

Status: U

Return-Path: <sojourners@sojo.net>

Received: from sojonet1.dedicated.expresstech.net ([216.26.147.11])

by kendall.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17PAcg40j3Nl3pM0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 12 Sep 2002 16:04:16 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from 127.0.0.1 ([127.0.0.1]) by sojonet1.dedicated.expresstech.net with Microsoft
SMTPSVC(5.0.2195.2966);

Thu, 12 Sep 2002 16:02:40 -0400

Content-type: text/plain

Date: Thu, 12 Sep 2002 15:56:43 -0400

From: sojourners@sojo.net

Subject: On Iraq: Help faith communities stand against war!

To: mupj@igc.org

X-mailer: SojoNet

Message-ID: <SOJONET1IXkVCgfMans0003c953@sojonet1.dedicated.expresstech.net>

X-OriginalArrivalTime: 12 Sep 2002 20:02:40.0426 (UTC) FILETIME=[594830A0:01C25A97]

Do you want it said that faith communities didn't speak out during the rush to war against Iraq? If not, we need your help NOW!

https://www.sojo.net/online_giving/

As the debate over possible military action to remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq grows louder, Sojourners is compelled by the prophetic vision of peace to organize the religious community in strong and visible opposition to war.

With your help, Sojourners can and will:

convene religious leaders in the United States and the United Kingdom to issue a statement opposing preemptive military action against Iraq as immoral, illegal, and unwise; clearly communicate to President Bush and Prime Minister Blair that many people of faith will speak out against a military attack on Iraq; facilitate a just war debate in Congress as hearings begin in October; launch a section on our Web site, <http://www.sojo.net>, to address issues of interest; and issue a broader action alert for wider circulation.

On your behalf, Sojourners will urge our governments, especially President Bush and Prime Minister Blair, to pursue alternative means to contain Iraq's development of weapons of mass destruction. Diplomatic cooperation with the United Nations in renewing weapons inspections, linked to the gradual lifting of sanctions, would strengthen the containment of Saddam Hussein's threat without the risks and costs of military attack.

Will you reaffirm our hope for a world in which "nation shall not lift up sword against nation?" Will you pray that our governments will be guided by moral principles, legal standards, and political wisdom, and will step back from

their headlong rush to war?

You can make a difference and help us issue this important call to action. Please make a gift today to support this critical cause.

https://www.sojo.net/online_giving/

Thank you,
Jim Wallis
Executive Director

If you prefer to mail your check:

Sojourners
attn: Action Fund
2401 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009

Status: U
Return-Path: <david@fcnl.org>
Received: from local.fcnl.org ([65.207.12.2])
by nils.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17PfHR3I93Nl3pm0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 11 Sep 2002 18:11:30 -0400 (EDT)
Received: by local.fcnl.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
id <R9143Y9P>; Wed, 11 Sep 2002 18:09:28 -0400
Message-ID: <E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF67360D8@local.fcnl.org>
From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>
To: "'Howard W. Hallman'" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: New web site
Date: Wed, 11 Sep 2002 18:09:27 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain

It will have to wait until next month. Really overloaded right now.

David

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2002 8:47 AM
To: Culp, David
Subject: New web site

David,

When you get a chance, I ask you to send the following message about zero-nukes.org to your Monday Lobby list. I assume that I am on it, so I'll know when the message has gone out.

Thanks,
Howard

###

Dear Colleagues:

I am pleased to announce that the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, has created a new web site, www.zero-nukes.org. I invite you to visit the site, draw on its information, and use it to participate in dialogue on how to get to zero nuclear weapons.

The web site has these major pages:

- * Religious Statements
- * Military Leaders Speak Out
- * Civil Sector Statements
- * Arsenals & Treaties
- * How to Get to Zero
- * Your Feedback

The Civil Sector Statements page, which is still being developed, will

provide linkage with many of the organizations participating in the Monday Lobby. Some linkage is now in place for Arsenals & Treaties and a de-alerting section of How to Get to Zero.

How to Get to Zero is intend to provide discussion of scenarios on how to eliminate all nuclear weapons. We invite you to submit your ideas and offer comments on the ideas of others. This process is explained at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/yourfeedback.html>. You can also send your evaluation of zero-nukes.org from the Your Feedback page.

We hope this new web site will strengthen the ties between the religious and civil sector communities in our common quest for eliminating nuclear weapons.

Shalom,
Howard W. Hallman

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

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

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
To: "Kayser, Marie" marie_kayser@yahoo.com
Subject: New material
Date: Wed, 11 Sep 2002 16:18:55 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----
=_NextPart_000_001C_01C259AE.EDB5EE60"
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 developed a new section for the Religious Statements page. It is attached.

The first part goes in the index section at the top. The main part goes at the bottom of the present page after Religious Denominations.

I have indicated bold, italics, and underlining in brackets because sometimes these elements are lost in transmission.

Let me know if you have any problems.

Howard

An addition to Religious Statements

1. In the index at the top in the block under INTERFAITH AND ECUMENICAL, add a new section as follows. Type size and style should match the other index sections.

FAITH PERSECTIVE ON NUCLEAR ISSUES

- *[bold face, italic] Nuclear Posture Review (U.S.A.)* [link to section below]

[Note: we'll be adding other issues later]

2. After the long section on Denominations, create a new section with a similar format.

Faith Perspective on Nuclear Issues [in brown box, like Denominations]

[bold face, italic] Nuclear Posture Review (U.S.A.) [bold, italics continue]

- *Holy See*[this and other items linked to text below]
- *U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops*
- *Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament*
- *Mennonite Central Committee*
- *Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)*
- *United Church of Christ*
- *United Methodist Bishops*
- *Methodists United for Peace with Justice*

[space]

- *Civil Sector Perspective*

[begin box]

[As inset to first paragraph, NPR in bold, 36 pt. serif type]

NPR

On January 8, 2002 the U.S. Department of Defense sent to Congress a secret report on its Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). Mandated by Congress, the NPR lays out the direction for American nuclear forces for the next ten years and beyond.

The Defense Department released to the public only the Foreword

[<http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jan2002/d20020109npr.pdf>] of the NPR report. However, at a Special Briefing on the Nuclear Posture Review

[<http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/pol/arms/stories/review.htm>] at the Pentagon on January 9, defense officials presented a series of slides that outline elements of the report. This included:

Sizing the Nuclear Force

- A new approach to U.S. nuclear requirements to address the spectrum of immediate and potential contingencies.
 - **Operationally deployed force** for immediate and unexpected contingencies
 - **Responsive force** for potential contingencies
 - **Preplanning** is essential for immediate and potential contingencies
- Goal of 1,700-2,200 operational deployed warheads by 2012 to meet requirements of new defense policy goals
 - Force sizing not driven by immediate contingency involving Russia
- Force structure and downloaded warheads preserved for the responsive force

Sustainment of Current Nuclear Forces

- Current force project to remain until 2020 or longer
 - Life extension programs for all systems
 - Study alternatives for follow-ons
- Accelerate test readiness of the Department of Energy

In March news stories in the Los Angeles Times

[<http://www.clw.org/control/nukereview02press2.html>], based upon a leak of the classified version of the Nuclear Posture Review, divulged greater details. Subsequently

GlobalSecurity.org put Excerpts

[<http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/policy/dod/npr.htm>] of the classified Nuclear Posture Review on its web site.

This fuller revelation of the Nuclear Posture Review disclosed the following:

- 1) United States would retain nuclear strike capability to deal with two nuclear-weapon states, China and Russia, and five states currently without nuclear weapons, North Korea, Iraq, Syria, and Libya.

Comment: This would be an expansion of the previous doctrine that nuclear weapons are used primarily to deter other nuclear-weapon states.

- 2) "The need is clear for a revitalized nuclear weapons complex that will... be able, if directed, to design, develop, manufacture, and certify new warheads in response to new national requirements; and maintain readiness to resume underground nuclear testing if required."

Comment: This means development of new nuclear weapons and the possible renewal of nuclear testing, not done since a 1992 moratorium.

- 3) "New capabilities must be developed to defeat emerging threats such as hard and deeply buried targets, to find and attack mobile and relocatable targets, to defeat chemical or biological agents, and to improve accuracy and limit collateral damage."

Comment: This give support for a new "bunker buster" weapon and raises the possibility of using nuclear weapons to counter chemical and biological weapons and attack production facilities.

[end box]

[begin new box]

Faith Perspective

[We need a graphic here. Could we used a reduced version of the dove and "Nuclear Weapons -- A Moral Issue" from the top of the page?]

A variety of religious organizations have offered their views and raised concerns about the Nuclear Posture Review. They are summarized here with linkages to fuller statements.

[bold face, italic] Holy See

*Although the Holy See hasn't issued an official statement on the U.S. Nuclear Posture Review, remarks by Monsignor Francis Chullikat, deputy head of a Holy See delegation to the United Nations, to the 2002 NPT Preparatory Committee touched on issues related to the NPR. Excerpts from his speech entitled "There Has Been Regregration" *[end underlining]* [<http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html#holysee>] are as follows:*

Even more serious than the lack of progress [in nuclear disarmament] is the overt determination of some nuclear weapon states to maintain nuclear weapons in a critical role in their military doctrines.

My Delegation is deeply concerned about the old posture of nuclear deterrence that is evolving into the possibility of use in new strategies.

There can be no moral acceptance of military doctrines that embody the permanence of nuclear weapons.

[extra space]

[bold face, italic] U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops

*In a May 2002 Statement on New Nuclear Treaty and U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy *[end underlining]* [<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/may02fin.htm>], the Most Reverend Wilton D. Gregory, president, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, indicated:*

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.

[extra space]

[bold, italics] *Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament*

Representatives of 25 religious organizations that participate in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament wrote a letter to President Bush [<http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html#march152002>] in March 2002 to express six concerns about the Nuclear Posture Review.

(1) Reductions. We commend the NPR commitment to reduce strategic nuclear weapons to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads along with the Russia commitment to reduce theirs to 1,500. . . We ask that standing down of these warheads and their delivery vehicles be completed by 2004.

(2) Warhead reserve and the terrorist threat. The reduction in strategic weapons is compromised by the NPR plan to keep an estimated 1,500 warheads in an active reserve with their delivery systems intact for uploading. If the United States keeps so many warheads in reserve, Russia is likely to do the same. The more warheads that Russia has in reserve the greater the risk of some of them falling into the hands of terrorist organizations. . . .

(3) Mutual assured destruction. . . . The approximately 3,500 strategic warheads in active deployment and reserve are of sufficient magnitude to cover hundreds of targets in Russia, as they now do under the single integrated operational plan (SIOP). Thus, in actuality the MAD doctrine prevails.

4) De-alerting. Not only is MAD continuing but also the practice of keeping large numbers of missiles on hair-trigger alert. . . . True friends do not keep nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert targeted at each other. Therefore, we call for zero alert.

(5) Expanded role. . . . The Nuclear Posture Review speaks of . . . immediate, potential, or unexpected contingencies involving North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Libya. The NPR indicates that nuclear weapons could be employed against targets able to withstand non-nuclear attack or in retaliation for use of biological or chemical weapons. . . . We are greatly disturbed that your administration wants to expand rather than contract the role of nuclear weapons in the 21st century.

(6) Testing. . . . While we welcome reaffirmation of your commitment to a moratorium on nuclear weapons testing, we are bothered by the NPR's call for the Department of Energy to reduce the time it would take to resume testing. . . . This is compounded by the NPR's indication that the current nuclear force is projected to remain until 2020 and that in the meantime the Department of Defense will "study alternatives for follow-ons" for

nuclear delivery systems. Preparation to resume testing appears to be part of this scheme. This sounds like a commitment to nuclear weapons forever. We find this objectionable.

Accordingly, the signers of the letter to President Bush asked him to

send the Nuclear Posture Review back to the drawing boards and have the Pentagon planners come up with a plan that will truly end the MAD doctrine and will steadily reduce the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. military and foreign policy. We propose that nuclear disarmament objectives be incorporated into the Nuclear Posture Review in accordance to the U.S. obligation under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

[extra space]

[bold face, italic] Mennonite Central Committee

In a Washington Comment on [underline] "The news behind the nuclear news" [end underlining] [http://www.thirdway.com/wv/article.asp?A_ID=93&Submit=Go], J. Daryl Byler, director of the Mennonite Central Committee Washington Office, notes:

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.

Byler contrasts this new policy with Mennonite policy 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 . . ."

[extra space]

[bold face, italic] Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

The Washington Office, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) has offered its analysis of [underline] "The New U.S. Nuclear Posture Review" [end underlining] [http://www.pcusa.org/washington/issuenet/gs-020401.htm]. This report indicates:

The NPR is more than an inventory of nuclear and conventional arsenals. It is a compilation of current nuclear capabilities, post-Cold War nuclear strategy, and the military imperative to prepare for a world envisioned by Strangelovian nuclear-war planners. It covers every circumstance in which the President might wish to use nuclear weapons.

In accordance with this construct, the Review has called for developing a new generation of nuclear weapons and delivery systems, which has undermined all efforts toward nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation.

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.

Under these circumstances, the NPR named Russia, China, Iraq, Iran, Syria, Libya and North Korea as countries that the United States would most likely use nuclear weapons against. In the event of surprising military developments, the report recommends that the Pentagon be prepared to use nuclear weapons against hostile regimes or terrorist groups that might suddenly acquire unknown weapons.

The NPR has also drafted contingency plans in case of military confrontation and mirrored nuclear weapons development in the future. These plans outline possible U.S. military intervention in an Arab-Israeli conflict, in an attack from North Korea on the south, or a hostile takeover of Taiwan by China.

Of the seven countries, Iraq, Iran, Syria, Libya and North Korea are non-nuclear parties to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. The Treaty was first signed in 1972 in hopes of keeping nuclear weapons from spreading across the world. The five nuclear states (the U.S., Britain, the Soviet Union, China and France) had pledged never to use nuclear weapon against non-nuclear countries that were parties to the treaty, except in the case of an attack in alliance with a nuclear state. This pledge and the treaty were reaffirmed in April 1995, in connection with a U.N. Security Council resolution.

