.3.222.2])

by walker.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17u6Ht1uSr3Nl3s70 for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 15 Jul 2002 10:19:42 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by national.afsc.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <MBBYJYN8>; Mon, 15 Jul 2002 10:19:40 -0400

Message-ID: <4CFAFD5E4CB7D4119D2E005004D7CA45136F6D@national.afsc.org>

From: Baltazar Pinguel <BPinguel@afsc.org>

To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>, interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] ICND meeting for Sept. -- reply requested

Date: Mon, 15 Jul 2002 10:19:40 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

I prefer the 17th of September. I have so many things to do for the 1st anniversary of 9-11.

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

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

Sent: Monday, July 15, 2002 9:17 AM

To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

Subject: [interfaithnd] ICND meeting for Sept. -- reply requested

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

I would like to hold a meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament during the first half of September. The purpose would be to develop an action strategy to counter the retrogressive Bush policies on nuclear disarmament. The potential agenda is covered in a separate communication.

We used to meet on Tuesday afternoons. But since the schedule quickly thickens by the second week in September, maybe we should meet soon after Labor Day. Therefore, I suggest three choices, each from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.

Friday, September 6

Tuesday, September 10

Tuesday, September 17

Please reply immediately about which of these dates you can and cannot attend.

As to further alternatives, I know about commemoration and heightened security on the Hill on 9/11, heads of offices on the afternoon of Sept. 12, Yom Kippur on the 16th, Churches for Middle East Peace on the 18th, the meeting on trade and investment on the 19th and 20th. Are there other meetings to avoid or specific dates when you cannot attend?

Thanks for our reply,

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: <mweiner@rac.org>  
Received: from racsrv.rac.org ([207.224.8.205])  
by walker.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17u6NX1vng3NI3s70  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 15 Jul 2002 10:26:25 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: by racsrv.rac.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
id <349D8P28>; Mon, 15 Jul 2002 10:26:23 -0400  
Message-ID: <23B701418684D21182F600A0C9D60D05AA70F6@racsrv.rac.org>  
From: Michael Weiner <mweiner@rac.org>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] ICND meeting for Sept. -- reply requested  
Date: Mon, 15 Jul 2002 10:26:19 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="----\_=\_NextPart\_001\_01C22C0B.95DE4730"

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

-----\_=\_NextPart\_001\_01C22C0B.95DE4730  
Content-Type: text/plain

Howard,

I will be gone as of August 9, but my successor will certainly participate. Sept. 6 is the beginning of Rosh Hashanah, so that won't work for us.

Thanks,  
Mike

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2002 9:17 AM  
To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com  
Subject: [interfaithnd] ICND meeting for Sept. -- reply requested

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

I would like to hold a meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament during the first half of September. The purpose would be to develop an action strategy to counter the retrogressive Bush policies on nuclear disarmament. The potential agenda is covered in a separate communication.

We used to meet on Tuesday afternoons. But since the schedule quickly thickens by the second week in September, maybe we should meet soon after Labor Day. Therefore, I suggest three choices, each from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.

Friday, September 6  
Tuesday, September 10

Tuesday, September 17

Please reply immediately about which of these dates you can and cannot attend.

As to further alternatives, I know about commemoration and heightened security on the Hill on 9/11, heads of offices on the afternoon of Sept. 12, Yom Kippur on the 16th, Churches for Middle East Peace on the 18th, the meeting on trade and investment on the 19th and 20th. Are there other meetings to avoid or specific dates when you cannot attend?

Thanks for our reply,

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: <egbert14pj@yahoo.com>

Received: from web11102.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.131.149])

by walker.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17u7qo1vJI3N13s70  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 15 Jul 2002 11:06:07 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020715150606.37916.qmail@web11102.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [216.193.62.28] by web11102.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Mon, 15 Jul 2002 08:06:06 PDT

Date: Mon, 15 Jul 2002 08:06:06 -0700 (PDT)

From: Egbert Lawrence <egbert14pj@yahoo.com>

Subject: Reply re: ICND meeting for Sept.

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

In-Reply-To: <000001c22c06\$f4591560\$506ef7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Howard,

September 6, 10 and 17 are all free for me at the present time. Name you date. I will plan on being there. We need to put some pressure on ourselves since the anniversary of 9/11 is coming up and also because elections are around the corner.

PEACE! Larry

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

> To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

>

> Dear Colleagues:

>

> I would like to hold a meeting of the Interfaith

> Committee for Nuclear

> Disarmament during the first half of September. The

> purpose would be to

> develop an action strategy to counter the

> retrogressive Bush policies on

> nuclear disarmament. The potential agenda is

> covered in a separate

> communication.

>

> We used to meet on Tuesday afternoons. But since

> the schedule quickly

> thickens by the second week in September, maybe we

> should meet soon after

> Labor Day. Therefore, I suggest three choices, each

> from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.

> Friday, September 6

> Tuesday, September 10

> Tuesday, September 17

>

> Please reply immediately about which of these dates

> you can and cannot

> attend.

>

> As for further alternatives, I know about

> commemoration and heightened

> security on the Hill on 9/11, heads of offices on  
> the afternoon of Sept. 12,  
> Yom Kippur on the 16th, Churches for Middle East  
> Peace on the 18th, the  
> meeting on trade and investment on the 19th and  
> 20th. Are there other  
> meetings to avoid or specific dates when you cannot  
> attend?

>  
> Thanks for our reply,

>  
> 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! Autos - Get free new car price quotes

<http://autos.yahoo.com>

Status: U

Return-Path: <lwright@churchworldservice.org>

Received: from ddiemail.ddi.org ([216.37.43.215])

by hazard.mail.atl.earthlink.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17uaiuh6t3Nl3qG0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 15 Jul 2002 13:10:10 -0500 (EST)

Received: from GWDomain-MTA by ddiemail.ddi.org

with Novell\_GroupWise; Mon, 15 Jul 2002 13:10:10 -0500

Message-Id: <sd32c9b2.080@ddiemail.ddi.org>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 6.0.1

Date: Mon, 15 Jul 2002 14:09:20 -0500

From: "Lisa Wright" <lwright@churchworldservice.org>

To: <mupj@igc.org>

Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] ICND meeting for Sept. -- reply requested

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Disposition: inline

Howard, I can't make the first two - the 17th is a maybe.

Lisa

>>> "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> 07/15/02 08:16AM >>>

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

I would like to hold a meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament during the first half of September. The purpose would be to develop an action strategy to counter the retrogressive Bush policies on nuclear disarmament. The potential agenda is covered in a separate communication.

We used to meet on Tuesday afternoons. But since the schedule quickly thickens by the second week in September, maybe we should meet soon after Labor Day. Therefore, I suggest three choices, each from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.

Friday, September 6

Tuesday, September 10

Tuesday, September 17

Please reply immediately about which of these dates you can and cannot attend.

As to further alternatives, I know about commemoration and heightened security on the Hill on 9/11, heads of offices on the afternoon of Sept. 12, Yom Kippur on the 16th, Churches for Middle East Peace on the 18th, the meeting on trade and investment on the 19th and 20th. Are there other

meetings to avoid or specific dates when you cannot attend?

Thanks for our reply,

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

-----~-->

Save on REALTOR Fees

<http://us.click.yahoo.com/Xw80LD/h1ZEAA/Ey.GAA/nJ9q1B/TM>

-----~-->

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

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

Status: U  
Return-Path: <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>  
Received: from web13904.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.67])  
by pickering.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17ubV85gf3Nl3p20  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Mon, 15 Jul 2002 15:54:10 -0400 (EDT)  
Message-ID: <20020715195410.10606.qmail@web13904.mail.yahoo.com>  
Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13904.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Mon, 15 Jul 2002 12:54:10 PDT  
Date: Mon, 15 Jul 2002 12:54:10 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Marie Kayser <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Re: Your Feedback  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
In-Reply-To: <000201c22c06\$f6b3ce40\$506ef7a5@default>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-1395236555-1026762850=:10537"

--0-1395236555-1026762850=:10537  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Howard,  
Not sure what you mean by post the feedback - can you explain?  
The feedback will come to you in an email. Did you want to post the selected feedback somewhere on the feedback page?  
mk  
"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote: Marie,

You made a good start in the Your Feedback page. I have further developed it as shown in the attachment.

I want this page to be used particularly to provide substantive comments on various statements found on the web site. I would like to post them in order received. At one time you suggested that we can do this by month with the latest received on top.

I don't want to offer to reply to all feedback. That would be too time consuming.

Unless you have further suggestions for me, go ahead and open the Your Feedback page as revised.

Howard

> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword name=Your Feedback.01.doc

Reply-To: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <jheim@cc.edu>  
References: <000001c22c06\$f4591560\$506ef7a5@default> <3D331B74.4020302@cc.edu>  
Subject: Sept. meeting, web site  
Date: Mon, 15 Jul 2002 17:36:13 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
 charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Joel,

I realize you can't come to D.C. for a two hour meeting. I hope that we will have a longer one later in the fall that you can attend. September 6th is out because it is the eve of the Jewish New Year.

On another matter, can you help us develop a posting on the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) for our web page? You can see our approach at [www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements](http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements).

In the past I have seen a variety of resolutions by your General Assembly. Are ones related to nuclear disarmament available on the Disciples web site for linkage? Or can key resolutions of the past ten years be posted on [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org) -- with proper permission?

We are looking for additional denominational sponsors of the web page. (See the current list on the home page). I'm emphasizing denominations rather than a long list of peace fellowships and religious associations because I want to emphasize to military leaders and others not usually identified with the peace movement that this site has establishment backing. (Pax Christi USA is an exception because we can't get the official Catholic Church.) In your case options might be Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) as a whole or the Division of Homeland Ministries. Also, the Disciples web page suggests that the Disciples Peace Fellowship is a unit of Homeland Ministries. Is that the case? What would you advise?

Shalom,  
Howard

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

From: "Joel Heim" <jheim@cc.edu>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2002 2:59 PM  
Subject: Re: [interfaithnd] ICND meeting for Sept. -- reply requested

> Howard,

>  
> As I have indicated before, it is hard to justify a trip to DC for a  
> 2-hour meeting, so I probably could not come for this. I might be able  
> to do it on Friday, Sept. 6th, the other two would not be possible.  
> While it makes sense to have this sort of meeting first, I do hope a  
> more complete full-day summit happens and will do everything possible to  
> come to it.  
>  
> Joel Heim  
> DPF, Moderator  
>

Status: U

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

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

by charles.admin.atl.earthlink.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17urZv2b0V3Nl3rY0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 16 Jul 2002 08:03:45 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <20020716130344.22415.qmail@web13907.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13907.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Tue, 16 Jul 2002 06:03:44 PDT

Date: Tue, 16 Jul 2002 06:03:44 -0700 (PDT)

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

Subject: Re: Your Feedback

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

In-Reply-To: <002901c22c47\$e8479260\$fe6ff7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-1301532257-1026824624=:21657"

--0-1301532257-1026824624=:21657

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

Howard,

You can keep the commentaries on the same page. It's really up to you and there doesn't seem to be a standard way of presenting the commentaries.

Marie

"Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote: Marie, I want to post reader feedback somewhere. Either as part of the Your Feedback page or on a separate page, such as Readers Comments (or whatever it might be called). This is part of the dialogue I want to get going. What is customary? Howard----- Original Message ----- From: Marie Kayser To: Howard W. Hallman Sent: Monday, July 15, 2002 3:54 PM Subject: Re: Your Feedback

Howard,

Not sure what you mean by post the feedback - can you explain?

The feedback will come to you in an email. Did you want to post the selected feedback somewhere on the feedback page?

mk

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

You made a good start in the Your Feedback page. I have further developed it as shown in the attachment.

I want this page to be used particularly to provide substantive comments on various statements found on the web site. I would like to post them in order received. At one time you suggested that we can do this by month with the latest received on top.

I don't want to offer to reply to all feedback. That would be too time consuming.

Unless you have further suggestions for me, go ahead and open the Your Feedback page as revised.

Howard

> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword name=Your Feedback.01.doc

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>  
References: <20020716130344.22415.qmail@web13907.mail.yahoo.com>  
Subject: Re: Your Feedback  
Date: Tue, 16 Jul 2002 09:22:33 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
    boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_002F\_01C22CAA.50FE49E0"  
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\_002F\_01C22CAA.50FE49E0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Marie,

Then go ahead and set up Your Feedback for posting of replies, by month. =  
Initially I'll send replies to you for posting after I start receiving =  
them.

Howard

----- Original Message -----=20  
From: Marie Kayser=20  
To: Carlee L. Hallman=20  
Sent: Tuesday, July 16, 2002 9:03 AM  
Subject: Re: Your Feedback

Howard,=20

You can keep the commentaries on the same page. It's really up to you =  
and there doesn't seem to be a standard way of presenting the =  
commentaries.=20

Marie=20

"Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote:=20

Marie,

I want to post reader feedback somewhere. Either as part of =  
theYour Feedback page or on a separate page, such as Readers Comments =  
(or whatever it might be called). This is part of the dialogue I want =  
to get going.

What is customary?

Howard

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

From: Marie Kayser

To: Howard W. Hallman

Sent: Monday, July 15, 2002 3:54 PM

Subject: Re: Your Feedback

Howard,

Not sure what you mean by post the feedback - can you explain?

The feedback will come to you in an email. Did you want to post the selected feedback somewhere on the feedback page?

mk

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

Marie,

You made a good start in the Your Feedback page. I have further developed it as shown in the attachment.

I want this page to be used particularly to provide substantive comments on various statements found on the web site. I would like to post them in order received. At one time you suggested that we can do this by month with the latest received on top.

I don't want to offer to reply to all feedback. That would be too time consuming.

Unless you have further suggestions for me, go ahead and open the Your Feedback page as revised.

Howard

> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword name=3DYour Feedback.01.doc

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Miller, Phillip H." <millerph@att.net>  
Subject: MCI bill  
Date: Tue, 16 Jul 2002 09:23:52 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
 charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Phil,

Please provide a check payable to MCI in the amount of \$3.48.

Thanks,  
Howard

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>  
Subject: Entree for web site  
Date: Tue, 16 Jul 2002 11:00:59 -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 Catherine,

As we move ahead with our new web site, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org), we would like to have an entree from the Presbyterian Church, USA. Would you help provide one? You can see the approach used with other denominations at [www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements](http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements).

In looking through the Presbyterian web site, I noted a document entitled "Social Witness Policy Compilation 2000" with a section on "Disarmament and Arms Control" that had an introduction reviewing General Assemblies positions during the past 50 years. That may be useful to link to or to reproduce on our site if linkage is too complicated. (I found access difficult). In 2000 your General Assembly passed a long statement entitled "The Challenge of Security in the 21st Century: The Continuing Dynamics of the Arms Race", which seems to be your current policy. Is this available for linkage? Or at least could the action recommendations be posted?

Although this site is not intended to serve as an alert system on current issues, I'm thinking about creating a section on the Nuclear Posture Review because it deals with long-range policy. In that case, I will want to link with your statement on this subject.

Lastly, did anything come of consideration by the Presbyterian Peacemaking Program to make a contribution to the web site?

Thanks for your assistance and all you do on nuclear disarmament.

Howard

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

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

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
To: [marsusab@aol.com](mailto:marsusab@aol.com)  
Subject: zero-nukes web site  
Date: Tue, 16 Jul 2002 11:03:16 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----  
=\_NextPart\_000\_0051\_01C22CB8.637F7FE0"  
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 Mark,

As we move ahead with the web site, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org), I want to add a section on the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. Knowing that you are extremely busy, I have taken the liberty of writing a draft, which is attached. It would join information from other denominations at [www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements](http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements).

Would you please review this draft and offer any corrections and additions you think are necessary. Also, would it be possible to use the ELCA logo as an identity marker? Some denominations allow this, some don't.

Finally would the Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs be willing to be listed as a sponsor of this web site? The current list of sponsors is on the home page: [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). Being listed shows your endorsement and support. I will confer with sponsors' representatives via e-mail from time to time for advice. Collectively they provide oversight. Some sponsors have made a financial contribution to support the site (\$100, \$300, \$500 and a \$5,000 grant from the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society). However, a financial contribution is not an absolute requirement for sponsorship.

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

Shalom,

Howard

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

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

## **Draft**

logo from <http://www.elca.org> (if permission granted)

## **Evangelical Lutheran Church in America**

*The **Evangelical Lutheran Church in America** [[www.elca.org](http://www.elca.org)] consists of 5.1 million members in 10,851 congregations. It is governed by a Churchwide Assembly that meets every two years. ELCA is represented in Washington, D.C. by the **Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs** [[www.loga.org](http://www.loga.org)].*

*The theological basis for ELCA's concern for nuclear disarmament is provided by a social statement on **For Peace in God's World**, [<http://www.elca.org/dcs/peacein.pf.html>] which was adopted by the Fourth Churchwide Assembly in 1995. In a section on "A Politics of Cooperation" this statement indicates:*

**Give high priority to arms control and reduction.** We particularly urge a sharp reduction in the number of weapons of mass destruction. We call for arms control agreements that are substantial, equitable, verifiable, and progressive. We support mutual confidence-building measures to improve mutually assured security. In particular, we give priority to:

\* agreements among the leading nuclear powers to reduce their nuclear stockpiles and to decrease the possibility of nuclear confrontation or accident;

\* the successful negotiation of a renewed Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty, the strengthening of mechanisms to monitor and enforce nuclear treaties, and efforts that move toward the elimination of nuclear weapons;

\* treaties to ban the production, sale, and use of biological and chemical weapons; and

\* agreements to ban the production, sale, and use of land mines.

*The Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs provides current information on nuclear disarmament issues [<http://www.loga.org/Arms.html>] on its web site.*

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
To: [david@fcnl.org](mailto:david@fcnl.org)  
Subject: FCNL on web page  
Date: Tue, 16 Jul 2002 12:18:02 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----  
=\_NextPart\_000\_0010\_01C22CC2.D5414FA0"  
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

David,

I have drafted the attachment statement about FCNL for posting on [www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements](http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements). It is intended as a point of departure for you and others at FCNL to edit as you see fit. You can look at the web page to see how we are handling other denominations.

Please note that I am suggesting use of the FCNL logo as an identity marker. Is this acceptable? Some denominations permit this, some don't.

I look forward to your comments and possible editing.

Howard

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

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

Draft

logo from [www.fcnl.org](http://www.fcnl.org) if given permission

## **Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quaker)**

*The **Friends Committee on National Legislation** [[www.fcnl.org](http://www.fcnl.org)] is a Quaker lobby in the public interest. FCNL seeks to bring the concerns, experiences and testimonies of the Religious Society of Friends to bear on policy decisions in the nation's capital.*

*Reducing armaments [[http://www.fcnl.org/legpolicy/sek\\_frewar.htm#reduce](http://www.fcnl.org/legpolicy/sek_frewar.htm#reduce)] is one of FCNL's legislative priorities. In a policy statement FCNL indicates:*

National security does not rely on military strength. More arms mean less security for ordinary people. Increasingly, armaments serve to secure the positions of those in power. Military expansion by a country or group provokes similar expansion by others, and reliance on threats tends to increase the hostility and distrust that lead to war.

We believe that nations need to move toward general and complete disarmament, both domestically and internationally. We urge both gun control and arms control to reduce the dangers of personal, conventional and nuclear weapons.

Arms proliferation is rooted in the false premise that one can control one's enemy; it is also perpetuated by immense profits in arms sales and unhealthy dependence on military employment. We urge negotiated worldwide disarmament, supported by conversion of military industries to peaceful production and political settlements under world law.

At the same time, based on our understanding of Christian principles, we urge unilateral disarmament, believing that other nations will respond affirmatively. We are prepared to take the risks of such a course, convinced that they are far smaller than the risks involved in the current course of endless weapons development.

*FCNL urges the United States to encourage worldwide and regional efforts for peace, disarmament, and global security, among other ways, by:*

- eliminating all nuclear weapons and any nuclear power projects which could contribute to weapons production. Testing of nuclear weapons by both explosion and simulation should be permanently halted worldwide, as should the development and production of fissionable materials.

*FCNL also urges the United States to take unilateral actions, both because they are valid steps in their own right and because they would challenge other nations to reciprocate in the search for peace. Among such actions would be to:*

- eliminate its nuclear arsenal, abandon plans to build new nuclear weapons production facilities, and end all research on weapons of mass destruction, as well as on space-based weapons.

*In its current legislative agenda on nuclear weapons*

*[[http://www.fcnl.org/issues/arm/cntrl\\_nuclear-weapons.htm](http://www.fcnl.org/issues/arm/cntrl_nuclear-weapons.htm)] FCNL has a concern for*

*the following issues:*

- New nuclear weapons development.
- De-alerting the nuclear arsenal
- Strategic Offensive Reduction Treaty
- Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
- Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
- Missile defense

*As a service to the peace and disarmament community FCNL publishes a **Nuclear Calendar** [<http://www.fcnl.org/NuclearCalendar/index.htm>] every Monday when Congress is in session*

*to provide information on public hearings, meetings, and international conferences related to nuclear disarmament.*

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
To: [msperry@usccb.org](mailto:msperry@usccb.org)  
Subject: Permission request  
Date: Tue, 16 Jul 2002 15:54:00 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----  
=\_NextPart\_000\_0009\_01C22CE1.01228B20"  
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. Sperry:

Attached is the "Summary" from The Challenge of Peace which we want to include on our web site, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). It will be inserted in the present entree for the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, which you will find at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html#usconferenceofcatholicbishops>. We already have an excerpt from The Harvest of Justice with your permission. I have incorporated the same permission language into the Summary but will use whatever language you indicate.

I look forward to receiving your permission.

Shalom,

Howard Hallman

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

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

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

### **A Pastoral Letter on War and Peace**

[PDF document]

*In November 1980 the National Conference of Bishops (as it was then known) appointed a committee of bishops, chaired by Cardinal Joseph Bernardin, to draft a pastoral letter on war and peace. The bishops reviewed two drafts and adopted the third and final draft on May 3, 1983. A substantial part of this pastoral letter focuses on nuclear weapons. The summary is presented below. The complete pastoral letter, The Challenge of Peace, is available from USCCB at 800 235-8722, order number 863-0.*

### **Summary**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **A. On War**

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

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

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

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

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

## **B. On Deterrence**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. **Military Service:** "All those who enter the military service in loyalty to their country should look upon themselves as the custodians of the security and freedom of their fellow countrymen; and when they carry out their duty properly, they are contributing to the maintenance of peace." (*Pastoral Constitution, #79*.)

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

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

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

## **II. Moral Principles and Policy Choices**

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

### **A. On the Use of Nuclear Weapons**

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

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

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

## **B. On Deterrence**

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

## **C. On Promoting Peace**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In the words of the Holy Father, we need a "moral about-face." The whole world must summon the moral courage and technical means to say no to nuclear conflict; no to weapons of mass destruction; no to an arms race which robs the poor and the vulnerable; and no to the moral danger of a nuclear age which places before humankind indefensible choices of constant terror or surrender. Peacemaking is not an optional commitment. It is a requirement of our faith. We are called to be peacemakers, not by some movement of the moment, but by our Lord Jesus. The content and context of our peacemaking is set not by some political agenda or ideological program, but by the teaching of his Church.

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

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

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

Status: U  
Return-Path: <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>  
Received: from halak.pcusa.org ([65.173.210.8])  
by farley.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17uw9M2hH3N13pa0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 16 Jul 2002 13:30:37 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from fire1.pcusa.org ([65.173.210.2]) by halak.pcusa.org  
(Post.Office MTA v3.5.3 release 223 ID# 0-69934U100L100S0V35)  
with SMTP id org for <mupj@igc.org>;  
Tue, 16 Jul 2002 13:26:21 -0400  
Received: from CTR-Message\_Server by gerizim.ctr.lan  
with Novell\_GroupWise; Tue, 16 Jul 2002 13:42:11 -0400  
Message-Id: <sd3422b3.079@gerizim.ctr.lan>  
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 5.5.6.1  
Date: Tue, 16 Jul 2002 13:30:32 -0400  
From: "Catherine Gordon" <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>  
To: <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Entree for web site  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-Disposition: inline

Howard,

The site looks excellent! Good job.

I agree that the social policy compilation on the web is difficult to =  
access. I think using the policy statement you mentioned would be the =  
best alternative. It's an excellent comprehensive statement. We also =  
passed as statement at this past GA which might be useful as well. I =  
pasted it below. In terms of getting the other statement operational, we =  
don't have that policy formatted on computer. I could fax you a copy and =  
you could scan it I suppose. Just let me know what would be easiest for =  
you.