The United States has avoided the use of nuclear weapons in times of crisis. But the NPR directed by the administration is inconsistent with the commitment to build a secure world through nuclear reduction and disarmament. . . .

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.

[extra space]

[bold face, italics] **United Church of Christ**

In a March 2002 Action Alert on [underline] Continue Nuclear Disarmament [end underling] [linkage to be added], the Justice and Witness Ministries, United Church of Christ indicated:

General Synods 14 and 17 called for the reduction and ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons, for a "no first strike" policy, for unilateral initiatives to freeze the testing, development and deployment of nuclear weapons, and for the withdrawal of all short-range nuclear weapon from Europe.

Although the Cold War is over, the 2002 Nuclear Posture Review returns to the Cold War position of sustaining enough nuclear weapons on high alert status so that any nation which attacks the United States could be totally destroyed. To make matters worse, the Review lays the groundwork for justifying the use of nuclear weapons against nations involved in terrorism against the United States or its allies. At a time when Russia is actively reducing its nuclear arsenal with our financial assistance, when China is not engaged in a nuclear build up, and when terrorist threats come from groups or nations with limited strategic capacity, the report of the Nuclear Posture Review may be fairly characterized as moving from peace-making to threatening and bullying behavior.

The 2002 Nuclear Posture Review represents the wrong direction to take if the goal is to radically reduce nuclear weapons in the world.

[extra space]

[bold face, italics] **United Methodist Council of Bishops**

In May 2002 the United Methodist Council of Bishops adopted a resolution on [underline] "In the Aftermath of 9-11" [end underling] [<http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html#911>] in which they stated:

Whereas, we now witness: (a) the potential development and testing of new nuclear weapons; (b) the cancellation of the ABM agreement, and (c) the threatened utilization of first strike nuclear weapons, and

Whereas, under the heading of "war against terrorism," ethical restraint has been compromised;

Therefore, the bishops resolved to seek an audience with President Bush to share their concerns and to seek ecumenical and interfaith venues to express and embody the values, principles and positions of the United Methodist Church.

[extra space]

[bold, italics] **Methodists United for Peace with Justice**

In an article on [underline] "Nuclear Posture Review: A Flawed Proposal" [end underlining] [<http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html#frompeaceleaf>], Howard W. Hallman, chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, identifies four major flaws in the NPR.

Reductions Insufficient. On the positive side the Nuclear Posture Review offers the goal of 1,700 to 2,200 operationally deployed strategic warheads for the United States by 2012. . . . [But] the Nuclear Posture Review reveals an intent to preserve the delivery vehicles and warheads for possible redeployment. This goes against the principle of irreversibility that the United States agreed to during the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

MAD Continues. [Although President Bush and other administration officials speak of moving away from the doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD)], their words... are contradicted by the level of the nuclear force to remain deployed and held in reserve. . . . Because Russia retains the capability of launching a massive attack on the United States, the U.S. must maintain a counter capability. This means that mutual assured destruction remains in effect between two nations now said to be friends. The only way to end the MAD doctrine is to substantially reduce capability far below the numbers considered in the Nuclear Posture Review, perhaps to fewer than 200 or 100, and eventually to zero.

Expanded Role. The Nuclear Posture Review . . . indicates that nuclear strike capability should be available for various contingencies. It specifies: "North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Libya are among the countries that could be involved in immediate, potential, or unexpected contingencies." The NPR also indicates that nuclear weapons should be used to deter attack by biological and chemical weapons. It adds that nuclear weapons could be employed against targets able to withstand non-nuclear attack, such as, deep underground bunkers and bio-weapon facilities.

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

Testing and New Weapon Development The desire to expand the role of nuclear weapons leads the Nuclear Posture Review to give consideration to return to nuclear weapon testing and development of new nuclear weapons. . . . The NPR indicates that the current nuclear force is projected to remain until 2020 or longer. Meanwhile the

Department of Defense will study alternatives for follow-ons. This could include a new intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) to be operational in 2020, a new SLBM (submarine-launched ballistic missile) and a new SSBN (ballistic missile submarine) in 2030, and a new heavy bomber in 2040 as well as new warheads for all of them. Thus, the Bush Administration assumes that nuclear weapons will be part of U.S. military forces for at least the next 50 years. This is clearly in conflict with the goal of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

[end box]

back to top

[new box]

[bold, italic, larger type] ***Civil Sector Perspective***

In addition to the religious organizations raising concerns about the Nuclear Posture Review, a number of civil sector organizations that favor nuclear disarmament have expressed their concerns. For instance, see the views of:

[Arms Control Association](http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002_03/panelmarch02.asp) [http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002_03/panelmarch02.asp]

[Center for Defense Information](http://www.psr.org/NPRfactsheet.html) [http://www.psr.org/NPRfactsheet.html]

[Council for a Livable World](http://www.clw.org/control/npr02response.html) [http://www.clw.org/control/npr02response.html]

[Global Security Institute](http://www.gs institute.org/archives/000086.shtml) [http://www.gs institute.org/archives/000086.shtml]

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

[http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/02.01/020110kriegerposturereview.htm]

[Peace Action](http://www.peace-action.org/pub/releases/rel0313.html) [http://www.peace-action.org/pub/releases/rel0313.html]

[Physicians for Social Responsibility](http://www.psr.org/NPRfactsheet.html) [http://www.psr.org/NPRfactsheet.html]

[Union of Concerned Scientists](http://www.ucsusa.org/security/NPR_review.pdf) [http://www.ucsusa.org/security/NPR_review.pdf]

For further information see [Resources on the Nuclear Posture Review](#)

[<http://www.wslfweb.org/nukes/npr.htm>] on the web site of the Western States Legal Foundation.

[end box]

back to top

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <powelll@ucc.org>
Cc: <conoverp@ucc.org>
Subject: Need UCC material for web site
Date: Wed, 11 Sep 2002 16:25:43 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Dear Loey,

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament has developed a new web site, www.zero-nukes.org, to provide information and promote dialogue. On the Religious Statements page we feature statements from various denominations, ecumenical and interfaith bodies on nuclear disarmament.

Would you be willing and able to help us develop a section for the United Church of Christ that summarizes policy statements related to nuclear disarmament and provides linkage to the full statements? You can see the pattern used for other denominations at www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.

I know that UCC has been a long advocate of nuclear disarmament. It's important that UCC be added to the site.

Thanks for your assistance.
Howard

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

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

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <jdean@ucsusa.org>
Subject: Our new web site
Date: Wed, 11 Sep 2002 16:34:57 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Jonathan,

One of the things I want to discuss with you when we meet at 2:30 p.m., Thursday, September 12 is the new web site of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. It is found at www.zero-nukes.org. Already we have provide a reference to your views on de-alerting at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero.html#jonathandean>. As we get to deep cuts and civil sector statements, undoubtedly we will include other references.

For the How to Get to Zero page we would like to post the current ideas of persons like yourself on scenarios for going to zero or to near zero. You have written on this in the past. Could you provided us with something current? We are suggesting some up to 2,000 words, but we don't have an absolute on length.

I would also like your suggestions on others we might ask.

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: <dkimball@armscontrol.org>
Subject: Our new web site
Date: Wed, 11 Sep 2002 17:44:15 -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

Daryl,

One of the things I want to discuss with you is the new web site of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament: www.zero-nukes.org. Its purpose is to provide information and promote dialogue on how to get to zero nuclear weapons. The site isn't completely developed. For instance, the Civil Sector Statements page is not yet ready. But we are on our way.

The How to Get to Zero page has a place for persons to offer their scenarios for the elimination of nuclear weapons. We would encourage you to write something for this page, as explained in Your Feedback. I would also like your suggestions for others in the ACA network who we might ask to write.

I hope to reach you by phone to discuss this. There is also a related matter I would like to talk about.

Shalom,
Howard

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

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

Status: U

Return-Path: <kentkathyb@earthlink.net>

Received: from harrier.mail.pas.earthlink.net ([207.217.120.12])

by strange.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17PgTZBL3Nl3oW0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 11 Sep 2002 19:28:07 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from sdn-ap-004watacop0393.dialsprint.net ([63.187.225.139])

by harrier.mail.pas.earthlink.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #1)
id 17pGto-0001Ls-00

for mupj@igc.org; Wed, 11 Sep 2002 16:28:01 -0700

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

Date: Wed, 11 Sep 2002 16:31:53 -0700

Subject: Re: Web site

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

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

Message-ID: <B9A52079.36D4%kentkathyb@earthlink.net>

In-Reply-To: <000201c24625\$9f3e7500\$7750f7a5@default>

Mime-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

IS your website up and running yet? Let me know. Thanks. Kathy
Campbell-Barton

on 8/17/02 11:16 AM, Carlee L. Hallman at mupj@igc.org wrote:

> Kathy,

>

> We have in development a new web site called www.zero-nukes.org. It is a
> project of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair.

> Take a look.

>

> It is not quite ready to publicize but should be after Labor Day. I'll let
> you know when it is ready to tell more people about.

>

> Howard

>

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

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

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

> Sent: Saturday, August 03, 2002 10:27 AM

> Subject: Peace Action

>

>

>> Howard: Just a note to connect. I just attended the Peace Action

> Congress

>> in Chicago as a new board member. There were many attending who were
> faith

>> based...quite a few clergy. A lot of focus about the NPR. Does

> Methodists

>> United for Peace with Justice have a website...or the Interfaith Committee

>> that you chair? I noticed that there were numbers of laity representing

>> the Lutherans, Presbyterians, Roman Catholic, Unitarians, Friends, as well

>> as United Methodists. If you do have websites I would like to pass the

> info
>> on. Peace, Kathy Campbell-Barton
>

Status: U

Return-Path: rutledge@indiana.edu

Received: from igcb.igc.apc.org ([192.82.108.46]) by pickering.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17Pk2241i3NI3p20 for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 11 Sep 2002 22:48:38 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from julesburg.uits.indiana.edu (julesburg.uits.indiana.edu [129.79.1.75]) by igcb.igc.apc.org (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id TAA06171 for <mupj@igc.apc.org>; Wed, 11 Sep 2002 19:48:33 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from iu-mssg-smtp04.ads.iu.edu (iu-mssg-smtp04.exchange.iu.edu [129.79.1.223]) by julesburg.uits.indiana.edu (8.12.1/8.12.1/IUPO) with ESMTP id g8C2m8eT006289; Wed, 11 Sep 2002 21:48:09 -0500 (EST)

Received: from iu-mssg-mbx07.ads.iu.edu ([129.79.1.216]) by iu-mssg-smtp04.ads.iu.edu with Microsoft SMTPSVC(5.0.2195.4905); Wed, 11 Sep 2002 21:48:08 -0500

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.5762.3 content-class: urn:content-classes:message

MIME-Version: 1.0 Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="-----_=_NextPart_001_01C25A06.97B518BF"

Subject: RE 2002 Working Groups Committees

Date: Wed, 11 Sep 2002 21:46:28 -0500

Message-ID: 61C1B60F8691D84D8924539B865D9E4026E9DC@iu-mssg-mbx07.ads.iu.edu

X-MS-Has-Attach:

X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:

Thread-Topic: RE 2002 Working Groups Committees

Thread-Index: AcJaBzNwxdCJF7QYCJLmg2zlbkmg==

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

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

X-OriginalArrivalTime: 12 Sep 2002 02:48:08.0358 (UTC)

FILETIME=[D3724460:01C25A06]

Colleagues:

The Social Equity Panel Executive Committee has been confirmed, and will be announced at the meeting on Friday. Some Committees and Working Groups, unfortunately, are not functioning.

Phil

SOCIAL EQUITY PANEL COMMITTEES AND WORKING GROUPS 2002

Strategic Purpose: Carry Out the 2002 Work Plan

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

1. Committee on Leadership Transition (Activities temporarily suspended)

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

2. Committee on Social Equity Indicators and Measurements

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

3. Working Group on International Opportunities and Linkages

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

4. Working Group on Publications and Documentation

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

5. Working Group on Environmental Justice Project Implementation strategies

Explore ways of implementing Panel's environmental project recommendations; generate possible spin-offs: Phil Rutledge, Jonathon Howes, Co-Chairs; Jim Barnes, Ted Benavides, Diane Henshel, Dave Mora, Jim Murley, Sy Murray

6. Working Group on DC Area Initiatives

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

7. Executive Committee: Phil Rutledge*, Chair; Bill Hansell* and Gail Christopher*, Vice Chairs; Valerie Lemmie*, Rapporteur; George Frederickson, Herb Jasper, Sy Murray, Elaine Orr, Mitch Rice, Dan Skoler, Jim Svara, Harvey White, Joe Wholey

*(Officers appointed by NAPA Board Chair David Chu, February, 2000)

Serves as a Steering Committee for Panel.

9-12-02

Status: U

Return-Path: <sojourners@sojo.net>

Received: from sojonet1.dedicated.expresstech.net ([216.26.147.11])

by kendall.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17PAcg40j3Nl3pM0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 12 Sep 2002 16:04:16 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from 127.0.0.1 ([127.0.0.1]) by sojonet1.dedicated.expresstech.net with Microsoft
SMTPSVC(5.0.2195.2966);

Thu, 12 Sep 2002 16:02:40 -0400

Content-type: text/plain

Date: Thu, 12 Sep 2002 15:56:43 -0400

From: sojourners@sojo.net

Subject: On Iraq: Help faith communities stand against war!

To: mupj@igc.org

X-mailer: SojoNet

Message-ID: <SOJONET1IXkVCgfMans0003c953@sojonet1.dedicated.expresstech.net>

X-OriginalArrivalTime: 12 Sep 2002 20:02:40.0426 (UTC) FILETIME=[594830A0:01C25A97]

Do you want it said that faith communities didn't speak out during the rush to war against Iraq? If not, we need your help NOW!

https://www.sojo.net/online_giving/

As the debate over possible military action to remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq grows louder, Sojourners is compelled by the prophetic vision of peace to organize the religious community in strong and visible opposition to war.