It would be great if you could link to our piece on NPR. I'll be doing =  
the next piece on the US Policy and the situation in South East asia. We =  
will be adding a link to the zeronukes site as well.

Regarding finances - because a lot of the social justice programs were hit =  
in our most recent budget cuts, the Peacemaking program couldn't commit at =  
this time. I'm still working on Social Justice.

Thanks for all your work.  
Catherine

Resolution on the Challenges to Global Security:  
Threats to the International System  
Controlling Arms and Their Development  
A. Introduction

In 2000, at the beginning of the 21st century, the 212th General Assembly  
(2000) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) approved a "Statement of =

## Concern

Regarding the Challenge of Security in the 21st Century: The Continuing =  
Dynamics  
of the Arms Race" (Minutes, 2000, Part I, pp. 276\*81). Numerous dynamics =  
were  
identified with suggestions of their potential impact on national and =  
global security.  
The General Assembly expressed concern about developments/trends in United  
States foreign policy and its military developments, noting that the arms =  
race, often  
thought dead because of the "end of the cold war," was still very much =  
alive. It  
called on the United States to reexamine both its domestic and internationa=  
l policies,  
and the seeking of informed public review of its foreign policy perspective=  
and goals  
for the 21st century, to the end that the building of security for the =  
21st century will  
be based on the extension of the rule of law, the developme nt of =  
strengthened  
instruments of international governance, the strengthening of arms control =  
and  
disarmament agreements, the enhancing of instruments of nonviolent =  
conflict  
resolution, not on the continued enhancement of technological instruments =  
of  
destruction, shaped originally in the context of the cold war (Ibid, p. =  
281).

The events of September 11, 2001 (9/11), have made it clear that  
achieving security for the country within the context of global security =  
is still  
and will remain a challenge. In some ways, those events should have made  
clear that devastation can come in unexpected ways, that methods of  
prevention are not always successful, that violence usually begets =  
violence,  
and that technological fixes are problematic.

## B. Recent Developments

Recent developments and decisions in the United States have justified and  
heightened the importance of the call of the 212th General Assembly =  
(2002). While it  
is clear that major decisions with far-reaching consequences have been =  
made, their  
import seems the opposite of the concerns expressed. The rule of law and  
international instruments of governance have been weakened. Arms control =  
and  
disarmament agreements are increasingly under threat. The arms control =  
regime  
that took decades to develop is increasingly at risk. The Comprehensive =  
Test Ban  
Treaty has been sidetracked and the U.S. is contemplating abandoning its =  
own  
voluntary moratorium and resuming tests. The Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty =  
has  
been abrogated and an opportunity to strengthen the Biological Weapons =

Treaty has been lost. The nation's response to the crimes committed on September 11 has been a massive use of destructive power leveled against the Taliban, an unpopular government controlling a country already in the throws of desperation, and the Al Qaeda.

Among recent actions of the United States are its refusal to ratify the Ottawa Treaty (the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction) and its refusal to ratify The Rome Statute (the International Criminal Court), partly on the grounds that it poses a threat for our military. While the United States has opposed these two treaties and has tried to weaken them in the negotiation process, it has taken no formal action on them.

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT): On October 13, 1999, by a 51 to 48 vote, the United States Senate voted on and rejected the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, a decisive legal action and statement to the world. Sought by every U. S. president and General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) and its predecessor bodies for almost thirty years, the CTBT was an effort to complete a partial ban achieved in 1963, which included testing in the atmosphere, outer space, and underwater. The earlier treaty had allowed the continued testing underground and simulation tests. The CTBT would have included the underground tests. This defeat for a long-sought treaty endorsed by all earlier presidents, while not irreversible, certainly contains a more strident message to the rest of the world than simply allowing the treaty to float in legislative-political limbo. The testing of nuclear weapons by India and Pakistan and the increased tensions between those now nuclear powers reveal the importance of both the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the CTBT.

National Missile Defense System: While the Strategic Defense Initiative (Star Wars) was shelved, work continued on missile defense technology. After the end of the cold war, focus turned to a limited version of the earlier challenge, a limited National Missile Defense system, proposed to prevent "rogue states" or =

"terrorist groups" from limited missile attack. More than twenty years and \$95 billion have been invested in research and testing without proving the ability to successfully deploy such a system. Another \$60 billion in expenses for the program is expected. Whether either provided credible threats or whether such would be probable scenarios seems irrelevant. In the presidential campaign in 2000, President Clinton chose to make the National Missile Defense System an issue, promising continued support for research and development and a recommendation of deployment should initial tests succeed. President Bush, in his election campaign and in his first year in office, made the building of a National Missile Defense system the keystone in his asserted effort to provide homeland protection, despite the fact that it would violate the terms of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty agreed to in 1972. Since that time, the ABM Treaty has been regarded by most as an important cornerstone of the nuclear control system. The events of 9/11 have not deterred President Bush from that commitment even though the National Missile Defense System would provide no defense for an attack like that suffered. On December 13, 2001, President Bush announced that the United States was giving the six-month required notice that it was going to abrogate the treaty, something neither country had found necessary during the height of the cold war. This marks the first time that a major post-World War II arms control treaty has been abrogated by a major participant, and in this situation that abrogation has effectively destroyed the treaty since there are only two parties. The abrogation came after a legal analysis ultimately concluded that building a limited National Missile Defense System would violate the ABM Treaty. The United States opted to abrogate the ABM Treaty, informing its allies of the decision, in opposition to the concerns of Russia and China. Abrogation is an international method often built into treaties that allows, after a specified time, for ratifiers to withdraw from the obligations of the treaty. The question is not the legality of the decision but its symbolism and the potential consequences both for the United States and global security. The government=

's own  
2002 Intelligence Assessment report suggested that the greatest danger of =  
a nuclear  
attack on the U.S. would come from planes and ships, not missiles. Gre =  
ater security  
would be provided by addressing these other threats.  
Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention: Over thirty years ago, the United  
States took the lead in trying to prevent the development of biotoxin =  
weapons,  
achieving in 1972 the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development,  
Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin =  
Weapons and  
on Their Destruction (BWC), a treaty subscribed to by 144 governments. In  
principle, such weapons have been banned since 1925, recognizing their =  
inherent  
dangers and risks. A few highly publicized terrorist efforts in recent =  
years have  
shown both the risks and the difficulties of chemical and biological =  
terrorism and  
the difficulties of preparing for them. For over seven years, the =  
adherents to that  
treaty have sought a protocol providing for a new inspection mechanism to =  
help  
monitor compliance.  
As with many treaties, a regular review process takes place. At the =  
five-year  
review conference that took place in Geneva in December 2001, the U.S. =  
effectively  
blocked further work on the protocol. This decision stunned other =  
countries,  
particularly since the United States was reeling from the internal impact =  
of the  
anthrax scare and caught up in speculation and rumor about a terrorist =  
attack  
spreading smallpox. The U.S. chose not to try to develop international =  
monitoring  
mechanisms, efforts its own country specialists had worked on. Yet, little =  
evidence is  
available in the public domain that the United States, despite decades of  
consideration, is able to provide protections or even rapid responses for =  
its own  
people in the light of chemical or biological attack. The United States =  
told the  
conference that it was not in this country's business and defense =  
interests to have  
any kind of monitoring or enforcement agreement, thus bringing the =  
conference  
work to a halt. Conference chairman, Hungarian diplomat Tibor Toth, =  
managed to  
obtain an adjournment of the meeting until November 2002 rather than to =  
have it  
end, in effect, in failure.  
Small Arms and Light Weapons: At the United Nations Conference on the  
Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, the =

United States

was active in expressing concerns about the trafficking, but was also =  
instrumental in  
blocking the creation or development of any instrumentation with the =  
capacity to  
monitor or control the flow. Therefore, more than five hundred million =  
small arms  
and light weapons are in circulation, with more in the pipeline. There are =  
few  
international mechanisms in place that keep them from the hands of =  
terrorists  
deemed to be the source of our insecurity and the focus of our open-ended =  
war.

Arms Control Decisions at the United Nations General Assembly: The 56th  
General Assembly of the United Nations (2001) dealt with a usual array of =  
arms

control and security issues. One pattern is worth noting, though, in fact, =  
it is not  
new. On the major resolutions that were adopted by vote related to nuclear  
weapons, development, use, etc., the United States voted in the negative =  
on ten of  
twelve votes, with one abstention and one affirmative. The ten all related =  
to matters  
that seek to move the world toward nuclear disarmament, including the =  
United  
States. The affirmative vote was for a resolution on the Non-Proliferation =  
Treaty  
because its application had been basically aimed at preventing others from =  
gaining  
what we are legally bound by that same treaty to give up. The abstention, =  
marking a  
switch from some previous years where the vote had been negative, was on a  
resolution designed to assure non-nuclear states would not be the victims =  
of nuclear  
attack from nuclear states. The U.S. was one of four countries to abstain =  
on a  
resolution seeking to prevent an arms race in outer space (of particular =  
concern for  
those who feel that the development of the National Missile Defense System =  
will be  
the first major step in the weaponization of space, reflecting well-circula=  
ted U.S.

commitments to control space, to fight in, from, and through space).

### C. Key Questions for Discussion and Reflection

United States policy and practice in recent years pose concerns for public  
discussion and reflection. The Advisory Committee on Social Witness Policy  
(ACSWP) drafted some conclusions regarding U.S. actions, which are shared =  
as

questions for discussion.

=B7 Has the United States adopted a unilateralist approach to the whole  
question of armaments and military developments (in its treatment of =  
allies, its

former stated enemies, and its current list of enemies)?

=B7 Is the United States seeking freedom from any international restraints

or instruments, no matter how beneficial they may be perceived to be by others?

(This includes freedom to build its own military establishment without restrictions.

It also includes the option to impose by force, if necessary, its will on those countries

that displease it.)

=B7 Does the United States commitment to an extensive military buildup, costly in nature, skew its national priorities? Does it destabilize others in

implication? Does it represent a potential stimulus to others, including the fueling of

a new global arms race?

=B7 Does the United States' decision-making reflect a disconnect between a critical analysis of security needs and the efforts to meet those needs? =

(A so-called

rogue state, seeking to attack the United States with nuclear weapons, is more apt to

choose a less risky method of delivery, exploring the openness of ports as most

container ships arrive without inspection. )

=B7 Has the United States manipulated both the domestic and international climate created by the events of September 11? Has the U.S. =

counted

on the reticence of its political establishment, the U.S. media and = public, and its

allies to question its actions?

=B7 Is the United States caught in a paradox of its own making? In the name of enhancing national security, is it undermining international =

efforts at

control and restraint developed to provide an increased context of = confidence and

security? Is the United States seeking to achieve peace by intimidation?

=B7 What price is U.S. "military" security at home and abroad? What cost in addressing critical social needs at home as military budgets escalate?

\* What relevance does the development of the international rule of law have to the issues raised by 9/11?

D. Need for Criteria for Evaluation

Over the years, criteria have been set for judging the rightness or = wrongness

of the use of force. Guidelines embodied in "just war doctrine," and "just = peace

principles" and "nonviolent intervention principles" have provided the = basis for

both rational and irrational support of military action. They also provide = the basis

for challenging those same actions. Discuss whether the following provide = a set of

criteria to evaluate or judge decisions that are made in the realm of arms development and foreign policy decisions?

=B7 Does the action-program development promote restraint and build confidence instead of engendering fear and mistrust in the world community =

at

large or among states where there has been previous conflict, where there =

is current

tension, or where there are growing issues that could ensue in conflict?

=B7 Does the action-program development tempt other countries to follow suit with similar developments, thus raising the potential level of future = conflict? Or

does it stimulate efforts to develop countervailing options that stimulate = an

increased cycle of research, expenditure, and development of other = weapons?

=B7 Are the action-program development goals to be achieved at the expense of weaker countries and people, imposing economic, military, or = political

burdens on them, with or without their informed consensual and participator= y

acceptance?

=B7 When does a response to a threat/strategy set into motion irreversible,=

unintended consequences? What is the possibility that the decision, = deployme nt,

dare, or defiance will set in motion things that were not intended?

=B7 Does the action-program development tempt or encourage a country or a group of countries to unilaterally exercise power just because it has = it;

increasing the likelihood, as has us ually been the historic case, that in = the quest for

security, those with the power have become the threat to the security of = others?