With your help, Sojourners can and will:

convene religious leaders in the United States and the United Kingdom to issue a statement opposing preemptive military action against Iraq as immoral, illegal, and unwise; clearly communicate to President Bush and Prime Minister Blair that many people of faith will speak out against a military attack on Iraq; facilitate a just war debate in Congress as hearings begin in October; launch a section on our Web site, <http://www.sojo.net>, to address issues of interest; and issue a broader action alert for wider circulation.

On your behalf, Sojourners will urge our governments, especially President Bush and Prime Minister Blair, to pursue alternative means to contain Iraq's development of weapons of mass destruction. Diplomatic cooperation with the United Nations in renewing weapons inspections, linked to the gradual lifting of sanctions, would strengthen the containment of Saddam Hussein's threat without the risks and costs of military attack.

Will you reaffirm our hope for a world in which "nation shall not lift up sword against nation?" Will you pray that our governments will be guided by moral principles, legal standards, and political wisdom, and will step back from

their headlong rush to war?

You can make a difference and help us issue this important call to action. Please make a gift today to support this critical cause.

https://www.sojo.net/online_giving/

Thank you,
Jim Wallis
Executive Director

If you prefer to mail your check:

Sojourners
attn: Action Fund
2401 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Christel Poelman" <cjpoelman@yahoo.com>
References: <20020912205759.10373.qmail@web13005.mail.yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: meeting,
Date: Thu, 12 Sep 2002 22:19:29 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_008E_01C25AAA.76889D40"
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_008E_01C25AAA.76889D40
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Does the meeting have to be at that time and date? I had previously =
scheduled a meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament =
at the same time in Room 3 of the Methodist Building to discuss our =
current strategies on this issue. It involves many of the same people.

Howard Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice

----- Original Message -----=20
From: Christel Poelman=20
To: bgirtonm@nccusa.org ; chobccca@aol.com ; jeanstokan@hotmail.com ; =
jmcnrick@erols.com ; meclark@networklobby.org ; mupj@igc.org ; =
marsusab@aol.com ; jmatlack@erols.com ; jdb@mcc.org ; dshank@sojo.net ; =
cchiders@nmcgbc.org ; washofc@aol.com ; stiefr@ucc.org ; =
rcavenaugh@uuc.org ; RCavenaugh@uuc.org=20
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2002 4:57 PM
Subject: meeting,=20

Greetings, =
September 12, 2002=20

In response to the meeting this morning, September 12, a working group =
is being formed for the religious response to the Iraq situation the =
week of September 23-27. To develop the details of the week a meeting =
will be held on Tuesday, September 17 at 1:30 pm. Brenda =
Girton-Mitchell will convene this meeting. Our apologies for the lack =
of options for meeting times but it is due to the limited time available =
and urgency of our response. =20

The meeting will be held in the conference of room of the National =
Council of Churches located at 110 Maryland Avenue, NE, Suite 108. =

Please respond to this email at cjpoelman@yahoo.com if you are able or =
not able to come. =20

Please plan to attend. Light refreshments will be provided. =20

Sincerely,=20

Christel Poelman

Intern for NCC=20

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Christel Poelman" <cjpoelman@yahoo.com>
References: <20020912205759.10373.qmail@web13005.mail.yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: meeting, second thoughts
Date: Fri, 13 Sep 2002 08:51:42 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0007_01C25B02.C86ACD60"
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_0007_01C25B02.C86ACD60
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

After thinking about it overnight, I decided to cancel the meeting of =
the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, scheduled for Tuesday, =
September 17 at 1:30 p.m. rather than compete for time and personnel =
with the Iraq working group. Broad nuclear disarmament remains an =
important issue, but the Iraqi situation has more immediacy at this =
time.

We were scheduled to use Room 3 in the Methodist Building. If you would =
like to use it, I can release it to you.

Howard Hallman
301 896-0013

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "David Culp" <david@fcn1.org>
References: <E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF67360D8@local.fcn1.org>
Subject: Re: New web site
Date: Fri, 13 Sep 2002 08:53:43 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

David,

On my computer I can forward a message to an established group list with two or three clicks of the mouse. It takes less time than writing a reply. Sorry you can't. I'll look for another way to get the message out to civil sector organizations.

Howard

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com>,
<rkillmer@wesleysem.edu>
Subject: ICND meeting for September 17 is cancelled
Date: Fri, 13 Sep 2002 13:21:35 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Dear Colleagues:

I am canceling the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, scheduled for Tuesday, September 17 at 1:30 p.m. This is because a faith community working group on Iraq wants to meet at that time. It will draw many of the same people. Opposing war against Iraq is now the pre-eminent issue, so I want to yield to this initiative. Nuclear disarmament remains important, but there is only so much time and energy. Anyway dealing with a proliferator is an aspect of nuclear disarmament.

As a contribution to the Iraq campaign, I am developing a section for www.zero-nukes.org on "Disarming Iraq without War". It will contain a compilation of statements by religious organizations and a listing of articles and reports on alternatives to war. When it is on line, I'll let you know so that you can link to it.

Next week I'll write a memo on what we might be doing to continue our efforts on nuclear disarmament, especially dealing with the retrogressive policies of the Bush Administration. We had on our agenda for Tuesday a discussion of the Urgent Call, which Rich Killmer is working on. He will continue to be in touch with you on this project.

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: "Kayser, Marie" marie_kayser@yahoo.com
Subject: A new section
Date: Fri, 13 Sep 2002 13:39:21 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----
=_NextPart_000_0044_01C25B2A.F7DB65A0"
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,

Because Iraq has heated up as an issue of deep concern, I want to add a section on "Disarming Iraq without War" to our How to Get to Zero page. This is a topic of considerable urgency, so put it ahead of other pending assignments from me. If you are able, I would like to have it on line by Monday, September 16. Of course, this is an addition to be paid at your hourly rate.

I am sending two attachments. The first deals with changes at the top of the page and at several other places to adjust for the new section. The second is the additional section, which should be set up in a similar format to other sections. I hope my markings come through the Word attachment. If not, in the compilation the names of organizations should be in bold and the titles of reports underlined and linked to the url's.

If you have any questions, call me at 301 896-0013.

Thanks for your efforts,
Howard

A new section for the How to Get to Zero page.

- (1) Index at top of page:
 - (a) Change "Interim Measures" to "Steps Toward Zero"
 - (b) Change "Reductions Approaching Zero" to "Deep Cuts"
 - (c) Add a new item:
 - * Disarming Iraq without War" [linkage to later section]

- (2). In section of text where "Interim Measures" begin:
 - (a) Change heading to "Steps toward Zero Nuclear Weapons"
 - (b) In introduction after #2 add:
 3. In the process of promoting non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, it may be necessary to eliminate incipient programs for production of weapons of mass destruction. Currently this includes [bold] **disarming Iraq without going war.** [end bold]
 - (c) Change last sentence to read: "*Ideas on de-alerting, deep cuts, and disarming Iraq are presented here.*"

- (3) In next section where "De-alerting" begins:
 - a. Change "Interim Measures" to "Steps toward Zero Nuclear Weapons"
 - b. Under "De-alerting" put four sub-items, linked to where they appear:
 - * Civil Sector Advocates
 - * Commission Recommendations
 - * Military Leaders' Proposals
 - * Views of Religious Organizations
 - (c) Where each of these sub-items start, change "Interim Measures" to "Steps toward Zero Nuclear Weapons."

- (4) At end of long de-alerting section:
 - a. Change "Reductions Approaching Zero" to "Deep Cuts"

- (5) Then add a new section on "Disarming Iraq without War". It is sent as a separate attachment.

A new section on "Disarming Iraq" on How to Get to Zero Page

It is at the bottom of the page after "Deep Cuts" (which should replace "Reductions Approaching Zero". It is as follows:

(italics in brown box)

Steps toward Zero Nuclear Weapons

[following in bold, italic, on right margin]

- ***Disarming Iraq without War***
Statements of Religious Organizations *[linkage to below]*
Articles and Reports *[linkage to below]*

[graphic: map of Middle East with Iraq in center and highlighted; identify neighborhood states]

[italics] Nuclear non-proliferation is an important aspect of achieving zero nuclear weapons. One of the contemporary challenges is how to stop Iraq from developing nuclear weapons. There is also a need to contain and eliminate other weapons of mass destruction (WMD) -- chemical and biological -- that Iraq appears to possess.

[begin box]

[bold, italics, 16 pt] Statements of Religious Organizations

A variety of religious organizations have spoken in opposition to war against Iraq. We present references to their statements and resolutions.

American Friends Service Committee

Conflict with Iraq: Policy Gone Awry [<http://www.afsc.org/iraq/Default.htm>]

Catholic Church: The Holy See

Vatican Urges U.S. to Seek U.N. Approval on Iraq [<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A5543-2002Sep11.html>]

Church of the Brethren

Iraq: What's a Christian to Do [<http://www.brethren.org/genbd/witness/Iraq.htm>]

Preventing the Second Gulf War [<http://www.brethren.org/genbd/witness/Iraq.htm>]

Churches for Middle East Peace

Letter to President George W. Bush to Reconsider Iraq Invasion, September 12, 2002

[<http://www.cmep.org/iraqletter.htm>] Signed by 48 Protestant Orthodox, Catholic, Evangelical leaders

Episcopal Church

Presiding Bishop Frank T. Griswold's Statement on Military Action Against Iraq, September 6, 2002 [<http://www.episcopalchurch.org/presiding-bishop/>]

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

ELCA President Bishop Mark S. Hanson's Statement on Iraq Situation, August 30, 2002
[<http://www.elca.org/bishop/iraq.html>]

Fellowship of Reconciliation, USA

No War with Iraq! [http://www.forusa.org/News/FOR_Statement_081602.html]

Friends Committee for National Legislation

Letter to Congress: Oppose unilateral, preemptive U.S. military attack against Iraq, September 12, 2002 [http://www.fcnl.org/issues/int/sup/iraq_volk_ltr912-02.htm]
Statements from Quaker meetings on U.S.-Iraq relations
[<http://www.fcnl.org/issues/int/iraindx.htm#sta>]

Mennonite Central Committee

Threats of War [<http://www.mcc.org/areaserv/middleeast/iraq/index.html>]

Mennonite Church USA

Letter to President Bush, August 27, 2000
[<http://peace.mennolink.org/resources/iraq5000/schragletter.pdf>]

Pax Christi, USA

Iraq Peace Pledge/Iraq Pledge of Resistance
[http://www.paxchristiusa.org/news_events_more.asp?id=263]

Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

Church leaders sign statement opposing military action against Iraq
[<http://www.pcusa.org/pcnews/02349.htm>]
Church is preparing material on Iraq [<http://www.pcusa.org/pcnews/index.htm>]

Reformed Church in America

Action Alert: Possible U.S. Military Action Against Iraq, August 2002
[<http://www.rca.org/churchlife/advocate/iraq0802.html>]

United Church of Christ

Oppose War in Iraq, September 4, 2002 [<http://www.ucc.org/justice/action/w090402.htm>]

United Kingdom Statement by Christian Leaders

The Morality and Legality of War against Iraq - A Christian Declaration, August 6, 2002
[<http://www.paxchristi.org.uk/press.HTML>]

United Methodist General Board of Church and Society

Bush Urged to Turn Back from War, August 30, 2002 [<http://www.umc-gbcs.org/gbpr170.htm>]

United Methodist Women's Division

Statement on Iraq, September 4, 2002 [http://gbgm-umc.org/umw/statement_iraq.html]

World Council of Churches

Stop the Rush to War, August 29, 2002. [<http://www.ucc.org/news/r090302.htm>] Signed by 37 Christians leaders from Canada, Great Britain, and the United States.
[end box]

back to top

[new box]

[bold, italics, 14 pt] ***Articles and Reports on Alternatives to War against Iraq***
We list articles and reports that offer ideas on how to deal with Iraq's weapons of mass destruction without going to war. We present them as a contribution to public discussion without necessarily endorsing particular recommendations.

Arms Control Association

Documents, News, and Analysis on the Task of Disarming Iraq

[<http://www.armscontrol.org/country/iraq/>]

Disarming Iraq: Nonmilitary Strategies and Options

[http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002_09/cortright_lopez_sept02.asp] by David Cortright and George A. Lopez. September 2002

The Task of Disarming Iraq [http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002_09/foc_sept02.asp] by Daryl Kimball. September 2002.

The Case for Iraq's Qualitative Disarmament

[http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2000_06/iraqjun.asp] by Scott Ritter. June 2000.

The Lessons and Legacy of UNSCOM. [http://www.armscontrol.org/act/1999_06/rbjun99.asp]

An interview with Ambassador Richard Butler. June 1999.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Non-Proliferation Project

Iraq's WMD Arsenal: Deadly But Limited

[<http://www.ceip.org/files/nonprolif/templates/Publications.asp?p=8&PublicationID=1050>]

Center for Defense Information

Eye on Iraq [<http://www.cdi.org/terrorism/eye-on-iraq.cfm>]

Education for Peace in Iraq Center (EPIC)

About the Crisis in Iraq [<http://epic-usa.org/thecrisis/>]

Fourth Freedom Forum

Sanctions, Inspection, and Containment: Viable Policy Options in Iraq

[<http://www.fourthfreedom.org/php/t-si-index.php?hinc=SecondIraq.hinc>]

Exploring Options for the Nonviolent Resolution of International Conflict

[<http://www.fourthfreedom.org/index.php>]

Friends Committee on National Legislation

U.S.-Iraq Relations [http://www.fcnl.org/hottopics_index.htm#usi]

Intervening in Iraq [http://www.fcnl.org/issues/int/sup/iraq_dan-smith.htm]

Unwrapping Tony Blair. [http://www.fcnl.org/issues/int/sup/iraq_tony-blair.htm]

Institute for Policy Studies

[Seven Reasons to Oppose a U.S. Invasion of Iraq](http://www.fpif.org/papers/iraq2.html) [<http://www.fpif.org/papers/iraq2.html>]

**Monterey Institute of International Studies, Chemical and Biological Weapons
Nonproliferation Program**

[IRAQ:Nuclear, Biological, Chemical, and Missile Capabilities and Programs](http://cns.miis.edu/research/wmdme/iraq.htm)

[<http://cns.miis.edu/research/wmdme/iraq.htm>]

Sojourners

[With Weapons of the Will: How to Topple Saddam Hussein -- nonviolently](http://www.sojo.net/magazine/index.cfm/action/sojourners/issue/soj0209/article/020910.html)

[<http://www.sojo.net/magazine/index.cfm/action/sojourners/issue/soj0209/article/020910.html>]

by Peter Aclerman and Jack DuVall

[end box]

[back to top](#)

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
To: "Kayser, Marie" marie_kayser@yahoo.com
Subject: Correction for new section
Date: Fri, 13 Sep 2002 13:44:34 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----
=_NextPart_000_0057_01C25B2B.B2222A20"
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,

The version I just sent you of "How to Get to Zero changes" was not the final one. The final was still on my screen, not saved. The correct one is attached.