=B7 Is the action-program development built on worst-case scenario developments, which, if pursued, could be self-fulfilling or on informed understanding of probabilities coupled with deliberate political and = diplomatic

efforts to resolve sources of potential conflict through nonviolent = methodologies?

=B7 Has there been an honest, transparent effort to consult with the United Nations and other appropriate international organizations about the implications and consequences of steps that are contemplated?

\* What additional criteria would you add?

#### E. Conclusion and Reflection

The 214th General Assembly (2002) presents this study to the constituency = ofthe church and, for whatever benefit, to the larger society. At the = beginning of the

21st century, the American people must learn from the tragedies of the = present and

the legacies of the past and engage in a full discussion of our country's = role and

responsibility in the world community. We urge our members to prayerfully = study

these concerns.

With prayer we lift up our country, which represents but one part of God's good creation, with prayers for its peace and security, with prayers for = its leaders

and all who are called to serve it, with compassion for all who have = suffered from

the violence of criminal acts and of war and from the systemic oppressions =

of  
economic, social, cultural, and political power. We pray that America, so =  
richly  
blessed, will use its gifts as they bestow special responsibility, not as =  
they signify  
special privilege. We pray for all peoples what we would pray for =  
ourselves: the  
opportunity to live free from fear, free from want, and in the fullness of =  
life intended  
by God in the creation.  
Comment: The Presbyterian Peacemaking Program is committed to producing =  
and  
distributing this material as a study guide including as appendices: just =  
war criteria, just  
peace principles, nonviolent intervention principles, and glossary (e.g, =  
"international rule  
of law").  
Vote: 55/0/0

Catherine Gordon  
Associate for International Issues  
Washington Office, Presbyterian Church (USA)  
110 Maryland Ave. Suite 104  
Washington, DC 20002  
[www.pcusa.org/washington](http://www.pcusa.org/washington)  
tel - 202 543 1126  
fax - 202 543 7755

Status: U

Return-Path: <david@fcnl.org>

Received: from local.fcnl.org ([65.207.12.2])

by kendall.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17uwCg3pP3Nl3pM0 for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 16 Jul 2002 14:00:04 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by local.fcnl.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <N5W975GV>; Tue, 16 Jul 2002 13:50:15 -0400

Message-ID: <E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF6A85AF5@local.fcnl.org>

From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>

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

Subject: Good document. A few minor changes.

Date: Tue, 16 Jul 2002 13:50:14 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="-----\_=\_NextPart\_001\_01C22CF1.3D228C50"

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

-----\_=\_NextPart\_001\_01C22CF1.3D228C50

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Draft

logo from [www.fcnl.org](http://www.fcnl.org) if given permission You can use our logo.

Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quakers)

The Friends Committee on National Legislation [[www.fcnl.org](http://www.fcnl.org)] is a Quaker lobby in the public interest. FCNL seeks to bring the concerns, experiences and testimonies of the Religious Society of Friends to bear on policy decisions in the nation's capital.

Reducing armaments [[http://www.fcnl.org/legpolicy/sek\\_frewar.htm#reduce](http://www.fcnl.org/legpolicy/sek_frewar.htm#reduce)] is one of FCNL's legislative priorities. In a policy statement FCNL indicates:

National security does not rely on military strength. More arms mean less security for ordinary people. Increasingly, armaments serve to secure the positions of those in power. Military expansion by a country or group provokes similar expansion by others, and reliance on threats tends to increase the hostility and distrust that lead to war.

We believe that nations need to move toward general and complete disarmament, both domestically and internationally. We urge both gun control and arms control to reduce the dangers of personal, conventional and nuclear weapons.

Arms proliferation is rooted in the false premise that one can control one's enemy; it is also perpetuated by immense profits in arms sales and unhealthy dependence on military employment. We urge negotiated worldwide disarmament, supported by conversion of military industries to peaceful production and

political settlements under world law. [One paragraph. No break here.]

At the same time, based on our understanding of Christian principles, we urge unilateral disarmament, believing that other nations will respond affirmatively. We are prepared to take the risks of such a course, convinced that they are far smaller than the risks involved in the current course of endless weapons development.

FCNL urges the United States to encourage worldwide and regional efforts for peace, disarmament, and global security, among other ways, by:

- \* eliminating all nuclear weapons and any nuclear power projects which could contribute to weapons production. Testing of nuclear weapons by both explosion and simulation should be permanently halted worldwide, as should the development and production of fissionable materials.

FCNL also urges the United States to take unilateral actions, both because they are valid steps in their own right and because they would challenge other nations to reciprocate in the search for peace. Among such actions would be to:

- \* eliminate its nuclear arsenal, abandon plans to build new nuclear weapons production facilities, and end all research on weapons of mass destruction, as well as on space-based weapons.

In its current legislative agenda on nuclear weapons [[http://www.fcnl.org/issues/arm/cntrl\\_nuclear-weapons.htm](http://www.fcnl.org/issues/arm/cntrl_nuclear-weapons.htm)] FCNL has a concern for the following issues:

- \* New nuclear weapons development.
- \* De-alerting the nuclear arsenal
- \* Strategic Offensive Reduction Treaty
- \* Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
- \* Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
- \* Missile defense

As a service to the peace and disarmament community FCNL publishes a Nuclear Calendar [<http://www.fcnl.org/NuclearCalendar/index.htm>] by e-mail every Monday when Congress is in session to provide information on public hearings, meetings, and international conferences related to nuclear disarmament.

Status: U

Return-Path: <rkillmer@wesleysem.edu>

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

by walker.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17uy9QWnp3N13s70  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 16 Jul 2002 15:38:49 -0400 (EDT)

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

id <399FXYL9>; Tue, 16 Jul 2002 15:38:27 -0400

Message-ID: <DC1977460103D311B0DE0060943F439FE8BA6E@wesley-exch1.wesleysem.edu>

From: KILLMER RICH <rkillmer@wesleysem.edu>

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

Subject: RE: [interfaithnd] ICND Agenda

Date: Tue, 16 Jul 2002 15:38:25 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

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

Howard,

Thanks for including me in the ICND. All three dates in September are good for me. I have an idea I want to check with you on. I'll call you on Wednesday.

Rich Killmer

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

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

Sent: Monday, July 15, 2002 9:19 AM

To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

Subject: [interfaithnd] ICND Agenda

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues,

In a separate communication I have proposed some alternative dates for a September meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Here I want to discuss the agenda.

## OVERALL

The overall agenda is intended to discuss action strategies to promote a broader and deeper approach to nuclear disarmament to counter the retrogressive policies of the Bush Administration. This is becoming a matter of urgency because of consideration being given to use of nuclear weapons against Iraq and other non-nuclear weapon states.

## SUMMIT

On June 18 I sent you a proposal for a "summit meeting" in October that would be an all-day session with wider participation than the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament to develop a broad action strategy. I've talked with a number of you about this and concluded that first we need the kind of strategy meeting that I am calling for September.

I've received a suggestion that we should look for a window of opportunity for national religious leaders, such as heads of communion, to make a public statement calling for specific steps for nuclear disarmament and to seek a meeting with President Bush and/or his top aides. One occasion might be when the Senate ratifies the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT), which is likely to occur some time this fall. The religious leaders could praise President Bush for negotiating the treaty as a first step toward nuclear disarmament and praise the Senate for ratifying it. The religious leaders could then say that much more needs to be done and could lay out an agenda for next steps. In the process they could specifically oppose the use of nuclear weapons in dealing with Iraq and other non-nuclear weapon states.

I tried this out on one person who suggested that because of the uncertainty of when the Senate will ratify SORT and the length of time it takes to set up a meeting with the president and/or his top aides, the two should be handled separately.

This and other possibilities will be considered at our September meeting. Meanwhile, let me and others know what you think.

#### JOINT STATEMENT

We all know how hard it is to work out a consensus statement in the faith community. Because of the way that the Catholic polity works, it is particularly difficult to gain Catholic endorsement of a joint statement. Also, the Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative has in the works a reaffirmation of the statement originally issued at the Washington National Cathedral in June 2000.

Therefore, rather than developing another statement, I'm wondering whether we could simply build on the "Statement on New Nuclear Treaty and U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy", made by the Most Reverend Wilton D. Gregory, President, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops on May 24, 2002. (See <http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/may02fin.htm>) This statement welcomes the new treaty but calls for policies that "move away from reliance on nuclear weapons as a central part of our nation's military doctrine." In discussing issues of particular importance, the statement indicates:

\* "Much deeper, more irreversible cuts, in both strategic and tactical weapons, are both possible and necessary."

\* "We oppose the continued readiness of the United States to use nuclear weapons, especially against non-nuclear threats, and the potential development of new weapons for this purpose. . . . We abhor any use of nuclear weapons."

\* "We urge the President to support the ratification of the comprehensive test ban treaty."

\* "More must be done to assist nuclear nations, particularly Russia, in dismantling and safeguarding their weapons and nuclear materials."

If we staged a news conference, other heads of communion could endorse the statement of Bishop Gregory, who we hope would participate. The four items could also serve as an agenda for a meeting with President Bush. They cover essential points, though one of the participants might also raise the matter

of de-alerting, which isn't covered in the Catholic statement.

Heads of communion would have the liberty of making available to the press their own policy statements on nuclear disarmament. Press information could reference [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org) for further religious statements.

What do you think of this approach?

## GRASSROOTS MOBILIZATION

At our September meeting, we should consider how to mobilize the grassroots constituencies of the faith community for a broader nuclear disarmament agenda. We can build upon our experience working together for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. If we could obtain additional resources, we could consider the experience of Jubilee 2000 and other faith-based campaigns.

## URGENT CALL

One piece of a grassroots campaign could be use of a faith-based version of an "Urgent Call to End the Nuclear Danger" that has recently been initiated by David Cortright, Randy Forsberg, and Jonathan Schell. It is modeled on the experience of the Freeze Campaign in the 1980s, though now making much greater use of the Internet. Information is available at [www.urgentcall.org](http://www.urgentcall.org).

Richard Killmer, who has taken Wendy Starman's place at the Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative, will be communicating to you about the Urgent Call.

We will consider these and other ideas when the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament meets in September. Meanwhile, please share your observations by replying to all.

Shalom,  
Howard

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

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

Status: U

Return-Path: <invest@joejacquescpa.com>

Received: from mc01.sjc1.loudcloud.com ([66.54.0.70])

by payne.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17uygV2MY3Nl3p40  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Tue, 16 Jul 2002 15:46:09 -0400 (EDT)

Received: (qmail 31910 invoked from network); 16 Jul 2002 19:45:08 -0000

Received: (ofmipd 10.2.16.24); 16 Jul 2002 19:44:46 -0000

Received: (from isonl@localhost)

by m0712sjc1.cust.loudcloud.com (8.9.3+Sun/8.9.1) id TAA01007  
for mupj@igc.org; Tue, 16 Jul 2002 19:45:06 GMT

Date: 16 Jul 2002 19:45:06 +0000

Message-Id: <200207161945.TAA01007@m0712sjc1.cust.loudcloud.com>

From: invest@joejacquescpa.com

To: mupj@igc.org

X-Authentication-Warning: m0712sjc1.cust.loudcloud.com: isonl set sender to invest@joejacquescpa.com using -r

Subject: "ADVISOR Joseph W Jacques has prepared your Quarterly Consolidated Statement"

Investor Howard W Hallman,

Attached is your Quarterly consolidated statement. Please visit your personal secure link <https://www.mainaccount.com/stmt/getReport?batchId=L363> where once you've entered your secret password you will be able to view your statement online.

If this is your first time using this service, you must register and choose a secret password.

To do so please click <https://www.mainaccount.com/Register.html>. You will need your Client Temporary Password, which is: HIFINANCE

The report will require that you have the Adobe Reader plug-in on your browser.

If you need to get the Adobe Reader please click <http://www.adobe.com> and follow the instructions.

Once you have completed the download, you may return to this screen.

If you have already registered but forgotten your password, please click <https://www.mainaccount.com/ForgotPassword.html>.

As always, please contact me directly regarding this service or your financial statement.