Howard

A new section on "Disarming Iraq without War" for the How to Get to Zero page.

- (1) Index at top of page:
 - (a) Change "Interim Measures" to "Steps Toward Zero"
 - (b) Change "Reductions Approaching Zero" to "Deep Cuts"
 - (c) Add a new item:
 - * Disarming Iraq without War" [linkage to later section]

- (2). In section of text where "Interim Measures" begins:
 - (a) Change heading to "Steps toward Zero Nuclear Weapons"
 - (b) In introduction after #2 add:
 3. In the process of promoting non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, it is necessary to eliminate incipient programs for production of weapons of mass destruction. Currently this includes [bold] **disarming Iraq without going war.** [end bold]
 - (c) Change last sentence to read: "*Ideas on de-alerting, deep cuts, and disarming Iraq are presented here.*"

- (3) In next section where "De-alerting" begins:
 - a. Change "Interim Measures" to "Steps toward Zero Nuclear Weapons"
 - b. Under "De-alerting" put four sub-items, linked to where they appear:
 - * Civil Sector Advocates
 - * Commission Recommendations
 - * Military Leaders' Proposals
 - * Views of Religious Organizations
 - (c) Where each of these sub-items start, change "Interim Measures" to "Steps toward Zero Nuclear Weapons".

- (4) At end of long de-alerting section:
 - a. Change "Reductions Approaching Zero" to "Deep Cuts"

- (5) Then add a new section on "Disarming Iraq without War". It is sent as a separate attachment.

Status: U

Return-Path: <catherine@fcnl.org>

Received: from local.fcnl.org ([65.207.12.2])

by payne.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17PRJ41Eb3NI3p40

Fri, 13 Sep 2002 10:47:17 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by local.fcnl.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <SZPML3R4>; Fri, 13 Sep 2002 10:45:08 -0400

Message-ID: <E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF6696974@local.fcnl.org>

From: Catherine Stratton Treadway <catherine@fcnl.org>

To: Catherine Stratton Treadway <catherine@fcnl.org>

Subject: FW: FCNL: Legislative Action Message (09/12/02)

Date: Fri, 13 Sep 2002 10:45:06 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: text/plain

Dear WISC and Monday Lobby colleagues,

Here is FCNL's latest Legislative Action Message on "Expanded War with Iraq."

Catherine Stratton Treadway
Legislative Associate
Friends Committee on National Legislation
Phone: 202-547-6000 ext 121
Fax: 202-547-6019
catherine@fcnl.org
<http://www.fcnl.org>

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

From: fcnl-news@fcnl.org [mailto:fcnl-news@fcnl.org]

Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2002 6:10 PM

To: undisclosed-recipients

Subject: FCNL: Legislative Action Message (09/12/02)

FCNL LEGISLATIVE ACTION MESSAGE - September 12, 2002

The following action items from the Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) focus on federal policy issues currently before Congress or the Administration.

EXPANDED WAR WITH IRAQ

Today (Thursday, September 12), President Bush addressed the United Nations General Assembly, pressing the UN to take whatever action is necessary to compel Iraq to disarm and comply with existing UN Security Council (UNSC) resolutions. The Financial Times reports (9/12/02) that the U.S. and the UK are expected to draft and introduce a new resolution for the UNSC to consider in a matter of days. However, today, the President did not rule out that the U.S. would take unilateral military action nor did he say that the U.S. would necessarily wait for the UNSC to take action.

The House and Senate are expected soon to consider resolutions to authorize the President to take U.S. military action against Iraq as needed.

ACTION: Please contact your senators, especially if they serve on the Senate Armed Services Committee or the Foreign Relations Committee. Also, please ask five or ten friends to do the same.

MESSAGE: There is no need to rush a congressional resolution concerning war with Iraq. This is a matter for the UN Security Council to deliberate and act upon, first. Then, Congress must carefully examine the Administration's evidence and plans and consider the many troubling unanswered questions.

Let them know you oppose war with Iraq. War is a dangerous, provocative, and ineffective way to halt the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Instead, UN weapons inspections should be resumed, and, in order for the inspections to be successful, the Bush Administration must stop threatening to invade Iraq to overthrow the government. There is no reason for the government of Iraq to cooperate with UN weapons inspections if the inspections are simply a prelude to a U.S.-led invasion to overthrow the government.

USE FCNL'S WEB SITE TO MAKE LETTER-WRITING EASIER: Start with the sample letter posted in our Legislative Action Center, personalize the language, then email or fax your message directly from our site. You can also print it out and mail it. To view the sample letter, click on the link below, then enter your zip code and click <Go> in the <Take Action Now> box. Here is the link: <<http://capwiz.com/fcnl/issues/alert/?alertid=490041&type=CO>>

BACKGROUND:

Read President Bush's speech.

<<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020912-1.html>>

Read UN Secretary General Kofi Annan's speech.

<<http://www.un.org/apps/sg/sgstats.asp?nid=45>>

Read FCNL's September 12 letter to Congress.

<http://www.fcnl.org/issues/int/sup/iraq_volk_ltr912-02.htm>

FCNL's SEPTEMBER 11th OBSERVANCE: Nearly 70 people from ten states as far away as Arizona, Washington state, Rhode Island, and Florida, convened in Washington to remember the tragedies of one year ago and to collectively and individually oppose any expanded war with Iraq. It appears almost certain that President Bush will come before Congress soon to secure authorization for unilateral military action against Iraq. With that in mind, FCNL planned events to center, prepare, and inspire Friends to make lobby visits urging their members of Congress to recognize the inherent danger and futility of such action.

Meeting for Worship began our day as Friends contemplated the violence and loss of life that September 11th has come to represent and considered the

underlying roots of hatred, violence, peace, and love. A sense of obligation and determination to take action against the impending war and to live every day as an instrument of peace emerged through the silence before Friends shook hands and crowded onto buses headed to Capitol Hill for a briefing.

Individuals from the American Friends Service Committee, Friends General Conference, Friends United Meeting, Friends World Committee on Consultation, and the Quaker United Nations Office, participated in the briefing. Each individual, speaking from his or her own experience, urged Friends to feel confidence in both the critical importance of their peace witness and the potential impact they could have on averting a new war in Iraq. A congressional staff member explained the present climate on Capitol Hill. She and a grassroots activist pointed to ways in which Friends might effectively engage their members of Congress. Pictures of the event have now been posted at the FCNL website at <http://www.fcnl.org/quakers/photo-sub7-indx.htm>.

FCNL's web site has much information about the Iraq situation, with new documents posted almost daily. Check them out at <http://www.fcnl.org/issues/int/iraindx.htm>. We hope you will find them informative and helpful as you advocate alternatives to an expanded war with Iraq.

Please forward this message to your friends.

CONTACTING LEGISLATORS

Capitol Switchboard: 202-224-3121

Sen. _____
U.S. Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Rep. _____
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Information on your members is available on FCNL's web site:
<http://capwiz.com/fconl/dbq/officials/directory/directory.dbq?command=congr>

CONTACTING THE ADMINISTRATION

White House Comment Desk: 202-456-1111
FAX: 202-456-2461
E-MAIL: president@whitehouse.gov
WEB PAGE: <http://www.whitehouse.gov>

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

This message supplements other FCNL materials and does not reflect FCNL's

complete policy position on any issue. For further information, please contact FCNL.

Mail: 245 Second Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002-5795
Email: fcnl@fcnl.org
Phone: (202) 547-6000
Toll Free: (800) 630-1330
Fax: (202) 547-6019
Web: <http://www.fcnl.org>

Your contributions sustain our Quaker witness in Washington. We welcome your gifts to FCNL, or, if you need a tax deduction, to the FCNL Education Fund. You can use your credit card to donate money securely to FCNL through a special page on FCNL's web site <http://www.fcnl.org/suprt/indx.htm> FCNL also accepts credit card donations over the phone. For more information about donating, please contact the Development Team directly at development@fcnl.org. Thank you.

This message may be found regularly on FCNL's web site <http://www.fcnl.org> where a printer-friendly version is available and on PeaceNet in the fcnl.update conference.

This message is distributed regularly via the fcnl-news mailing list. To subscribe to this list, please visit FCNL's web site at http://www.fcnl.org/listserv/quaker_issues.php.

Alternatively, you can send an e-mail message to majordomo@his.com. Leave the subject line blank. The message should read "subscribe fcnl-news." Please Note: Make sure that you are sending this message from the e-mail address to which you would like fcnl-news materials to be sent.

If you currently receive this message via the fcnl-news mailing list and are no longer interested in receiving messages from this list, send an e-mail message to majordomo@his.com. The message should read "unsubscribe fcnl-news."

We seek a world free of war and the threat of war
We seek a society with equity and justice for all
We seek a community where every person's potential may be fulfilled
We seek an earth restored...

Status: U

Return-Path: <program@backfromthebrink.org>

Received: from falcon.mail.pas.earthlink.net ([207.217.120.74])

by runyon.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17PSR5LO3Nl3sj0

Fri, 13 Sep 2002 11:59:39 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from user-uivenl9.dsl.mindspring.com ([165.247.94.169] helo=esther)

by falcon.mail.pas.earthlink.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #1)

id 17psqD-000356-00; Fri, 13 Sep 2002 08:58:45 -0700

Reply-To: <program@backfromthebrink.org>

From: "Brink Campaign" <program@backfromthebrink.org>

To: <program@backfromthebrink.org>

Subject: First the Good News!..Then There's Iraq

Date: Fri, 13 Sep 2002 12:05:31 -0400

Message-ID: <NEBBKJHCMLACLOPKCPPBMEEACJAA.program@backfromthebrink.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)

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

Importance: Normal

(Please send to your member organizations and contacts.)

Dear Back from the Brink Supporter,

I've got some exciting news. Back From the Brink is merging with Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR).

Over the last two years, PSR has been a key partner in the Brink campaign's efforts to de-alert nuclear weapons. This merger will deepen that partnership and enhance our program work by allowing the Brink campaign to become an integral part of PSR's education and outreach activities to doctors and other citizens nationwide.

Of course, Back From the Brink, will also continue to work with other national and local disarmament organizations, as we pursue de-alerting and the elimination of related nuclear dangers.

NEW CONTACT INFORMATION:

Ira Shorr

Back From the Brink, C/O PSR

1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1012

Washington, D.C. 20009

Tel: (202) 667-4260 ex. 227

Fax: (202) 667-4201

Website: www.backfromthebrink.org

NOW THE BAD NEWS: The Bush administration seems intent on rushing into war with Iraq. They have revealed no new assessment of the danger-and they seem

totally detached from the potential disastrous ramifications of a unilateral invasion. In addition-by disparaging inspections they weaken a foundation of international arms control efforts.

Copied below is a SAMPLE LETTER TO THE EDITOR on the possible nuclear ramifications of a U.S. attack-and a supporting op-ed by Milton Viorst that was just printed in the NY Times.

As always, if you get a letter printed send it along.

I send my thanks for your continuing work to make a safer world.

Ira Shorr
Back From the Brink

SAMPLE LETTER-TO-THE EDITOR ON IRAQ WAR

It appears that the U.S. is prepared to go to war with or without the United Nations. In the name of reducing a nuclear threat the Bush administration seems intent on invading Iraq-a move, that in a worst case scenario, could actually spark a nuclear war. After all, with nothing to lose, Saddam Hussein could chose to attack Israel with chemical weapons. Israel might then retaliate with nuclear weapons, setting off a cauldron of violence in the Middle East that could draw in nuclear powers-and fervent enemies--Pakistan and India.

I wonder if President Bush is the best person to lead the world away from the use of nuclear weapons. After all, it's his administration that has endorsed a planning policy that calls for building a new, supposedly "usable" nuclear bomb and reserves the right to hit seven nations with a nuclear first strike.

In times of crisis, wise leadership is crucial. President Bush talks of acting preemptively to prevent a potential danger. Yet when it come to preventing the widespread destruction of the environment Mr. Bush doesn't even believe that the burning of fossil fuels contributes to global warming. If Mr. Bush is not smart on the environment, what makes us think he's on top of national security?

If we bomb Iraq, we might see a lot more burning oil--an apt image. Confronting the threat of nuclear weapons by going to war in a volatile region like the Middle East is like fighting fire with gasoline

September 12, 2002
New York Ti mes
Imagining the Worst-Case Scenario in Iraq
By MILTON VIORST

WASHINGTON

Like most Americans, I've reflected this week on the personal impact of the tragedy of Sept. 11, recalling most vividly the trauma of emptiness I felt

in the pit of my stomach as I watched the towers of the World Trade Center vanish from my television screen. The feeling still periodically recurs. In a flash, the inconceivable had become real, the horror of the unbelievable had become part of my and every American's existence.

During the cold war, the futurists who studied world conflict had devised a clever name for such an event: the "worst-case scenario." Implied in this phrase, however, was the sense that the event was unlikely to happen. Government and policy professionals hypothesized less severe outcomes, dismissing the doomsayers. But on Sept. 11 we all learned that even disasters can be of an unexpected magnitude. Fortrightness now demands that we gird not for some tepid end to our conflicts but for catastrophes hitherto unimaginable.

In preparing for a war against Iraq, President Bush urges us to overlook that lesson. Categorizing Saddam Hussein as "evil," he warns that the Iraqis have nuclear, chemical and biological weapons with which to attack us. Mr. Bush's concern is justified, though some responsible statesmen at home and abroad believe he overstates the danger. But in suggesting that our forces will dispose of Saddam Hussein in a war that is quick and painless, like the Persian Gulf war or the war in Afghanistan, the president is clearly choosing not to consider the worst-case scenario at all. Mr. Bush asserts a new doctrine for America, the right of preemptive attack, to keep Saddam Hussein from using his weapons. Preemption, Mr. Bush tells us, is what the proposed war is all about. But the doctrine does not take Saddam Hussein's own efforts at pre-emption into account; it assumes that he will wait around for America to attack at its convenience.

Surely Saddam Hussein will not repeat the strategic mistake he made after swallowing Kuwait in 1990 when, in choosing not to invade Saudi Arabia, he allowed half a million allied troops to assemble over several months time for invasion. Saudi Arabia is hardly less vulnerable now. By moving into Saudi Arabia, Saddam Hussein would shift the battlefield far to the south, imposing on American forces a much heavier burden than just the capture of Baghdad. We should also recall that in the last war Saddam Hussein blew up almost all of Kuwait's oil wells; in the next he could blow up Saudi Arabian wells, with significant repercussions for the international economy.

That's one scenario. Another is that Saddam Hussein, prior to an American attack, goes after Israel with the chemical or biological weapons that Mr. Bush says Iraq possesses. Israel, if it survives, will retaliate, perhaps even with nuclear weapons. Such retaliation might indeed bring about the "regime change" Mr. Bush seeks, but it would not end the story.

Just over the horizon lies Pakistan, a Muslim country armed with nuclear weapons and permeated by extremists. Pervez Musharraf, its president, has joined America's war on terrorism but he is unlikely to survive politically should there be a nuclear attack by an American ally on Iraq's Muslims. Islamists, overthrowing him, would take control of Pakistan's nuclear arsenal; lacking the ability to launch missiles that would reach Israel, they would turn on India, their more proximate enemy. A nuclear attack would set off global chaos.

Before Sept. 11, I probably would not have written the above lines. I have

covered the Middle East conflict as a journalist for several decades, but I would have considered such scenarios fantasy, if not madness. Now they seem to me at least plausible.

The responsibility of America's leadership is to prevent the plausible from becoming reality. The cold war is a useful precedent. Saddam Hussein's power, and perhaps his evil too, pale next to that of Stalin. Yet even when we had clear military superiority over Stalin we chose not to attack him. All our presidents, Republican and Democratic alike, accepted the principle of avoiding a war that might wreck the planet. Mr. Bush is the first to question this principle, and his resolve is bolstered by Vice President Dick Cheney and Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, both of whom close their eyes to the potential ramifications of a war with Iraq.

Iraq, as a highly centralized tyranny dedicated to its own preservation, is not that different from the old Soviet Union, and it is no coincidence that the same deterrence that restrained the Kremlin has kept Iraq in line for a decade. The Soviet Union's ultimate fall with barely a whimper vindicated America's patience, and in time Saddam Hussein too will vanish. Is not Sept. 11 a compelling reminder that the steadfast vigilance exercised by our leaders for a half-century of cold war is wiser than rushing toward a worst-case outcome?

Milton Viorst is author of the forthcoming "What Shall I Do With This People: Jews and the Fractious Politics of Judaism."

Status: U

Return-Path: <david@fcnl.org>

Received: from local.fcnl.org ([65.207.12.2])

by osgood.mail.atl.earthlink.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17PVvA4lZ3Nl3pt0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 13 Sep 2002 14:49:37 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by local.fcnl.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <S6DTZNY>; Fri, 13 Sep 2002 14:46:47 -0400

Message-ID: <E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF67360F5@local.fcnl.org>

From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>

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

Subject: RE: New web site

Date: Fri, 13 Sep 2002 11:48:59 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: text/plain

The list needs to be updated. I have really trying to focus on lobbying the next few weeks.

David

David Culp, Legislative Representative
Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quakers)
245 Second Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002-5795
Tel: (202) 547-6000, ext. 146
Toll-free: (800) 630-1330, ext. 146
Fax: (202) 547-6019
E-mail: david@fcnl.org
Web: www.fcnl.org

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

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

Sent: Friday, September 13, 2002 8:54 AM

To: David Culp

Subject: Re: New web site

David,

On my computer I can forward a message to an established group list with two or three clicks of the mouse. It takes less time than writing a reply.

Sorry you can't. I'll look for another way to get the message out to civil sector organizations.

Howard

Status: U

Return-Path: <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

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

by farley.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17PXnx2fA3NI3pa0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 13 Sep 2002 16:49:27 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020913204926.89588.qmail@web13907.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13907.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Fri, 13 Sep 2002 13:49:26 PDT

Date: Fri, 13 Sep 2002 13:49:26 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: New material

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

In-Reply-To: <002601c259d0\$9d265580\$4d59f7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-1613948499-1031950166=:89218"

--0-1613948499-1031950166=:89218

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

Howard,

Please review the addition. I have not added the links on top of the page but the content should all be there.

Thanks,

Marie

"Howard W. Hallman" wrote:Marie,

I have developed a new section for the Religious Statements page. It is attached.

The first part goes in the index section at the top. The main part goes at the bottom of the present page after Religious Denominations.

I have indicated bold, italics, and underlining in brackets because sometimes these elements are lost in transmission.

Let me know if you have any problems.

Howard

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

Status: U

Return-Path: <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Received: from web13908.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.175.71])

by wanamaker.mail.atl.earthlink.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17PXsI4FG3Nl3oJ0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 13 Sep 2002 16:54:48 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020913205447.81523.qmail@web13908.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [64.178.14.226] by web13908.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Fri, 13 Sep 2002 13:54:47 PDT

Date: Fri, 13 Sep 2002 13:54:47 -0700 (PDT)

From: Marie Kayser <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: A new section

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

In-Reply-To: <004701c25b4c\$853e7420\$065df7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-593584183-1031950487=:80894"

--0-593584183-1031950487=:80894

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

I will work on it this weekend.

"Howard W. Hallman" wrote:Marie,

Because Iraq has heated up as an issue of deep concern, I want to add a section on "Disarming Iraq without War" to our How to Get to Zero page. This is a topic of considerable urgency, so put it ahead of other pending assignments from me. If you are able, I would like to have it on line by Monday, September 16. Of course, this is an addition to be paid at your hourly rate.

I am sending two attachments. The first deals with changes at the top of the page and at several other places to adjust for the new section. The second is the additional section, which should be set up in a similar format to other sections. I hope my markings come through the Word attachment. If not, in the compilation the names of organizations should be in bold and the titles of reports underlined and linked to the url's.

If you have any questions, call me at 301 896-0013.

Thanks for your efforts,
Howard

> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword name=Get to Zero changes.01.doc > ATTACHMENT part 3
application/msword name=Disarming Iraq.01.doc

Status: U

Return-Path: bbhardt@mail.esc4.com

Received: from mail.academicplanet.com ([209.245.216.197]) by
niles.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17Q1aV2e23NI3pm0
Fri, 13 Sep 2002 20:52:41 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from brenda (207-173-195-207.academicplanet.com [207.173.195.207]) by
mail.academicplanet.com (8.11.1/8.11.0) with SMTP id g8E0jE427620; Fri, 13 Sep
2002 19:45:14 -0500

From: "brenda hardt" bbhardt@mail.esc4.com

To: "Kay Bailey Hutchison" Jordan_Byrne@hutchison.senate.gov

Subject: Rep. Ron Paul (TX) asks questions

Date: Fri, 13 Sep 2002 19:43:52 -0500

Message-ID: CAEJIIEFGMEIGGLHDKPOMEHDCOAA.bbhardt@mail.esc4.com

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----
=_NextPart_000_0028_01C25B5D.E3465A40"

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

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

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000 Importance: Normal

X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:

CAEJIIEFGMEIGGLHDKPOMEHDCOAA.bbhardt@mail.esc4.com

Dear Senaator Hutchison: Will these same questions (Rep. Paul's) be ones that the Senate will be asking? I sure wish someone on Capitol Hill had encouraged these questions be answered by the Bush administration a few months ago... before we got so close to the brink.

I wish you much wisdom and powers of discernment in the coming weeks. I sometimes quote what Einstein said about our nuclear age: "Remember our humanity and forget the rest." There are people who know how to lead us toward a time of cooperation, nonviolence, and a livable earth home. (Nelson Mandela and Bishop Tutu are two that come to mind.)

Sincerely, Brenda Hardt
Brenham, TX

Questions that Won't Be Asked About Iraq

by Representative Ron Paul (R-TX)

September 11, 2002

Soon we hope to have hearings on the pending war with Iraq. I am concerned there are some questions that won't be asked -- and maybe will not even be allowed to be asked. Here are some of those questions ... I would like them answered by those who are urging us to start this war:

1. Is it not true that the reason we did not bomb the Soviet Union at the height of the Cold War was because we knew they could retaliate?
2. Is it not also true that we are willing to bomb Iraq now because we know it cannot retaliate - which just confirms that there is no real threat?
3. Is it not true that those who argue that even with inspections we cannot be sure that Hussein might be hiding weapons, at the same time imply that we can be more sure that weapons exist in the absence of inspections?
4. Is it not true that the UN's International Atomic Energy Agency was able to complete its yearly verification mission to Iraq just this year with Iraqi cooperation?
5. Is it not true that the intelligence community has been unable to develop a case tying Iraq to global terrorism at all, much less the attacks on the United States last year? Does anyone remember that 15 of the 19 hijackers came from Saudi Arabia and that none came from Iraq?
6. Was former CIA counter-terrorism chief Vincent Cannistraro wrong when he recently said there is no confirmed evidence of Iraq's links to terrorism?
7. Is it not true that the CIA has concluded there is no evidence that a Prague meeting between 9/11 hijacker Mohammed Atta and Iraqi intelligence took place?
8. Is it not true that northern Iraq, where the administration claimed al-Qaeda were hiding out, is in the control of our "allies", the Kurds?
9. Is it not true that the vast majority of al-Qaeda leaders who escaped appear to have safely made their way to Pakistan, another of our so-called allies?
10. Has anyone noticed that Afghanistan is rapidly sinking into total chaos, with bombings and assassinations becoming daily occurrences; and that according to a recent UN report the al-Qaeda "is, by all accounts, alive and well and poised to strike again, how, when, and where it chooses"?
11. Why are we taking precious military and intelligence resources away from tracking down those who did attack the United States - and who may again attack the United States - and using them to invade countries that have not attacked the United States?
12. Would an attack on Iraq not just confirm the Arab world's worst suspicions about the US - and isn't this what bin Laden wanted?

13. How can Hussein be compared to Hitler when he has no navy or air force, and now has an army 1/5 the size of twelve years ago, which even then proved totally inept at defending the country?

14. Is it not true that the constitutional power to declare war is exclusively that of the Congress? Should presidents, contrary to the Constitution, allow Congress to concur only when pressured by public opinion? Are presidents permitted to rely on the UN for permission to go to war?

15. Are you aware that a Pentagon report studying charges that thousands of Kurds in one village were gassed by the Iraqis found no conclusive evidence that Iraq was responsible, that Iran occupied the very city involved, and that evidence indicated the type of gas used was more likely controlled by Iran, not Iraq?

16. Is it not true that anywhere between 100,000 and 300,000 US soldiers have suffered from Persian Gulf War syndrome from the first Gulf War, and that thousands may have died?

17. Are we prepared for possibly thousands of American casualties in a war against a country that does not have the capacity to attack the United States?

18. Are we willing to bear the economic burden of a 100 billion dollar war against Iraq, with oil prices expected to skyrocket and further rattle an already shaky American economy? How about an estimated 30-year occupation of Iraq that some have deemed necessary to "build democracy" there?

19. Iraq's alleged violations of UN resolutions are given as reason to initiate an attack, yet is it not true that hundreds of UN Resolutions have been ignored by various countries without penalty?

20. Did former President Bush not cite the UN Resolution of 1990 as the reason he could not march into Baghdad, while supporters of a new attack assert that it is the very reason we can march into Baghdad?

21. Contrary to current claims, is it not true that the 'no-fly zones' in Iraqi airspace were set up by Britain and the United States without specific approval from the United Nations?

22. If we claim membership in the international community and conform to its rules only when it pleases us, does this not serve to undermine our position, directing animosity toward us by both friend and foe?

23. How can our declared goal of bringing democracy to Iraq be believable when we prop up dictators throughout the Middle East and support military tyrants like Musharraf in Pakistan, who overthrew a democratically-elected president?

24. Are you familiar with the 1994 Senate Hearings that revealed the U.S. knowingly supplied chemical and biological materials to Iraq during the Iran-Iraq war and as late as 1992 - including after the alleged Iraqi gas attack on a Kurdish village?

25. Did we not assist Saddam Hussein's rise to power by supporting and encouraging his invasion of Iran? Is it honest to criticize Saddam now for his invasion of Iran, which at the time we actively supported?

26. Is it not true that preventive war is synonymous with an act of aggression, and has never been considered a moral or legitimate US policy?

27. If oil is not the real reason we plan to take over Iraq, why do the oil company executives strongly support this war?

28. Why is it that those who never wore a uniform and are confident that they won't have to personally fight this war are more anxious for this war than our generals?

29. What is the moral argument for attacking a nation that has not initiated aggression against us, and could not do so even if it wanted to?

30. Where does the US Constitution grant us permission to wage war for any reason other than self-defense?

31. Is it not true that a war against Iraq rejects the sentiments of the time-honored Treaty of Westphalia -- written nearly 400 years ago -- principles which state that countries should never go into another for the purpose of "regime change"?

32. Is it not true that the more civilized a society is, the less likely disagreements will be settled by war?

33. Is it not true that since World War II, Congress has not declared war and - not coincidentally - we have not since then had a clear-cut victory?

34. Is it not true that Pakistan, especially through its intelligence services, was an active supporter and key organizer of the Taliban?