Joseph W Jacques  
Jacques Advisors, LLC  
15430 Avery Road,  
Rockville, MD 20855  
(301) 738-1303  
[invest@joejacquescpa.com](mailto:invest@joejacquescpa.com)

Status: U

Return-Path: <Bdporter@umpublishing.org>

Received: from tweety.umpublishing.org ([208.161.156.2])

by runyon.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17uUfN5nU3Nl3sj0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 17 Jul 2002 15:14:27 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from tweety.umpublishing.org by tweety.umpublishing.org

via smtpd (for runyon.mail.mindspring.net [207.69.200.239]) with SMTP; 17 Jul 2002 19:05:07 UT

Received: by tweety.umpublishing.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <3Q47K0TS>; Wed, 17 Jul 2002 14:14:03 -0500

Message-ID: <F304CCB28099FC4885E81A32064DB5A602CE640C@tweety.umpublishing.org>

From: "Porter, Barb" <Bdporter@umpublishing.org>

To: mupj@igc.org

Subject: Permission request to use excerpts from In Defense of Creation and  
Book of Resolutions on website

Date: Wed, 17 Jul 2002 14:13:53 -0500

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: text/plain

One time permission is granted to use the excerpts from In Defense of  
Creation and Book of Resolutions of the UMC as described in your request at  
no charge. However, we must limit this use until June 30, 2003. If you  
desire to continue using this on the website, you will need to obtain  
permission from us again. Only material that is original to our publication  
may be reproduced. Please use the following credit lines:

from In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just  
Peace by the  
United Methodist Council of Bishops (c)1986 by Graded Press  
Used by permission  
from The Book of Resolutions of the United Methodist Church  
2000 (c)2000 by  
The United Methodist Publishing House Used by permission

Thank you for your request.

Barbara D. Porter  
Permissions Assistant  
Permissions Office, Abingdon Press

Status: U

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

Received: from web13908.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.71])

by nils.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17uUq72AI3NI3pm0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 17 Jul 2002 15:25:06 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020717192506.17799.qmail@web13908.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13908.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Wed, 17 Jul 2002 12:25:06 PDT

Date: Wed, 17 Jul 2002 12:25:06 -0700 (PDT)

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

Subject: Re: Religious statements

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

In-Reply-To: <000301c22c06\$f8e55440\$506ef7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-1688898413-1026933906=:17740"

--0-1688898413-1026933906=:17740

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

Howard,

I added the new text. I did not know where to add "Monsignor Francis Chullikat" - where exactly?

Thanks,

Marie

"Howard W. Hallman" wrote:Marie,

I am now ready to post statements by the Canadian Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches (USA). They are attached. You already have a place reserved for them on the Religious Statement page.

While you are working on that page, there are two corrections to make.

(1) In the opening paragraph, eliminate the blank space in the second line after "nuclear".

(2) Under the Holy See statement "There Has Been Regression", PDF version, you omitted the name of " Monsignor Francis Chullikat". Please add it.

Howard

> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword name=CCC.03.doc > ATTACHMENT part 3 application/msword name=NCC Statement.doc

Reply-To: "Carlee L. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
From: "Carlee L. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
To: [cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org](mailto:cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org)  
Subject: Web site entrée  
Date: Wed, 17 Jul 2002 17:16:20 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="-----  
=\_NextPart\_000\_0025\_01C22DB5.ABF3B040"  
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

Catherine,

Working with what you sent me and what I could obtain on-line, I have drafted the attached statement for the Presbyterian Church (USA) for [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). Please review it and make any changes you want.

Yesterday I was able to link with Social Witness Policy Compilation 2000 but not today. I left the linkage blank, hoping that you can fill it in for use by our webmaster.

Apparently the 2000 General Assembly statement is not on-line for linkage or even in electronic form for copying. I don't have the capacity to work from a print copy. Therefore, I simply took the conclusions that you used in your NPR piece.

Do I understand you correct that you want us to use the 2002 statement in its entirety? Ordinarily I'm doing this only where such a statement is not on-line on the denomination's web site. Is this the case with you? Do you want me to use it all? I will if you say so.

I have provided linkage to your NPR piece and chosen some highlights. Is my selection okay? What month was this issued?

Is it permissible to use the Presbyterian logo as an identity marker? Some denominations allow it, some don't.

Once we work these things through, we can add the Presbyterian statement to [www.zero-nukes/religiousstatements](http://www.zero-nukes/religiousstatements).

Shalom,

Howard

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

logo from [www.pcusa.org](http://www.pcusa.org) (if permission granted)

### ***Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)***

- ***The Continuing Dynamics of the Arms Race***
- ***Threats to the International System Controlling Arms and Their Deveelopment***
- ***The New U.S. Nuclear Posture Review***

*The **Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)** [<http://www.pcusa.org>] has 2.5 million members and 11,200 congregations. It is governed by a General Assembly that meets annually but will start meeting every other year after 2004. The **Presbyterian Washington Office** [<http://www.pcusa.org/washington.htm>] is the public policy information and advocacy office of the General Assembly.*

*The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) was formed in 1983 as a result of reunion between the Presbyterian Church in the U.S., the so-called "southern branch," and the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., the so-called "northern branch". By then the General Assemblies of both branches had a thirty year history of policy positions on nuclear weapons, including opposition to massive retaliation, atmospheric testing, anti-ballistic missile systems, all nuclear testing, the B-1 bomber. See [Social Witness Policy Compilation 2000](#) [[linkage to be added](#)].*

### ***The Continuing Dynamics of the Arms Race***

*In 2000 the 212<sup>th</sup> General Assembly considered and adopted a lengthy resolution entitled "The Challenge of Security in the 21st Century: The Continuing Dynamics of the Arms Race". Among the conclusions were the following:*

The 212th General Assembly (2000) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) reaffirms its long-standing call to end the arms race and urges:

- Ratification of and adherence by the United States to those existing international treaties that it has not yet accepted, such as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the Treaty on Land Mines;
- Adherence to and implementation of the treaties already ratified, such as the Chemical Weapons Treaty, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, or the Biological Weapon Convention; and the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaties I and II;
- Termination of efforts to build and deploy a Missile Defense System because its unnecessary and destabilizing military character;

- Reexamination by the United States of both its domestic and international policies, and the seeking of informed public review of its foreign policy perspective and goals for the 21st century will be based on the extension of the rule of law, the development of strengthened instruments of nonviolent conflict resolution, not on the continued enhancement of technological instruments of destruction, shaped originally in the context of the cold war...

### ***Threats to the International System Controlling Arms and Their Development***

*The 214<sup>th</sup> Presbyterian General Assembly (2002) revisited this issue and enacted a resolution on "The Challenges to Global Security: Threats to the International System Controlling Arms and Their Development." It is as follows:*

#### **A. Introduction**

In 2000, at the beginning of the 21st century, the 212th General Assembly (2000) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) approved a "Statement of Concern Regarding the Challenge of Security in the 21st Century: The Continuing Dynamics of the Arms Race" (Minutes, 2000, Part I, pp. 276\*81). Numerous dynamics were identified with suggestions of their potential impact on national and global security. The General Assembly expressed concern about developments/trends in United States foreign policy and its military developments, noting that the arms race, often thought dead because of the "end of the cold war," was still very much alive. It called on the United States to reexamine both its domestic and international policies, and the seeking of informed public review of its foreign policy perspective and goals for the 21st century, to the end that the building of security for the 21st century will be based on the extension of the rule of law, the development of strengthened instruments of international governance, the strengthening of arms control and disarmament agreements, the enhancing of instruments of nonviolent conflict resolution, not on the continued enhancement of technological instruments of destruction, shaped originally in the context of the cold war (Ibid, p. 281).

The events of September 11, 2001 (9/11), have made it clear that achieving security for the country within the context of global security is still and will remain a challenge. In some ways, those events should have made clear that devastation can come in unexpected ways, that methods of prevention are not always successful, that violence usually begets violence, and that technological fixes are problematic.

#### **B. Recent Developments**

Recent developments and decisions in the United States have justified and heightened the importance of the call of the 212th General Assembly (2002). While it is clear that major decisions with far-reaching consequences have been made, their import seems the opposite of the concerns expressed. The rule of law and international instruments of governance have been weakened. Arms control and disarmament agreements are increasingly under threat. The arms control regime that took decades to develop is increasingly at risk. The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty has been sidetracked and the U.S. is contemplating abandoning its own voluntary moratorium and resuming tests. The Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty has been abrogated and an opportunity to strengthen the Biological Weapons Treaty has been lost. The nation's response to the crimes committed on September 11 has been a massive use of destructive power leveled against the Taliban, an unpopular government controlling a country already in the throws of desperation, and the Al Qaeda.

Among recent actions of the United States are its refusal to ratify the Ottawa Treaty (the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction) and its refusal to ratify The Rome Statute (the International Criminal Court), partly on the grounds that it poses a threat for our military. While the United States has opposed these two treaties and has tried to weaken them in the negotiation process, it has taken no formal action on them.

**Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT):** On October 13, 1999, by a 51 to 48 vote, the United States Senate voted on and rejected the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, a decisive legal action and statement to the world. Sought by every U. S. president and General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) and its predecessor bodies for almost thirty years, the CTBT was an effort to complete a partial ban achieved in 1963, which included testing in the atmosphere, outer space, and underwater. The earlier treaty had allowed the continued testing underground and simulation tests. The CTBT would have included the underground tests. This defeat for a long-sought treaty endorsed by all earlier presidents, while not irreversible, certainly contains a more strident message to the rest of the world than simply allowing the treaty to float in legislative-political limbo. The testing of nuclear weapons by India and Pakistan and the increased tensions between those now nuclear powers reveal the importance of both the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the CTBT.

**National Missile Defense System:** While the Strategic Defense Initiative (Star

Wars) was shelved, work continued on missile defense technology. After the end of the cold war, focus turned to a limited version of the earlier challenge, a limited National Missile Defense system, proposed to prevent "rogue states" or "terrorist groups" from limited missile attack. More than twenty years and \$95 billion have been invested in research and testing without proving the ability to successfully deploy such a system. Another \$60 billion in expenses for the program is expected. Whether either provided credible threats or whether such would be probable scenarios seems irrelevant. In the presidential campaign in 2000, President Clinton chose to make the National Missile Defense System an issue, promising continued support for research and development and a recommendation of deployment should initial tests succeed. President Bush, in his election campaign and in his first year in office, made the building of a National Missile Defense system the keystone in his asserted effort to provide homeland protection, despite the fact that it would violate the terms of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty agreed to in 1972. Since that time, the ABM Treaty has been regarded by most as an important cornerstone of the nuclear control system. The events of 9/11 have not deterred President Bush from that commitment even though the National Missile Defense System would provide no defense for an attack like that suffered. On December 13, 2001, President Bush announced that the United States was giving the six-month required notice that it was going to abrogate the treaty, something neither country had found necessary during the height of the cold war. This marks the first time that a major post-World War II arms control treaty has been abrogated by a major participant, and in this situation that abrogation has effectively destroyed the treaty since there are only two parties.

The abrogation came after a legal analysis ultimately concluded that building a limited National Missile Defense System would violate the ABM Treaty. The United States opted to abrogate the ABM Treaty, informing its allies of the decision, in opposition to the concerns of Russia and China.

Abrogation is an international method often built into treaties that allows, after a specified time, for ratifiers to withdraw from the obligations of the treaty. The question is not the legality of the decision but its symbolism and the potential consequences both for the United States and global security. The government's own 2002 Intelligence Assessment report suggested that the greatest danger of a nuclear attack on the U.S. would come from planes and ships, not missiles. Greater security would be provided by addressing these other threats.

**Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention:** Over thirty years ago, the United States took the lead in trying to prevent the development of biotoxin weapons, achieving in 1972 the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction (BWC), a treaty subscribed to by 144 governments. In principle, such weapons have been banned since 1925, recognizing their inherent dangers and risks. A few highly publicized terrorist efforts in recent years have shown both the risks and the difficulties of chemical and biological terrorism and the difficulties of preparing for them. For over seven years, the adherents to that treaty have sought a protocol providing for a new inspection mechanism to help monitor compliance.

As with many treaties, a regular review process takes place. At the five-year review conference that took place in Geneva in December 2001, the U.S. effectively blocked further work on the protocol. This decision stunned other countries, particularly since the United States was reeling from the internal impact of the anthrax scare and caught up in speculation and rumor about a terrorist attack spreading smallpox. The U.S. chose not to try to develop international monitoring mechanisms, efforts its own country specialists had worked on. Yet, little evidence is available in the public domain that the United States, despite decades of consideration, is able to provide protections or even rapid responses for its own people in the light of chemical or biological attack. The United States told the conference that it was not in this country's business and defense interests to have any kind of monitoring or enforcement agreement, thus bringing the conference work to a halt. Conference chairman, Hungarian diplomat Tibor Toth, managed to obtain an adjournment of the meeting until November 2002 rather than to have it end, in effect, in failure.

**Small Arms and Light Weapons:** At the United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, the United States was active in expressing concerns about the trafficking, but was also instrumental in blocking the creation or development of any instrumentation with the capacity to monitor or control the flow. Therefore, more than five hundred million small arms and light weapons are in circulation, with more in the pipeline. There are few international mechanisms in place that keep them from the hands of terrorists deemed to be the source of our insecurity and the focus of our open-ended war. Arms Control Decisions at the United Nations General Assembly: The 56th General Assembly of the United Nations (2001) dealt with a usual array of arms control and security issues. One pattern is worth noting, though, in fact, it is not

new. On the major resolutions that were adopted by vote related to nuclear weapons, development, use, etc., the United States voted in the negative on ten of twelve votes, with one abstention and one affirmative. The ten all related to matters that seek to move the world toward nuclear disarmament, including the United States. The affirmative vote was for a resolution on the Non-Proliferation Treaty because its application had been basically aimed at preventing others from gaining what we are legally bound by that same treaty to give up. The abstention, marking a switch from some previous years where the vote had been negative, was on a resolution designed to assure non-nuclear states would not be the victims of nuclear attack from nuclear states. The U.S. was one of four countries to abstain on a resolution seeking to prevent an arms race in outer space (of particular concern for those who feel that the development of the National Missile Defense System will be the first major step in the weaponization of space, reflecting well-circulated U.S. commitments to control space, to fight in, from, and through space).

### **C. Key Questions for Discussion and Reflection**

United States policy and practice in recent years pose concerns for public discussion and reflection. The Advisory Committee on Social Witness Policy (ACSWP) drafted some conclusions regarding U.S. actions, which are shared as questions for discussion.

- Has the United States adopted a unilateralist approach to the whole question of armaments and military developments (in its treatment of allies, its former stated enemies, and its current list of enemies)?
- Is the United States seeking freedom from any international restraints or instruments, no matter how beneficial they may be perceived to be by others? (This includes freedom to build its own military establishment without restrictions. It also includes the option to impose by force, if necessary, its will on those countries that displease it.
- Does the United States commitment to an extensive military buildup, costly in nature, skew its national priorities? Does it destabilize others in implication? Does it represent a potential stimulus to others, including the fueling of a new global arms race?
- Does the United States' decision-making reflect a disconnect between a critical analysis of security needs and the efforts to meet those needs? (A so-called rogue state, seeking to attack the United States with nuclear weapons, is more apt to

choose a less risky method of delivery, exploring the openness of ports as most container ships arrive without inspection. )

- Has the United States manipulated both the domestic and international climate created by the events of September 11? Has the U.S. counted on the reticence of its political establishment, the U.S. media and public, and its allies to question its actions?
- Is the United States caught in a paradox of its own making? In the name of enhancing national security, is it undermining international efforts at control and restraint developed to provide an increased context of confidence and security? Is the United States seeking to achieve peace by intimidation?
- What price is U.S. "military" security at home and abroad? What cost in addressing critical social needs at home as military budgets escalate?
- What relevance does the development of the international rule of law have to the issues raised by 9/11?

#### **D. Need for Criteria for Evaluation**

Over the years, criteria have been set for judging the rightness or wrongness of the use of force. Guidelines embodied in "just war doctrine," and "just peace principles" and "nonviolent intervention principles" have provided the basis for both rational and irrational support of military action. They also provide the basis for challenging those same actions. Discuss whether the following provide a set of criteria to evaluate or judge decisions that are made in the realm of arms development and foreign policy decisions?

- Does the action-program development promote restraint and build confidence instead of engendering fear and mistrust in the world community at large or among states where there has been previous conflict, where there is current tension, or where there are growing issues that could ensue in conflict?
- Does the action-program development tempt other countries to follow suit with similar developments, thus raising the potential level of future conflict? Or does it stimulate efforts to develop countervailing options that stimulate an increased cycle of research, expenditure, and development of other weapons?
- Are the action-program development goals to be achieved at the expense of weaker countries and people, imposing economic, military, or political burdens on them, with or without their informed consensual and participatory acceptance?

- When does a response to a threat/strategy set into motion irreversible, unintended consequences? What is the possibility that the decision, deployment, dare, or defiance will set in motion things that were not intended?
- Does the action-program development tempt or encourage a country or a group of countries to unilaterally exercise power just because it has it; increasing the likelihood, as has usually been the historic case, that in the quest for security, those with the power have become the threat to the security of others?
- Is the action-program development built on worst-case scenario developments, which, if pursued, could be self-fulfilling or on informed understanding of probabilities coupled with deliberate political and diplomatic efforts to resolve sources of potential conflict through nonviolent methodologies
- Has there been an honest, transparent effort to consult with the United Nations and other appropriate international organizations about the implications and consequences of steps that are contemplated?
- What additional criteria would you add?

### **E. Conclusion and Reflection**

The 214th General Assembly (2002) presents this study to the constituency of the church and, for whatever benefit, to the larger society. At the beginning of the 21st century, the American people must learn from the tragedies of the present and the legacies of the past and engage in a full discussion of our country's role and responsibility in the world community. We urge our members to prayerfully study these concerns.

With prayer we lift up our country, which represents but one part of God's good creation, with prayers for its peace and security, with prayers for its leaders and all who are called to serve it, with compassion for all who have suffered from the violence of criminal acts and of war and from the systemic oppressions of economic, social, cultural, and political power. We pray that America, so richly blessed, will use its gifts as they bestow special responsibility, not as they signify special privilege. We pray for all peoples what we would pray for ourselves: the opportunity to live free from fear, free from want, and in the fullness of life intended by God in the creation.

***The New U.S. Nuclear Posture Review***

*In January 2002 the Bush Administration completed its Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). Some of the conclusions were made public, others were leaked to the press. In [month?] 2002 the Presbyterian Washington Office offered its analysis of "The New U.S. Nuclear Posture Review". [<http://www.pcusa.org/washington/issuenet/gs-020401.htm>] Highlights of this analysis include the following concerns:*

Whereas the United States has avoided the use of nuclear weapons in times of crisis, the NPR outlined three situations for which the U.S. would use nuclear forces:

- Nuclear weapons could be deployed against targets able to withstand non-nuclear attack.
- In retaliation for the use of nuclear, biological or chemical weapons, and
- In the event of surprising military developments.

Previously, during the Cold War period, U.S. nuclear weapons and policy were designed to deter a deliberate large-scale nuclear attack from the Soviet Union. Having witnessed the horrific impact on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, U.S. nuclear weapons remained the last resort and would be used only if the nation's survival depended on it. Now, the New Triad calls for using our nuclear capability to strengthen the credibility of our non-nuclear offensive force, in order to deter the enemy. This approach has undermined efforts toward nuclear disarmament and has exacerbated the risk of more aggressive nuclear capability development by other states.

The Review also calls for developing low-yield, tactical nuclear weapons to be used against hardened or deeply buried targets (HDBTs). Developing "usable" weapons is a significant change in U.S. policy that could seriously hamper U.S. non-proliferation efforts by encouraging other states to pursue similar capabilities. Moreover, even the use of "small" nuclear weapons will invite retaliation against the U.S. with nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons.

Development of new nuclear warheads would require testing before deployment. The Review contains provisions that would lift the self-imposed moratorium on U.S. nuclear testing. Although the Review does not explicitly advocate lifting the moratorium, it proposed a plan that would enable resumption of testing if the President decided such tests are needed.

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



Reply-To: "Carlee L. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
From: "Carlee L. Hallman" [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)  
To: "Kayser, Marie" [marie\\_kayser@yahoo.com](mailto:marie_kayser@yahoo.com)  
Subject: Two new religious statements  
Date: Wed, 17 Jul 2002 17:49:19 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----  
=\_NextPart\_000\_0039\_01C22DBA.47796420"  
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 two additions to Religious Statements.

(1) U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops

First, an "ed" needs to be added to "offer" in the first sentence of the second paragraph:

" In 1983 the National Conference of Bishops (as it was then known) offered their views on nuclear...."

Second, we now have permission to post the text of the Summary of the Challenge to Peace. It is attached as Usccb.04. Please include the opening paragraph and the text where it is marked "to be added".

(2) Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)

We now have the first of several expected Quaker entrees. I want to treat this as we did the Catholic Church: first in the contents near the top of the page, listed under Denominations in alphabetical order -- "R"; second, anew section among the statements, again in alphabetical order – after Mennonite in present listing.

This entree is attached as FCNL statement.01.

How are you coming with the sponsor listings for the home page? I'd like for them to be in place as soon as possible.

Take care,

Howard

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

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

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

### **A Pastoral Letter on War and Peace**

[PDF document]

*In November 1980 the National Conference of Bishops (as it was then known) appointed a committee of bishops, chaired by Cardinal Joseph Bernardin, to draft a pastoral letter on war and peace. The bishops reviewed two drafts and adopted the third and final draft on May 3, 1983. A substantial part of this pastoral letter focuses on nuclear weapons. The summary is presented below. The complete pastoral letter, The Challenge of Peace, is available from USCCB at 800 235-8722, order number 863-0.*

### **Summary**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### A. On War

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

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

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

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

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

### B. On Deterrence

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

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

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

### C. The Arms Race and Disarmament

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

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

### D. On Personal Conscience

1. **Military Service:** "All those who enter the military service in loyalty to their country should look upon themselves as the custodians of the security and freedom of their fellow countrymen; and when they carry out their duty properly, they are contributing to the maintenance of peace." (*Pastoral Constitution*, #79.)

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

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

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

## II. Moral Principles and Policy Choices

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

## **A. On the Use of Nuclear Weapons**

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

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

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

## **B. On Deterrence**

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

## **C. On Promoting Peace**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

produced every day. More and more nations are seeking to become nuclear powers. In our quest for more and more security we fear we are actually becoming less and less secure.

In the words of the Holy Father, we need a "moral about-face." The whole world must summon the moral courage and technical means to say no to nuclear conflict; no to weapons of mass destruction; no to an arms race which robs the poor and the vulnerable; and no to the moral danger of a nuclear age which places before humankind indefensible choices of constant terror or surrender. Peacemaking is not an optional commitment. It is a requirement of our faith. We are called to be peacemakers, not by some movement of the moment, but by our Lord Jesus. The content and context of our peacemaking is set not by some political agenda or ideological program, but by the teaching of his Church.

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

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

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

**Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)**  
**\* American Friends Service Committee**  
**\*Friends Committee on National Legislation**

***The Religious Society of Friends, also known as Quakers, was founded in England about 1648. Soon thereafter Friends started settling in North America. William Penn, a Quaker leader, founded the colony of Pennsylvania in 1682. Known for their peace testimony, Quakers are organized in a variety of yearly meetings, conferences, and service organizations.***

***Americans Friends Service Committee***

*To be added.*

---

fcnl logo from [www.fcnl.org](http://www.fcnl.org)

***Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quakers)***

***The Friends Committee on National Legislation [[www.fcnl.org](http://www.fcnl.org)] is a Quaker lobby in the public interest. FCNL seeks to bring the concerns, experiences and testimonies of the Religious Society of Friends to bear on policy decisions in the nation's capital.***

***Reducing armaments [[http://www.fcnl.org/legpolicy/sek\\_frewar.htm#reduce](http://www.fcnl.org/legpolicy/sek_frewar.htm#reduce)] is one of FCNL's legislative priorities. In a policy statement FCNL indicates:***

National security does not rely on military strength. More arms mean less security for ordinary people. Increasingly, armaments serve to secure the positions of those in power. Military expansion by a country or group provokes similar expansion by others, and reliance on threats tends to increase the hostility and distrust that lead to war.

We believe that nations need to move toward general and complete disarmament, both domestically and internationally. We urge both gun control and arms control to reduce the dangers of personal, conventional and nuclear weapons.