35. Why don't those who want war bring a formal declaration of war resolution to the floor of Congress?

Ron Paul, M.D., represents the 14th Congressional District of Texas in the United States House of Representatives.

+++++

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
To: marsusab@aol.com
Subject: Iraq on our web site
Date: Sat, 14 Sep 2002 09:46:12 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----
=_NextPart_000_0017_01C25BD3.900EA0A0"
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

Mark,

Attached is the material related to Iraq that I sent to our webmaster for posting on www.zero-nukes.org . It has the listing of articles and reports on alternatives to war, which I showed you, with some additions. It also has a compilation of statements from religious organizations, to the extent that I could find them on the web. This goes with other religious statements we have on other pages on nuclear disarmament and the Nuclear Posture Review.

The listings are open to additions if you have any to suggest. My webmaster says she will put this on-line this weekend. After that occurs, I'll pass the word so that those who choose can provide linkage on their web sites.

Keep up all of your good work,
Howard

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

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

A new section on "Disarming Iraq" on How to Get to Zero Page

It is at the bottom of the page after "Deep Cuts" (which should replace "Reductions Approaching Zero". It is as follows:

(italics in brown box)

Steps toward Zero Nuclear Weapons

[following in bold, italic, on right margin]

- ***Disarming Iraq without War***
Statements of Religious Organizations *[linkage to below]*
Articles and Reports *[linkage to below]*

[graphic: map of Middle East with Iraq in center and highlighted; identify neighborhood states]

[italics] Nuclear non-proliferation is an important aspect of achieving zero nuclear weapons. One of the contemporary challenges is how to stop Iraq from developing nuclear weapons. There is also a need to contain and eliminate other weapons of mass destruction (WMD) -- chemical and biological -- that Iraq appears to possess.

[begin box]

[bold, italics, 16 pt] Statements of Religious Organizations

A variety of religious organizations have spoken in opposition to war against Iraq. We present references to their statements and resolutions.

American Friends Service Committee

Conflict with Iraq: Policy Gone Awry [<http://www.afsc.org/iraq/Default.htm>]

Catholic Church: The Holy See

Vatican Urges U.S. to Seek U.N. Approval on Iraq [<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A5543-2002Sep11.html>]

Church of the Brethren

Iraq: What's a Christian to Do [<http://www.brethren.org/genbd/witness/Iraq.htm>]

Preventing the Second Gulf War [<http://www.brethren.org/genbd/witness/Iraq.htm>]

Churches for Middle East Peace

Letter to President George W. Bush to Reconsider Iraq Invasion, September 12, 2002

[<http://www.cmep.org/iraqletter.htm>] Signed by 48 Protestant Orthodox, Catholic, Evangelical leaders

Episcopal Church

Presiding Bishop Frank T. Griswold's Statement on Military Action Against Iraq, September 6, 2002 [<http://www.episcopalchurch.org/presiding-bishop/>]

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

ELCA President Bishop Mark S. Hanson's Statement on Iraq Situation, August 30, 2002
[<http://www.elca.org/bishop/iraq.html>]

Fellowship of Reconciliation, USA

No War with Iraq! [http://www.forusa.org/News/FOR_Statement_081602.html]

Friends Committee for National Legislation

Letter to Congress: Oppose unilateral, preemptive U.S. military attack against Iraq, September 12, 2002 [http://www.fcnl.org/issues/int/sup/iraq_volk_ltr912-02.htm]
Statements from Quaker meetings on U.S.-Iraq relations
[<http://www.fcnl.org/issues/int/iraindx.htm#sta>]

Mennonite Central Committee

Threats of War [<http://www.mcc.org/areaserv/middleeast/iraq/index.html>]

Mennonite Church USA

Letter to President Bush, August 27, 2000
[<http://peace.mennolink.org/resources/iraq5000/schragletter.pdf>]

Pax Christi, USA

Iraq Peace Pledge/Iraq Pledge of Resistance
[http://www.paxchristiusa.org/news_events_more.asp?id=263]

Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

Church leaders sign statement opposing military action against Iraq
[<http://www.pcusa.org/pcnews/02349.htm>]
Church is preparing material on Iraq [<http://www.pcusa.org/pcnews/index.htm>]

Reformed Church in America

Action Alert: Possible U.S. Military Action Against Iraq, August 2002
[<http://www.rca.org/churchlife/advocate/iraq0802.html>]

United Church of Christ

Oppose War in Iraq, September 4, 2002 [<http://www.ucc.org/justice/action/w090402.htm>]

United Kingdom Statement by Christian Leaders

The Morality and Legality of War against Iraq - A Christian Declaration, August 6, 2002
[<http://www.paxchristi.org.uk/press.HTML>]

United Methodist General Board of Church and Society

Bush Urged to Turn Back from War, August 30, 2002 [<http://www.umc-gbcs.org/gbpr170.htm>]

United Methodist Women's Division

Statement on Iraq, September 4, 2002 [http://gbgm-umc.org/umw/statement_iraq.html]

World Council of Churches

Stop the Rush to War, August 29, 2002. [<http://www.ucc.org/news/r090302.htm>] Signed by 37 Christians leaders from Canada, Great Britain, and the United States.
[end box]

back to top

[new box]

[bold, italics, 14 pt] ***Articles and Reports on Alternatives to War against Iraq***
We list articles and reports that offer ideas on how to deal with Iraq's weapons of mass destruction without going to war. We present them as a contribution to public discussion without necessarily endorsing particular recommendations.

Arms Control Association

Documents, News, and Analysis on the Task of Disarming Iraq

[<http://www.armscontrol.org/country/iraq/>]

Disarming Iraq: Nonmilitary Strategies and Options

[http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002_09/cortright_lopez_sept02.asp] by David Cortright and George A. Lopez. September 2002

The Task of Disarming Iraq [http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002_09/foc_sept02.asp] by Daryl Kimball. September 2002.

The Case for Iraq's Qualitative Disarmament

[http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2000_06/iraqjun.asp] by Scott Ritter. June 2000.

The Lessons and Legacy of UNSCOM. [http://www.armscontrol.org/act/1999_06/rbjun99.asp]

An interview with Ambassador Richard Butler. June 1999.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Non-Proliferation Project

Iraq's WMD Arsenal: Deadly But Limited

[<http://www.ceip.org/files/nonprolif/templates/Publications.asp?p=8&PublicationID=1050>]

Center for Defense Information

Eye on Iraq [<http://www.cdi.org/terrorism/eye-on-iraq.cfm>]

Education for Peace in Iraq Center (EPIC)

About the Crisis in Iraq [<http://epic-usa.org/thecrisis/>]

Fourth Freedom Forum

Sanctions, Inspection, and Containment: Viable Policy Options in Iraq

[<http://www.fourthfreedom.org/php/t-si-index.php?hinc=SecondIraq.hinc>]

Exploring Options for the Nonviolent Resolution of International Conflict

[<http://www.fourthfreedom.org/index.php>]

Friends Committee on National Legislation

U.S.-Iraq Relations [http://www.fcnl.org/hottopics_index.htm#usi]

Intervening in Iraq [http://www.fcnl.org/issues/int/sup/iraq_dan-smith.htm]

Unwrapping Tony Blair. [http://www.fcnl.org/issues/int/sup/iraq_tony-blair.htm]

Institute for Policy Studies

Seven Reasons to Oppose a U.S. Invasion of Iraq [<http://www.fpif.org/papers/iraq2.html>]

**Monterey Institute of International Studies, Chemical and Biological Weapons
Nonproliferation Program**

IRAQ:Nuclear, Biological, Chemical, and Missile Capabilities and Programs

[<http://cns.miis.edu/research/wmdme/iraq.htm>]

Sojourners

With Weapons of the Will: How to Topple Saddam Hussein -- nonviolently

[<http://www.sojo.net/magazine/index.cfm/action/sojourners/issue/soj0209/article/020910.html>]

by Peter Aclerman and Jack DuVall

[end box]

back to top

Status: U

Return-Path: <egbert14pj@yahoo.com>

Received: from web11107.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.131.154])

by tyner.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17QfRe5Se3NI3rs0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Sat, 14 Sep 2002 12:33:20 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020914163320.63027.qmail@web11107.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [216.193.55.24] by web11107.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Sat, 14 Sep 2002 09:33:20 PDT

Date: Sat, 14 Sep 2002 09:33:20 -0700 (PDT)

From: Egbert Lawrence <egbert14pj@yahoo.com>

Subject: Response from Larry Egbert: [interfaithnd] ICND meeting for September 17 is cancelled

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

In-Reply-To: <003c01c25b4a\$4b3d20c0\$065df7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Thanks, Howard, for the note. However, I did not know of an interfaith meeting about the war plans for Iraq. Where is it meeting? Same place and same place?

See you.

Larry

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

> Dear Colleagues:

>

> I am canceling the meeting of the Interfaith

> Committee for Nuclear

> Disarmament, scheduled for Tuesday, September 17 at

> 1:30 p.m. This is

> because a faith community working group on Iraq

> wants to meet at that time.

> It will draw many of the same people. Opposing war

> against Iraq is now the

> pre-eminent issue, so I want to yield to this

> initiative. Nuclear

> disarmament remains important, but there is only so

> much time and energy.

> Anyway dealing with a proliferator is an aspect of

> nuclear disarmament.

>

> As a contribution to the Iraq campaign, I am

> developing a section for

> www.zero-nukes.org on "Disarming Iraq without War".

> It will contain a

> compilation of statements by religious organizations

> and a listing of

> articles and reports on alternatives to war. When

> it is on line, I'll let

> you know so that you can link to it.

>

> Next week I'll write a memo on what we might be

> doing to continue our

> efforts on nuclear disarmament, especially dealing

> with the retrogressive

> policies of the Bush Administration. We had on our
> agenda for Tuesday a
> discussion of the Urgent Call, which Rich Killmer is
> working on. He will
> continue to be in touch with you on this project.

>
> Shalom,
> Howard

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

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

>
>
>

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! News - Today's headlines
<http://news.yahoo.com>

Status: U

Return-Path: <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>

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

by osgood.mail.atl.earthlink.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17QgmK74w3Nl3pt0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Sat, 14 Sep 2002 13:05:54 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020914170553.37828.qmail@web11108.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [216.193.55.24] by web11108.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Sat, 14 Sep 2002 10:05:53 PDT

Date: Sat, 14 Sep 2002 10:05:53 -0700 (PDT)

From: Egbert Lawrence <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: Larry Egbert attending meeting of WISC on September 17

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

In-Reply-To: <001001c25c0f\$f0b2a6e0\$6b6cf7a5@default>

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Howard,

Yes, I will plan on attending if that is OK. I would really appreciate the info about the session if you can send it to me.

Thanks again. Larry

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

> Larry,

>

> WISC (Washington Interagency Staff Council) had a meeting on Thursday to

> discuss the faith community's response to the Iraq crisis. They decided

> to focus actions for the week of September 23 and

> for October 10 and 11.

> They formed a task group for each. The latter chose

> September 17 as a

> meeting date in the conference room of the National

> Council of Churches, 110

> Maryland Avenue, NE. Presumably the meeting is open

> if you or another

> Unitarian wants to attend. It starts at 1:30 p.m.

>

> If you want to attend, I can share any information

> sent out in advance.

>

> Howard

>

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

> From: "Egbert Lawrence" <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>

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

> Sent: Saturday, September 14, 2002 12:33 PM

> Subject: Response from Larry Egbert: [interfaithnd]

> ICND meeting for

> September 17 is cancelled

>

>

>> Thanks, Howard, for the note. However, I did not

>> know of an interfaith meeting about the war

> plans
> > for Iraq. Where is it meeting? Same place and
> same
> > place?
> > See you.
> > Larry
> >
>

Do you Yahoo!?
Yahoo! News - Today's headlines
<http://news.yahoo.com>

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Egbert Lawrence" <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>
References: <20020914163320.63027.qmail@web11107.mail.yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Response from Larry Egbert: [interfaithnd] ICND meeting for September 17 is cancelled
Date: Sat, 14 Sep 2002 12:58:06 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Larry,

WISC (Washington Interagency Staff Council) had a meeting on Thursday to discuss the faith community's response to the Iraq crisis. They decided to focus actions for the week of September 23 and for October 10 and 11. They formed a task group for each. The latter chose September 17 as a meeting date in the conference room of the National Council of Churches, 110 Maryland Avenue, NE. Presumably the meeting is open if you or another Unitarian wants to attend. It starts at 1:30 p.m.

If you want to attend, I can share any information sent out in advance.

Howard

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

From: "Egbert Lawrence" <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Sent: Saturday, September 14, 2002 12:33 PM
Subject: Response from Larry Egbert: [interfaithnd] ICND meeting for September 17 is cancelled

> Thanks, Howard, for the note. However, I did not
> know of an interfaith meeting about the war plans
> for Iraq. Where is it meeting? Same place and same
> place?
> See you.
> Larry
>

Status: U

Return-Path: <forsberg@ids.org>

Received: from ids.org ([208.234.0.50])

by nils.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17QC5MiQ3Nl3pm0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Sun, 15 Sep 2002 12:17:50 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from [192.168.2.103] (h002078c6b011.ne.client2.attbi.com [66.30.30.212])

by ids.org (8.8.8/8.8.5) with ESMTP id MAA03276
for <mupj@igc.org>; Sun, 15 Sep 2002 12:17:48 -0400

Mime-Version: 1.0

Message-Id: <p05111b01b9aa633f605a@[192.168.2.103]>

Date: Sun, 15 Sep 2002 12:20:17 -0400

To: mupj@igc.org

From: Randall Forsberg <forsberg@ids.org>

Subject: Fwd: lunch meeting invitation

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="===== _-1180015676==_ma=====

--===== _-1180015676==_ma=====

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

Dear Howard,

I sent this invitation last week, and have not heard back from you. So I rechecked the email address, and believe that I had it wrong. I'm sorry it is coming so late, but I hope that you will be able to joining us for a lunch meeting on Tuesday, at Alistair Millar's office (Dupont Circle), 11-1.

Yours,
Randy

>Date: Mon, 9 Sep 2002 14:54:53 -0400

>To: Howard Hallman <mujp@igc.org>

>From: Randall Forsberg <forsberg@ids.org>

>Subject: Invitation

>Cc:

>Bcc:

>X-Attachments:

>

>Dear Howard,

>

>To date, we have gathered about 6000 signers of the Urgent Call to
>end the Nuclear Danger, of which about 4500 have email addresses. We
>are now planning new outreach efforts which I hope you will want to
>join, along with the Methodists United for Peace and Justice, and
>the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

>

>I would like to invite you to meet with me and Alistair Millar at
>the Stimson Center, 11 Dupont Circle, 9th Fl (202-393-5201), on
>Tuesday, 17 September, 11 am to 1 pm (lunch included), to discuss two
>new Urgent Call initiatives:

>

>First, we want to invite the two groups that you help lead or
>represent to become an UrgentCall.org coalition partners with
>membership and funding benefits. Let me explain.

>
>The main goal of UrgentCall.org is to recruit 1 million signers who
>give tax-deductible donations averaging \$10 each to fund national
>issue advertising that makes nuclear disarmament a prominent issue
>in the 2004 elections. Since nuclear policy is an Achilles heal for
>the administration, we plan to use the issue advertising to foster
>serious national debate not just on nuclear policy but on a broader
>range of peace and disarmament issues.

>
>To reach the goal of 1 million donor-signers, we are asking signers
>to participate in our '10/10/10 campaign': sign up 10 friends,
>contribute \$10/year, and take 10 other actions (letter writing,
>petitioning, etc) over 2002-2004.

>
>We hope that all national groups working for peace and disarmament
>will actively support the Urgent Call's goal of national issue
>advertising in 2004 by encouraging your members to join our 10/10/10
>campaign and to persuade 10 friends or family members who are not
>already activists to sign the Urgent Call.

>
>At the same time, to make sure that the 10/10/10 campaign strenthens
>other on-going efforts for nuclear disarmament, we have adapted the
>UrgentCall.org site to provide the following benefits for coalition
>partners:

>
>1. Contact information for potential members/donors: In our sign-up
>form, we now have a source field, "How did you hear about the Urgent
>Call?" which is filled in by 90 percent of signers. We also offer a
>web link which automatically inserts your group's name in the source
>field for any signer that comes to UrgentCall.org from your web
>site. With the help of these features, we can track all signers who
>are 'associated' with a coalition partner because they were referred
>to us by the partner's web site, by the partner's members, or by
>petitions gathered by members, as well as signers who list any group
>in our "organization affiliation" field. Every month, we will send
>each coalition partner a file with the names and contact information
>of all Urgent Call signers who are associated or affiliated with
>that group.

>
>2. Funding: Coalition partners that put the new UrgentCall link on
>their home page will receive 10 percent of the donations made now
>and in the future by signers affiliated or associated with that
>organization, to support their work for nuclear disarmament. We will
>send each coalition partner a check every month, along with a list
>of the donors whose donations are being shared, as well as all other
>signers recruited by the partner's web site, events, literature,
>emails, or members.

>
>3. Membership outreach: In several places on the UrgentCall.org
>site, we encourage signers who are not already members of a peace
>group to review thumbnail sketches we provide for coalition partners
>(based on information given on your web site) and join one or two
>congenial groups, nationally or locally or both. We have already
>posted sketches and links for many groups and will be adding other

>coalition partners.

>

>It would be great if the Methodists United and the Interfaith
>Committee became UrgentCall.org coalition partners, put our new link
>on their home pages (or the pages of participating groups), and
>urged all their members and coalition partners to sign and to
>recruit new people to sign -- who will also become potential new
>affiliates or supporters for them. In addition, we will consult
>with coalition partners about the actions relating to nuclear
>disarmament to be recommended to 10/10/10 signers over the course of
>2002-2004

>

>Second, as one of our first actions, we want to invite Methodists
>United and the Interfaith Committee to join us and other groups in
>co-sponsoring a call for nationwide campus, church, and
>community-based teach-ins that will cover four topics: nuclear
>weapons, Iraq, civil liberties, and military spending. (Other
>groups we are asking to co-sponsor the teach-ins and provide
>speakers and literature for them are listed below.)

>

>The UrgentCall.org co-chairs -- David Cortright, Alistair Millar,
>Jonathan Schell and I -- are preparing new material for our web site
>stressing that US support for the steps toward global nuclear
>disarmament included in the Urgent Call, along with other
>nonmilitary means, offer the best way to prevent Iraq from acquiring
>nuclear weapons. These steps would also reduce US military spending,
>strengthen international support for the rule of law, and help end
>terrorism without destroying lives and economies abroad or
>threatening civil liberties at home. At this juncture it is
>essential not only oppose war in Iraq but also to underscore that
>arms control agreements and the rule of law offer far better ways to
>prevent proliferation, terrorism, and end the "war at home"--and we
>believe that most groups working for peace and disarmament will want
>to make these connections.

>

>I would be grateful if you would email or call me to let me know
>what you think about these Urgent Call initiatives, and whether you
>will be able to join us on September 17th, You are welcome to bring
>other staff members who work on matters related to the meeting's
>agenda, which is as follows:

>(1) Introduction and discussion of the UrgentCall.org coalition
>partner program
>(2) Update on UrgentCall.org progress, planned outreach to the
>religious and academic communities, and brainstorming on other ways
>to recruit a million signer-donors
>(3) Jointly sponsoring a call for teach-ins on nuclear
>weapons/disarmament, Iraq, military spending, and civil liberties.

>

>I very much hope that your groups will become UrgentCall.org
>coalition partners and support the jointly-sponsored call for
>multi-issue teach-ins -- and that you will be able to join us on the
>17th.

>

>Yours,

>
>Randy
>
>
>Randall Caroline Forsberg, PhD, Director
>UrgentCall.org/Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies
>675 Massachusetts Ave, Cambridge MA 02139
>Tel: 617-354-4337, Fax: 617-354-1450
>Email: forsberg@urgentcall.org, Web site: www.urgentcall.org
>
>
>Organizations supporting UrgentCall.org and other DC-based groups
>invited to participate in the meeting on the 17th:
>20/20 Vision
>Alliance for Nuclear Accountability
>Americans for Democratic Action
>American Friends Service Committee
>Arms Control Association
>Back from the Brink
>British American Security Information Council
>Center for Defense Information
>Council for a Livable World
>Interfaith Committee on Nuclear Disarmament
>Friends Committee on National Legislation
>Methodists United for Peace and Justice
>Nuclear Reductions/Disarmament Initiative
>Peace Action
>Physicians for Social Responsibility
>Psychologists for Social Responsibility
>Sojourners
>Union of Concerned Scientists
>Veterans for Peace
>VVAF Nuclear Threat Reduction Campaign
>Women's Action for New Directions
>Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
>World Federalist Association
>
>Organizations to be invited to similar meetings in NY or Boston:
>War Resisters League
>Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy
>Alliance for Democracy
>Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities
>Fellowship of Reconciliation
>Global Security Institute
>
>Organizations to receive a separate initial appeal to support the Urgent Call:
>Grandmothers for Peace
>Gray Panthers
>Green Party USA
>Lawyers Alliance for World Security
>Sierra Club
>Network
>Pax Christi
>

>Memo on Outreach and Fundraising Support for Urgent Call Coalition Partners

>

>The main goal of UrgentCall.org -- the Urgent Call to End the
>Nuclear Danger -- is to recruit 1 million signers who give
>tax-deductible donations averaging \$10 each to fund national issue
>advertising that makes nuclear disarmament a key issue in the 2004
>presidential and congressional elections.

>

>To encourage national groups to help meet this goal and, at the same
>time, use the Urgent Call appeal to strengthen their own outreach
>and fundraising efforts, we have redesigned the UrgentCall.org
>web site to offer several types of feedback and support to
>UrgentCall.org coalition partners:

>

>1. Contact information for potential members/donors: To help
>coalition partners recruit new members and donors, we now offer a
>web link from your web site to UrgentCall.org which will
>automatically record your group as the source (that is, the response
>to the question "How did you hear about the Urgent Call?") in our
>record for a new signer. If people go to your web site and then
>link to ours and sign the Urgent Call, we will know they came from
>your site. Of course, many such signers may already be on your
>mailing list -- but some are likely to be new people who have been
>surfing the web for nuclear disarmament sites, or referred to your
>web site by friends or by local actions.

>

>This is the new link: <http://www.urgentcall.org/php/petition.php?partner=>

>

>You just fill in a brief version of the name of your group after the
>equal sign and whatever you put will appear as the source for that
>person in our database. At the same time, email the name you insert
>and your full contact information to forsberg@urgentcall.org.

>

>The source field is filled in automatically if a signer goes to our
>site through an UrgentCall link on another site. Otherwise, the
>signer enters the information. If your group's members ask friends
>who are not members to sign the Urgent Call, and if new signers
>respond to the question "How did you hear about the Urgent Call?" by
>saying "Friend in [fill in the name of your group]", we will treat
>those names as referred by and 'associated with' your organization.

>

>Then once a month we will mail your membership staff person the full
>contact information for all signers associated with your
>organization any of the following ways:

>-- The signer clicks on the UrgentCall.org link on your web site, and
>your organization is automatically inserted into the source field;
>-- The signer mentions your group in the source field, for example,
>citing a group newsletter or action alert, or contact from a friend
>who is a member of your group; or
>-- The signer lists your group in the field for organization affiliation.

>

>This means that your members can use the Urgent Call appeal to
>identify potential new members for your organization. If your
>members recruit new people to sign the Urgent Call, you can follow

>up their signing with a letter or email from the national or local
>office asking them to join your group, or to make a contribution;
>and they can stay on a national or local outreach list for potential
>fundraising or action until they have become full-fledged members
>Since individuals who sign the Urgent Call are likely to support
>your program, this is an easy form of outreach. And it means that
>members who encourage others to sign the Urgent Call also
>automatically helping with your own membership outreach and funding
>potential.

>
>2. Funding: For groups that actively participate in the Urgent Call
>campaign by putting our new link on your home page, UrgentCall.org
>will give you 10 percent of donations made by associated signers
>(signers referred by your web site, your members, or your
>activities, and signers affiliated with your group) provided that
>your group is a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization. We will tally
>shares and send checks once a month, along with the list of all
>donors and other associated and affiliated signers for that month.

>
>3. Membership outreach: We have invested a good deal of time in
>creating special pages on our web site for national groups working
>on nuclear disarmament. Our Signers by State page gives contact
>information arranged by zip code for all local chapters of groups
>with chapters (those that have endorsed the Urgent Call shown with a
>star) which we have been able to identify from national and local
>web sites. In addition, our Local Action-Guide to Groups page
>offers a thumbnail sketch of each national group's history, values,
>and program, along with a link and, for groups with chapters, a
>complete list of all the local chapters. The purpose of this part of
>our web site, which we stress in several other parts, is to
>encourage signers who are not already active in any national group
>to look over the range of groups and join one or two that they find
>particularly congenial. In addition, we make it easy for such
>individuals to identify groups that have local chapters where they
>live, to join or work with.

>
>Sept 2002

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Kayser, Marie" <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Subject: Corrections to additions to Religious Statements
Date: Mon, 16 Sep 2002 06:13:19 -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,

Please make the following corrections to the additions to Religious Statements page regarding "Religious Perspective on Nuclear Issues". This has lower prior than the material on Iraq.

A. Index at top of page.

1. I don't want the denominations, civil sector listed under "Nuclear Posture Review". Just provide linkage to where the text of this section begins.

2. I've decided to list other issues where we have pulled out religious statements on other pages. Therefore, this section of the index should be like this:

RELIGIOUS PERSPECTIVE ON NUCLEAR ISSUES

? De-alerting [<http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero.html#dealerting>]
? Moscow Treaty of 2002
[<http://www.zero-nukes.org/arsenalsandtreaties.html#moscows2002>]
? Nuclear Posture Review (U.S.A.) [linkage on Religious Statements page to be added]

B. Text of section on Nuclear Posture Review (U.S.A.)

1. In the sub-index at the beginning (under the brown box), provide linkage for each item.

2. Move "NPR" to inside box where text begins: "On January 8, 2002....."

3. Under "Sizing the Nuclear Force", the following words should be in bold:

Operationally deployed force
Responsive force
Preplanning

4. In the section that begins, "This fuller revelation.....", the three Comment paragraphs should be italics.

5. Where "Faith Perspective" begins, don't repeat brown box with "Faith Perspective on Nuclear Issues". Instead put inside the box:

a. "Faith Perspective on Nuclear Posture Review" in 14 or 16 pt. type

without a bullet.

b. Also the dove and "Nuclear Weapons A Moral Issue"

c. Thus the short paragraph -- "A variety of religious organizations...." -- might be on the right of the dove.

6. Under Holy See I provided the wrong linkage for "There Has Been Regression". It is:

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

7. Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. You missed the underlining and linkage.

8. Presbyterian Church. Remove the word "[underline]".

9. United Church of Christ.

a. You missed the underlining. I'm still seeking a link.

b. Can you adjust the right margins so that they aren't so ragged?

10. Civil Sector Perspective. Please add "to Nuclear Posture Review" to heading.

11. Center for Defense Information. I provided the wrong linkage. It should be:

<http://www.cdi.org/nuclear/time-warp.cfm>

12. In the past paragraph, underline "Resources on the Nuclear Posture Review" and provide linkage.

Thanks,
Howard

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <joe@fcnl.org>,
<J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org>,
<glaszakovits_gb@brethren.org>
Subject: Coercive inspections for Iraq
Date: Mon, 16 Sep 2002 09:47:59 -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 Joe, Daryl, and Greg,

Jessica Mathews of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has proposed coercive or armed inspections for Iraq. (See <http://www.ceip.org/files/publications/iraq/mathews.htm>.) Rolf Ekeus spoke favorable of this approach in an Outlook article in the Washington Post, Sunday, September 15. I'm skeptical.

I'm wondering what you think of it from the perspective of the peace churches. It would be useful to have your ideas for our current discussion.