Arms proliferation is rooted in the false premise that one can control one's enemy; it is also perpetuated by immense profits in arms sales and unhealthy dependence on military employment. We urge negotiated worldwide disarmament, supported by conversion of military industries to peaceful production and political settlements under world law. At the same time, based on

our understanding of Christian principles, we urge unilateral disarmament, believing that other nations will respond affirmatively. We are prepared to take the risks of such a course, convinced that they are far smaller than the risks involved in the current course of endless weapons development.

*FCNL urges the United States to encourage worldwide and regional efforts for peace, disarmament, and global security, among other ways, by:*

- eliminating all nuclear weapons and any nuclear power projects which could contribute to weapons production. Testing of nuclear weapons by both explosion and simulation should be permanently halted worldwide, as should the development and production of fissionable materials.

*FCNL also urges the United States to take unilateral actions, both because they are valid steps in their own right and because they would challenge other nations to reciprocate in the search for peace. Among such actions would be to:*

- eliminate its nuclear arsenal, abandon plans to build new nuclear weapons production facilities, and end all research on weapons of mass destruction, as well as on space-based weapons.

*In its current legislative agenda on nuclear weapons*

*[[http://www.fcnl.org/issues/arm/cntrl\\_nuclear-weapons.htm](http://www.fcnl.org/issues/arm/cntrl_nuclear-weapons.htm)] FCNL has a concern for the following issues:*

- New nuclear weapons development.
- De-alerting the nuclear arsenal
- Strategic Offensive Reduction Treaty
- Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
- Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
- Missile defense

*As a service to the peace and disarmament community FCNL publishes a **Nuclear Calendar** [<http://www.fcnl.org/NuclearCalendar/index.htm>] by e-mail every Monday when Congress is in session to provide information on public hearings, meetings, and international conferences related to nuclear disarmament.*

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <ecarroll@cdi.org>  
Subject: Interfaith web page on zero-nukes  
Date: Thu, 18 Jul 2002 10:32:30 -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 Admiral Carroll:

When we chatted briefly at Wesley Seminary in May at the lecture-dinner meeting, I mentioned that the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, is creating a new web site, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). Its purposes are twofold: (1) to be a source for statements by religious organizations, military leaders, civil sector organizations, and international bodies on the need to eliminate nuclear weapons and (2) to encourage dialogue on practical steps for achieving zero nuclear weapons.

As a work in progress, we have opened our home page, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org) with linkages to Religious Statements and How to Get Zero. We have the beginning of a page on Military Leaders Speak Out at [www.zero-nukes.org/draft/militaryleaders](http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/militaryleaders). I am contacting you on three aspects of the web site.

First, we have included you on Military Leaders Speak Out, drawing upon excerpts from your address to the Palme Institute and your speech on "Confrontation or Cooperation" given to the World Federalists and elsewhere. We hope that this is a fair presentation of your view. We would also like to draw on your article "The Case for Nuclear Abolition", published by Turtle River Press in January-February, but we don't know whether it is available on electronic format for linkage or excerpts. Can you guide us? Perhaps there are other articles and speeches you would suggest that expand upon your views. Also we would like to have your picture for inclusion on the site.

Second, on the How to Get to Zero page we will have a section for the ideas of military professionals, civil experts, and ordinary citizens on how to achieve this goal. We invite you to contribute your current thinking on the practical steps that should be taken to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons. Such a scenario might encompass a sequence for getting rid of different categories of nuclear weapons. It might include some or all of the common elements recommended by the Canberra Commission and other distinguished bodies (see listing on web page). Although we have no prescribed length, the range of 1,000 to 3,000 words might be appropriate, but we would accept longer. We would like submissions to come as Word attachments or similar formats. We reserve the right to edit for length and format. We offer no compensation for such submissions.

Third, I am wondering whether you would help identify other military leaders who might be willing to contribute their ideas on How to Get to Zero. Perhaps you would be willing to help us make contact. I would like to have a conversation by phone or in person about this possibility.

Information about the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is available at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html#interfaithcommittee>.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Shalom,  
Howard Hallman

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

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

Status: U

Return-Path: <ecarroll@CDI.ORG>

Received: from exchange.cdi.org ([65.120.76.3])

by charles.admin.atl.earthlink.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17vcMmGR53Nl3rY1 for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 18 Jul 2002 10:01:18 -0500 (EST)

Received: by mail.cdi.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <3ZGXL0J2>; Thu, 18 Jul 2002 10:51:25 -0400

Message-ID: <F6D16B241F35D611AD7500A0C9B1B0B60BB3C4@mail.cdi.org>

From: Admiral Carroll <ecarroll@CDI.ORG>

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

Subject: RE: Interfaith web page on zero-nukes

Date: Thu, 18 Jul 2002 10:51:24 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Dear Mr. Hallman,

Thanks for calling on me in connection with your Get to Zero project. The objective is dear to my heart and I will be pleased to contribute in any way possible. Regrettably, I am up to hips this week and next in another high priority effort but hope to be clear about the 25th and will be able to devote some attention to your various issues. Meanwhile, be assured that you may make full use of anything I have produced to date on the issue of nuclear abolition. I will try to track down useful sources/forms of that material when time permits.

All best wishes for success with your valuable undertaking,  
Sincerely, Eugene Carroll

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

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

Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2002 10:33 AM

To: Admiral Carroll

Subject: Interfaith web page on zero-nukes

Dear Admiral Carroll:

When we chatted briefly at Wesley Seminary in May at the lecture-dinner meeting, I mentioned that the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, is creating a new web site, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). Its purposes are twofold: (1) to be a source for statements by religious organizations, military leaders, civil sector organizations, and international bodies on the need to eliminate nuclear weapons and (2) to encourage dialogue on practical steps for achieving zero nuclear weapons.

As a work in progress, we have opened our home page, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org) with linkages to Religious Statements and How to Get Zero. We have the beginning of a page on Military Leaders Speak Out at [www.zero-nukes.org/draft/militaryleaders](http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/militaryleaders). I am contacting you on three aspects of the web site.

First, we have included you on Military Leaders Speak Out, drawing upon excerpts from your address to the Palme Institute and your speech on "Confrontation or Cooperation" given to the World Federalists and elsewhere. We hope that this is a fair presentation of your view. We would also like to draw on your article "The Case for Nuclear Abolition", published by Turtle River Press in January-February, but we don't know whether it is available on electronic format for linkage or excerpts. Can you guide us? Perhaps there are other articles and speeches you would suggest that expand upon your views. Also we would like to have your picture for inclusion on the site.

Second, on the How to Get to Zero page we will have a section for the ideas of military professionals, civil experts, and ordinary citizens on how to achieve this goal. We invite you to contribute your current thinking on the practical steps that should be taken to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons. Such a scenario might encompass a sequence for getting rid of different categories of nuclear weapons. It might include some or all of the common elements recommended by the Canberra Commission and other distinguished bodies (see listing on web page). Although we have no prescribed length, the range of 1,000 to 3,000 words might be appropriate, but we would accept longer. We would like submissions to come as Word attachments or similar formats. We reserve the right to edit for length and format. We offer no compensation for such submissions.

Third, I am wondering whether you would help identify other military leaders who might be willing to contribute their ideas on How to Get to Zero. Perhaps you would be willing to help us make contact. I would like to have a conversation by phone or in person about this possibility.

Information about the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is available at  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html#interfaithcommittee>.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Shalom,  
Howard Hallman

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

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

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <enquiries@randomhouse.co.uk>  
Subject: Permission request  
Date: Thu, 18 Jul 2002 10:56:38 -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

To: Chatto and Windus Ltd  
 c/o Random House UK Ltd

I would like to repeat a request made to you on May 17, 2002 for permission to use sections from pp. 16 to 18 if an article by Admiral Noel Gayler entitled "A Commander-in-Chief's Perspective on Nuclear Weapons", found in The Nuclear Crisis Reader, edited by Gwyn Prins, published in 1984 by Vintage Books, a division of Random Books. The book bears the copyright of Chatto & Windus Ltd.

We want to use this excerpt in web site of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, called [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). Specifically it will be included as a statement of Admiral Gayler's views on [www.zero-nukes.org/draft/militaryleaders.html](http://www.zero-nukes.org/draft/militaryleaders.html). We will use whatever permission language you prescribe.

Information about the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is available at  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html#interfaithcommittee>.

Sincerely yours,  
Howard W. Hallman

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

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

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <eregehr@ploughshares.ca>  
Subject: Web site entree  
Date: Thu, 18 Jul 2002 11:08:41 -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 Ernie,

As I wrote to you on May 23, the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, has created a new web-site, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). Its purposes are twofold: (1) to be a source for statements by religious organizations, military leaders, civil sector organizations, and international bodies on the need to eliminate nuclear weapons and (2) to encourage dialogue on practical steps for achieving zero nuclear weapons.

I sent you a draft of a posting on the Canadian Council of Churches. Although I never heard from you, we have gone ahead and posted it on the web site because we draw on material in the public domain. It is found at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html#ccc>. Would you please review and suggest any needed changes or additions.

Also, we have used the logo of the Canadian Council of Churches as an identity marker. Is this acceptable? We know that some denominations allow this, some do not. We will be guided by your wishes.

I hope that you will participate in the dialogue we are trying to create with [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org).

Shalom,  
Howard

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

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

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <interfaithnd@yahoo.com>  
Subject: ICND meeting on September 17  
Date: Thu, 18 Jul 2002 13:40:34 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
 charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament  
Dear Colleagues:

There will be a meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m. on Tuesday, September 17, 2000 in Conference Room 3, Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C. Refreshments for pre-meeting sociability will be available at 1:15.

The purpose of the meeting is to develop action strategies designed to promote the elimination of nuclear weapons and to counter the retrogressive policies of the Bush Administration.

Among the agenda items are:

1. Consideration of a religious summit meeting on nuclear disarmament.
2. What issues to pursue with Congress and the Bush Administration.
3. Grassroots mobilization on these issues.
4. Possible use of the "Urgent Call to End the Nuclear Danger" (see [www.urgentcall.org](http://www.urgentcall.org)).
5. Review of our web site, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org).

Please mark this time and day on your calendar. I will send background information after Labor Day.

Shalom,  
Howard

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

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

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <rkillmer@wesleysem.edu>,  
<enewport@wesleysem.edu>  
Subject: ICND meeting on September 17  
Date: Thu, 18 Jul 2002 13:40:08 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Rich, Erica,

I want to share with you the announcement of the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on Tuesday, September 17. You are invited to participate.

Howard

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

There will be a meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m. on Tuesday, September 17, 2000 in Conference Room 3, Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C. Refreshments for pre-meeting sociability will be available at 1:15.

The purpose of the meeting is to develop action strategies designed to promote the elimination of nuclear weapons and to counter the retrogressive policies of the Bush Administration.

Among the agenda items are:

1. Consideration of a religious summit meeting on nuclear disarmament.
2. What issues to pursue with Congress and the Bush Administration.
3. Grassroots mobilization on these issues.
4. Possible use of the "Urgent Call to End the Nuclear Danger" (see [www.urgentcall.org](http://www.urgentcall.org)).
5. Review of our web site, [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org).

Please mark this time and day on your calendar. I will send background information after Labor Day.

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: <jhorman@umc-gbcs.org>  
Subject: September 17 meeting room arrangements  
Date: Thu, 18 Jul 2002 13:43:40 -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

Janet,

On the eve of your departure for the Middle East (maybe you've already gone), I want you to know that I arranged with Michelle the use of Conference Room 3 from 1-4 pm, Tuesday, September 17 for a meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

Please fill out the appropriate form when you get a chance.

I hope that you have a safe and productive trip to the Holy Land.

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: "KILLMER RICH" <rkillmer@wesleysem.edu>  
References: <DC1977460103D311B0DE0060943F439FE8BA78@wesley-exch1.wesleysem.edu>  
Subject: Re: Reaffirmation  
Date: Thu, 18 Jul 2002 14:03:20 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
 charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Rich,

The Reaffirmation came through this time. Thanks.

Along those lines you may be interested in the letter the Interfaith  
Committee for Nuclear Disarmament sent to President Bush last October. It  
is found at  
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html#october232001>.

Howard

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

From: "KILLMER RICH" <rkillmer@wesleysem.edu>  
To: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2002 12:33 PM  
Subject: RE:

> Howard,  
> I am sorry about that. I hope this one works better. Please let me  
> know if it does not.  
> Rich Killmer

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

> From: Carlee L. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
> Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2002 7:04 PM  
> To: KILLMER RICH  
> Subject: Re:

> All I received was many lines of squares that took 10 minutes to download.

> Please send it in Word.

> Howard

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

> From: "KILLMER RICH" <rkillmer@wesleysem.edu>

> To: <mupj@igc.org>  
> Sent: Wednesday, July 17, 2002 5:13 PM  
>  
>  
>  
>

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Catherine Gordon" <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>  
References: <sd36cc27.088@gerizim.ctr.lan>  
Subject: Re: Web site entree  
Date: Thu, 18 Jul 2002 14:06:03 -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

Catherine,

What is the linkage for "Security in the 21st Century"?

Howard

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

From: "Catherine Gordon" <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>  
To: <mupj@igc.org>  
Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2002 1:58 PM  
Subject: Re: Web site entree

Carlee,

This looks good to me. I think the Social Witness Policy is difficult and cumbersome. It might be better just to link to our article on the Nuclear Posture Review on the Washington Office web page and possible have a link to our other resenct statement "Security in the 21st Century".

Let me know.

Thanks,  
Catherine

Catherine Gordon  
Associate for International Issues  
Washington Office, Presbyterian Church (USA)  
110 Maryland Ave. Suite 104  
Washington, DC 20002  
www.pcusa.org/washington  
tel - 202 543 1126  
fax - 202 543 7755

>>> "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> 07/17/02 05:16PM >>>  
Catherine,

Working with what you sent me and what I could obtain on-line, I have

drafted the attached statement for the Presbyterian Church (USA) for [www.zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org). Please review it and make any changes you want.

Yesterday I was able to link with Social Witness Policy Compilation 2000 but not today. I left the linkage blank, hoping that you can fill it in for use by our webmaster.

Apparently the 2000 General Assembly statement is not on-line for linkage or even in electronic form for copying. I don't have the capacity to work from a print copy. Therefore, I simply took the conclusions that you used in your NPR piece.

Do I understand you correct that you want us to use the 2002 statement in its entirety? Ordinarily I'm doing this only where such a statement is not on-line on the denomination's web site. Is this the case with you? Do you want me to use it all? I will if you say so.

I have provided linkage to your NPR piece and chosen some highlights. Is my selection okay? What month was this issued?

Is it permissible to use the Presbyterian logo as an identity marker? Some denominations allow it, some don't.

Once we work these things through, we can add the Presbyterian statement to [www.zero-nukes/religiousstatements](http://www.zero-nukes/religiousstatements).

Shalom,  
Howard

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

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

Status: U  
Return-Path: <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>  
Received: from halak.pcusa.org ([65.173.210.8])  
by bissell.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17vfxu2hz3Nl3rE0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 18 Jul 2002 13:58:08 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from fire1.pcusa.org ([65.173.210.2]) by halak.pcusa.org  
(Post.Office MTA v3.5.3 release 223 ID# 0-69934U100L100S0V35)  
with SMTP id org for <mupj@igc.org>;  
Thu, 18 Jul 2002 13:53:49 -0400  
Received: from CTR-Message\_Server by gerizim.ctr.lan  
with Novell\_GroupWise; Thu, 18 Jul 2002 14:09:43 -0400  
Message-Id: <sd36cc27.088@gerizim.ctr.lan>  
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 5.5.6.1  
Date: Thu, 18 Jul 2002 13:58:02 -0400  
From: "Catherine Gordon" <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>  
To: <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Web site entree  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable  
Content-Disposition: inline

Carlee,

This looks good to me. I think the Social Witness Policy is difficult and =  
cumbersome. It might be better just to link to our article on the Nuclear =  
Posture Review on the Washington Office web page and possible have a link =  
to our other resenct statement "Security in the 21st Century".

Let me know.

Thanks,  
Catherine

Catherine Gordon  
Associate for International Issues  
Washington Office, Presbyterian Church (USA)  
110 Maryland Ave. Suite 104  
Washington, DC 20002  
www.pcusa.org/washington  
tel - 202 543 1126  
fax - 202 543 7755

>>> "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> 07/17/02 05:16PM >>>  
Catherine,

Working with what you sent me and what I could obtain on-line, I have  
drafted the attached statement for the Presbyterian Church (USA) for  
www.zero-nukes.org. Please review it and make any changes you want.

Yesterday I was able to link with Social Witness Policy Compilation 2000 =  
but  
not today. I left the linkage blank, hoping that you can fill it in for =

use  
by our webmaster.

Apparently the 2000 General Assembly statement is not on-line for linkage =  
or  
even in electronic form for copying. I don't have the capacity to work =  
from  
a print copy. Therefore, I simply took the conclusions that you used in  
your NPR piece.

Do I understand you correct that you want us to use the 2002 statement in  
its entirety? Ordinarily I'm doing this only where such a statement is =  
not  
on-line on the denomination's web site. Is this the case with you? Do =  
you  
want me to use it all? I will if you say so.

I have provided linkage to your NPR piece and chosen some highlights. Is =  
my  
selection okay? What month was this issued?

Is it permissible to use the Presbyterian logo as an identity marker? =  
Some  
denominations allow it, some don't.

Once we work these things through, we can add the Presbyterian statement =  
to  
[www.zero-nukes/religiousstatements](http://www.zero-nukes/religiousstatements).

Shalom,  
Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036  
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)=20

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

Status: U

Return-Path: <Marsusab@aol.com>

Received: from imo-d09.mx.aol.com ([205.188.157.41])

by runyon.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17vgLR2983Nl3sj0  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 18 Jul 2002 15:17:03 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from Marsusab@aol.com

by imo-d09.mx.aol.com (mail\_out\_v32.21.) id q.158.110f0959 (4329)  
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 18 Jul 2002 15:16:57 -0400 (EDT)

From: Marsusab@aol.com

Message-ID: <158.110f0959.2a686e28@aol.com>

Date: Thu, 18 Jul 2002 15:16:56 EDT

Subject: Re: zero-nukes web site

To: mupj@igc.org

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="part1\_158.110f0959.2a686e28\_boundary"

X-Mailer: AOL 7.0 for Windows US sub 10512

--part1\_158.110f0959.2a686e28\_boundary

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Howard:

I have your note and will hopefully have an answer for you next week.

Mark

Mark B. Brown

<A HREF="http://www.loga.org/">Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs</A>

Division for Church in Society

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Washington, DC

tel. 202-626-7932

Status: U

Return-Path: <sentto-4736742-80-1027021904-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com>

Received: from n15.grp.scd.yahoo.com ([66.218.66.70])

by pickering.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17vhjw6vy3Nl3p20 for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 18 Jul 2002 15:51:49 -0400 (EDT)

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-4736742-80-1027021904-mupj=igc.org@returns.groups.yahoo.com

Received: from [66.218.66.98] by n15.grp.scd.yahoo.com with NNFMP; 18 Jul 2002 19:51:45 -0000

X-Sender: david@fcnl.org

X-Apparently-To: interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

Received: (EGP: mail-8\_0\_7\_4); 18 Jul 2002 19:51:43 -0000

Received: (qmail 23737 invoked from network); 18 Jul 2002 19:51:43 -0000

Received: from unknown (66.218.66.217)

by m15.grp.scd.yahoo.com with QMQP; 18 Jul 2002 19:51:43 -0000

Received: from unknown (HELO local.fcnl.org) (65.207.12.2)

by mta2.grp.scd.yahoo.com with SMTP; 18 Jul 2002 19:51:43 -0000

Received: by local.fcnl.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <N5W9789H>; Thu, 18 Jul 2002 15:41:46 -0400

Message-ID: <E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF6A85B27@local.fcnl.org>

To: 'Interfaith Nuclear Disarmament Advocates'

<interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com>

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>

X-Yahoo-Profile: davidculp

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Delivered-To: mailing list interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com

Precedence: bulk

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

Date: Thu, 18 Jul 2002 15:41:45 -0400

Subject: [interfaithnd] Bush administration proposes "usable" nuclear weapon: Your help is needed!

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

A small group of Pentagon strategists and certain members of Congress are pushing to develop a new nuclear weapon, called the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator or "bunker buster." It has been proposed to be used in a pre-emptive strike against non-nuclear countries, such as Iraq, Iran and North Korea. Many potential of the targets are in crowded urban areas. If used in such a setting, the bomb would kill more than 100,000 people. This bunker buster program can and must be stopped.

Every such program goes through multiple steps in Congress. Already the Senate Armed Services Committee has voted to cut off the funds for the "bunker buster" warhead. However the week of July 22 or July 29 another committee, the Senate Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, must vote on whether or not to fund development of the bunker buster. The subcommittee members and their telephone numbers are at the end of this e-mail.

**ACTION:** If your senator is a member of the Senate Energy and Water appropriations Subcommittee, please call or fax him or her. The subcommittee members, telephone numbers, and directions on sending an e-mail

or free fax are at the end of this e-mail. Ask her or him to delete funding for the "bunker buster" nuclear weapon from the Senate Energy and Water Appropriations bill.

August 6, 2002 is the 57th anniversary of the Hiroshima bomb, which killed 140,000 people within five months. These senators' vote will decide whether nuclear weapons might be used again. Help him or her make the right decision.

This issue is so urgent that we ask you to forward this action alert to ten (or more) of your friends and contacts. Thanks!

Sincerely,

David Culp, Legislative Representative  
Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quakers)  
245 Second Street, N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20002

Send a free fax: Go to the FCNL website at <[www.fcnl.org](http://www.fcnl.org)>. Click on the <Take Action Now> box. You will be offered a list of issues; select "Continue to Oppose Funding for New Nuclear Weapons (SENATE)". Enter your ZIP code and click <Go>. You will be offered a choice of e-mail, fax, or letter; select fax. Personalize the language of the letter and click <Send Message>. The letter will be faxed automatically.

Call your senator. Here are the phone numbers for members of the Senate Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee:

Harry Reid (NV) (202) 224-3542  
Robert Byrd (D-WV) (202) 224-3954  
Ernest Hollings (D-SC) (202) 224-6121  
Patty Murray (WA) (202) 224-2621  
Byron Dorgan (ND) (202) 224-2551  
Diane Feinstein (CA) (202) 224-3841  
Tom Harkin (IA) (202) 224-3254  
Pete Domenici (NM) (202) 224-6621  
Thad Cochran (R-MS) (202) 224-5054  
Mitch McConnell (R-KY) (202) 224-2541  
Robert Bennett (R-UT) (202) 224-5444  
Conrad Burns (R-MT) (202) 224-2644  
Larry Craig (R-ID) (202) 224-2752

###

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

Will You Find True Love?

Will You Meet the One?

Free Love Reading by phone!

[http://us.click.yahoo.com/ps3dMC/R\\_ZEAA/Ey.GAA/nJ9qlB/TM](http://us.click.yahoo.com/ps3dMC/R_ZEAA/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: "Marie Kayser" <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>  
References: <20020717192506.17799.qmail@web13908.mail.yahoo.com>  
Subject: Re: Religious statements  
Date: Thu, 18 Jul 2002 17:30:57 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
    boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_0087\_01C22E80.E0A20000"  
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\_0087\_01C22E80.E0A20000  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Marie,=20

You wrote:

I did not know where to add "Monsignor Francis Chullikat" - where =  
exactly?=20

Go to Religious Statements  
Click Holy See  
Click There Has Been Regression [first eliminate the extra "A"]  
This gets you to the introduction to the text in a box. Where it says =  
"Address by..." add his name.

Howard

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: "Kayser, Marie" <marie\_kayser@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Methodist statement  
Date: Fri, 19 Jul 2002 08:21:26 -0400  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/mixed;  
    boundary="-----\_NextPart\_000\_0009\_01C22EFD.469A0DE0"  
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\_0009\_01C22EFD.469A0DE0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Marie,

I now have the "Methodist" statement to go on the Religious Statements page. It goes in alphabetical order on the Denominations contents list and later on the page. It follows the Catholic model.

This includes a section on Methodists United for Peace with Justice. I am mailing you a logo and a picture of myself, which you can crop and insert at the appropriate place.

In working on this statement, I noted where boxes go, following the Catholic model. I didn't do this for the Friends statement I sent earlier this week, but the same idea applies.

Call me if you need any clarification.

Regards,  
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.

-----\_NextPart\_000\_0009\_01C22EFD.469A0DE0  
Content-Type: application/msword;  
    name="Methodist statement.01.doc"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64  
Content-Disposition: attachment;

filename="Methodist statement.01.doc"