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: "Randall Forsberg" forsberg@idds.org
References: [p05111b01b9aa633f605a@\[192.168.2.103\]](#)
Subject: Re: lunch meeting invitation
Date: Mon, 16 Sep 2002 09:49:15 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="-----
=_NextPart_000_000F_01C25D66.51B41940"
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

Randy,

I'm scheduled to play senior softball Tuesday morning, but I'll skip it and come to your meeting.

Howard

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <jdi@clw.org>,
<srobinson@armscontrolcenter.org>
Subject: Publicizing our new web site
Date: Mon, 16 Sep 2002 10:32:41 -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

Would you please do me the favor of sending out the following announcement about our new site, www.zero-nukes.org, to the e-list of the Nuclear Policy Task Force.

Thanks,
Howard

###

Dear Colleagues:

I am pleased to announce that the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, has created a new web site, www.zero-nukes.org. I invite you to visit the site, draw on its information, and use it to participate in dialogue on how to get to zero nuclear weapons.

The web site has these major pages:

- * Religious Statements
- * Military Leaders Speak Out
- * Civil Sector Statements
- * Arsenal & Treaties
- * How to Get to Zero
- * Your Feedback

The Civil Sector Statements page, which is still being developed, will provide linkage with many of the organizations participating in the Nuclear Policy Task Force. Some linkage is now in place for Arsenal & Treaties and a de-alerting section of How to Get to Zero.

How to Get to Zero is intended to provide discussion of scenarios on how to eliminate all nuclear weapons. We invite you to submit your ideas and offer comments on the ideas of others. This process is explained at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/yourfeedback.html>. You can also send your evaluation of zero-nukes.org from the Your Feedback page.

We hope this new web site will strengthen the ties between the religious and civil sector communities in our common quest for eliminating nuclear weapons.

Shalom,
Howard W. Hallman

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

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

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <acurtis@networklobby.org>
Subject: ICND meeting canceled
Date: Mon, 16 Sep 2002 10:48:33 -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

The meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament scheduled for Tuesday, September 17 at 1:30 p.m has been canceled due to a conflicting meeting of an Iraq working group that involves many of the same people. As important as broad nuclear disarmament is, the effort to oppose war against Iraq deserves higher priority.

Howard

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

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

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
References: <20020917180105.9678.qmail@web13908.mail.yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Corrections to additions to Religious Statements
Date: Tue, 17 Sep 2002 17:16:31 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_002E_01C25E6D.F762F8E0"
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_002E_01C25E6D.F762F8E0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Marie,

Go to Religious Statements. Scroll down in index where you already have =
Religious Perspective on Nuclear Issues. This is an amendment to that =
part of the index. The first two linkages are to other pages on our web =
site. The third is to where the section on Nuclear Posture Review =
appears toward the bottom of the Religious Statements page. Each of the =
three entrees should have a bullet.=20

While you are making adjustments, it would be visually helpful to add a =
space before Religious Perspective on Nuclear Issues.

How do you find out how many user the site has had?

Howard

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

From: Marie Kayser=20

To: Howard W. Hallman=20

Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2002 2:01 PM

Subject: Re: Corrections to additions to Religious Statements

Howard,=20

I have made the changes but I have been having difficulty logging in =
to the site. It is telling me that the site currently has 60 users! =20

As soon as I am able to log-in, I will send over the corrected files. =
See comments below:=20

NOT SURE WHERE TO FIND THIS?
RELIGIOUS PERSPECTIVE ON NUCLEAR ISSUES

? De-alerting =
[<http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero.html#dealerting>]
? Moscow Treaty of 2002
=
[<http://www.zero-nukes.org/arsenalsandtreaties.html#moscowtreatyof2002>]
? Nuclear Posture Review (U.S.A.) [linkage on Religious Statements =
page to
be added]

Thanks,
Marie

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
References: <20020917180105.9678.qmail@web13908.mail.yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: Corrections to additions to Religious Statements
Date: Tue, 17 Sep 2002 17:16:31 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_002E_01C25E6D.F762F8E0"
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_002E_01C25E6D.F762F8E0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Marie,

Go to Religious Statements. Scroll down in index where you already have =
Religious Perspective on Nuclear Issues. This is an amendment to that =
part of the index. The first two linkages are to other pages on our web =
site. The third is to where the section on Nuclear Posture Review =
appears toward the bottom of the Religious Statements page. Each of the =
three entrees should have a bullet.=20

While you are making adjustments, it would be visually helpful to add a =
space before Religious Perspective on Nuclear Issues.

How do you find out how many user the site has had?

Howard

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

From: Marie Kayser=20

To: Howard W. Hallman=20

Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2002 2:01 PM

Subject: Re: Corrections to additions to Religious Statements

Howard,=20

I have made the changes but I have been having difficulty logging in =
to the site. It is telling me that the site currently has 60 users! =20

As soon as I am able to log-in, I will send over the corrected files. =
See comments below:=20

NOT SURE WHERE TO FIND THIS?
RELIGIOUS PERSPECTIVE ON NUCLEAR ISSUES

? De-alerting =
[<http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero.html#dealerting>]
? Moscow Treaty of 2002
=
[<http://www.zero-nukes.org/arsenalsandtreaties.html#moscowtreatyof2002>]
? Nuclear Posture Review (U.S.A.) [linkage on Religious Statements =
page to
be added]

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: Corrections on Iraq
Date: Tue, 17 Sep 2002 22:09:55 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Marie,

For all the items in Disarming Iraq, there are very few errors, mostly mine.

To make corrections, go to How to Get to Zero page, then Disarming Iraq.

Under Statements of Religious Organizations

Church of the Brethren

Preventing the Second Gulf War. The correct URL is:
<http://www.brethren.org/genbd/washofc/IraqUpdate.htm>

Mennonite Church USA
The correct year is 2002.

Presbyterian Church (USA)

Church is preparing material on Iraq. The correct URL is:
<http://www.pcusa.org/pcnews/02348.htm>

Under Articles and Reports

Fourth Freedom Forum

Sanctions..... For URL add a "c" so that final element is "hinc"

Sojourners

I received an error message. The correct URL, which worked for me, is:
<http://www.sojo.net/magazine/index.cfm/action/sojourners/issue/soj0209/article/020910.html>

This section has very useful information for contemporary use.

Thanks,
Howard

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Statements on Iraq
Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 10:43:16 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Dear John,

I have added a section on "Disarming Iraq without War" to the web site of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. It is described below. I would appreciate your forwarding this information to the e-list of the Nuclear Policy Task Force. Also, I'm hoping that you will send them my previous message about this new web site.

Thanks for your cooperation,
Howard

###

Dear Colleagues:

As a service to the faith community and others, I have created a section on "Disarming Iraq without War" on www.zero-nukes.org, the web site of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament . It contains a compilation of (1) statements by religious organizations opposing war against Iraq and (2) articles and reports on alternatives to war. . It is found at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero.html#disarmingiraq>

You may want to provide linkage on your web site. One possible entree could be:

Disarming Iraq without War
[<http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero.html#disarmingiraq>]
Statements by religious organizations and proposals for alternative approaches.

Or whatever you choose.

As you look at the site, please let me know of any errors and additional statements and articles that should be posted.

Shalom
Howard

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

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

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <lisaw@nccusa.org>
Subject: WISC list
Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 13:56:00 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Lisa,

Could I be added to the WISC e-mail list? This will make it easier for me to be in the loop to participate in meetings on issues I am dealing with and might have a contribution to make. For instance, I heard about last Thursday's meeting on Iraq only second hand.

Thanks,
Howard

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

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

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <johnburroughs@lcnp.org>
Subject: Our new web site
Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 16:59:34 -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

Dear John,

Even as Iraq is receiving the world's attention for its possible possession of weapons of mass destruction, the huge nuclear arsenals of the United States and Russia and the lesser arsenals of other known possessors remain a major concern for the peace and security of Earth. In spite of being a step in the right direction, the Moscow Treaty of 2002 retains so many U.S. and Russian strategic warheads that in practice the Cold War doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD) remains in place.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, is convinced that the world can do better. Accordingly we have established a new web site called www.zero-nukes.org. It has two purposes: (1) provide a source for statements on nuclear disarmament by religious organizations, military leaders, civil sector organizations, commissions and international bodies; and (2) offer opportunity for presentation of proposals and dialogue on how to get to zero nuclear weapons.

If you visit the site, you will find that we have provide linkage to the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention (and I'm thinking about extracting the schedule for phased elimination). When I finish the Civil Statements page, I will have more on the Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy.

We invite you to contribute to the dialogue on nuclear disarmament by writing a short article on your current thinking about concrete steps required to eliminate nuclear weapons. Your scenario might go to zero or only approach zero if you don't see how to go all the way. You might deal with stages of reduction, categories of weapons, priorities for action, methods of verification, or however you want to address the issue.

We are suggesting an article around 2,000 words, but we will accept less and more. We will post your article on the site at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero.html#scenarios>. We are unable to provide compensation, but we hope that you will be willing to contribute your ideas to this forum for public discussion.

You can send your submission to me at proposal@zero-nukes.org. It would be helpful to receive the article as a Word attachment or equivalent.

If you want to comment on the views of others, you can do so at
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/yourfeedback.html#comments>.

Thank you for your cooperation,

Howard

P.S. I'm working on an idea for a model "START IV" and will write you separately about this.

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: <granoff@gsinstitute.org>
Subject: Our new web site
Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 17:24:49 -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 Jonathan,

Even as Iraq is receiving the world's attention for its possible possession of weapons of mass destruction, the huge nuclear arsenals of the United States and Russia and the lesser arsenals of other known possessors remain a major concern for the peace and security of Earth. In spite of being a step in the right direction, the Moscow Treaty of 2002 retains so many U.S. and Russian strategic warheads that in practice the Cold War doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD) remains in place.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, is convinced that the world can do better. Accordingly we have established a new web site called www.zero-nukes.org. It has two purposes: (1) provide a source for statements on nuclear disarmament by religious organizations, military leaders, civil sector organizations, commissions and international bodies; and (2) offer opportunity for presentation of proposals and dialogue on how to get to zero nuclear weapons.

If you visit the site, you will find that we have drawn on the Global Security Institute for the statement of international generals and admirals, the statement from the 1999 Parliament of World's Religions, and your views on the Nuclear Posture Review. When I finish constructing the Civil Sector Statements page, we will include reference to the civilian leaders' statement, the Middle Powers Initiative, and more about the Global Security Institute.

We invite you to contribute to the dialogue on nuclear disarmament by writing a short article on your current thinking about concrete steps required to eliminate nuclear weapons. Your scenario might go to zero or only approach zero if you don't see how to go all the way. You might deal with stages of reduction, categories of weapons, priorities for action, methods of verification, or however you want to address the issue.

We are suggesting an article around 2,000 words, but we will accept less and more. We will post your article on the site at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero.html#scenarios>. We are unable to provide compensation, but we hope that you will be willing to contribute your ideas to this forum for public discussion.

You can send your submission to me at proposal@zero-nukes.org. It would be helpful to receive the article as a Word attachment or equivalent.

If you want to comment on the views of others, you can do so at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/yourfeedback.html#comments>.

Lastly we want to invite retired military leaders to write similar articles. Would you be able to supply us with contact information for those who signed the 2000 Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament statement and the recent Reaffirmation?

Thank you for your cooperation,

Howard

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

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: <srobinson@clw.org>

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

by walker.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17RLRr2bby3Nl3s70
for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 18 Sep 2002 16:55:49 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from clw ([63.106.26.70]) by mail.clw.org (Post.Office MTA v3.5.3

release 223 ID# 0-57746U100L2S100V35) with SMTP id org;

Wed, 18 Sep 2002 16:46:00 -0400

Reply-To: <srobinson@armscontrolcenter.org>

From: "Stacie Robinson" <srobinson@armscontrolcenter.org>

To: <srobinson@armscontrolcenter.org>

Subject: Next meeting of Nuclear Policy Task Force meeting Friday, October 4

Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 16:56:52 -0400

Message-ID: <001801c25f55\$ea9223a0\$461a6a3f@clw.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 CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)

Importance: Normal

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2600.0000

The next Nuclear Policy Task Force meeting will be held on Friday, October
4, 9:30 - 11:00 AM, at Physicians for Social Responsibility, 1875
Connecticut Ave., NW Suite 1012.

Please send any additional agenda items to Stacie Robinson,
srobinson@armscontrolcenter.org

Topics to be discussed include:

- I. Missile defense
- II. Nuclear reductions
- III. New nuclear weapons
- IV. Iraq

Thanks,
Stacie

+ + + + +

Stacie Robinson
Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation
110 Maryland Ave., NE, Suite 201
Washington, DC 20002
Phone: (202) 546-0795 ext. 105

Status: U

Return-Path: <ANTHONY.P.ANDREWS@saic.com>

Received: from mclmx.mail.saic.com ([149.8.64.10])

by walker.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17RN1ffH3Nl3s71
for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 18 Sep 2002 18:10:01 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from mcl-its-ieg01.mail.saic.com by mclmx.mail.saic.com for mupj@igc.org; Wed, 18 Sep 2002 18:09:49 -0400

Received: from mcl-its-exig01.mail.saic.com ([149.8.64.12])

by mcl-its-ieg01.mail.saic.com (NAVGW 2.5.1.19) with SMTP id M2002091818094825415
; Wed, 18 Sep 2002 18:09:48 -0400

Received: by mcl-its-exig01.mail.saic.com with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
id <TFDGHZR9>; Wed, 18 Sep 2002 18:09:37 -0400

Message-Id: <D08E09E5E39ED311B01E00C00D0142FF022D2C67@arl-trg-exch01>

From: "Andrews, Anthony P." <ANTHONY.P.ANDREWS@saic.com>

To: 'Dwight O Smith' <dosmith6@juno.com>,

mcook221@mymailstation.com,

willnorth@aol.com,

gene.vincent@starpower.net,

holronfost@aol.com,

kiki@wizard.net,

jfnorth@aol.com,

jcm@duncanallen.com,

mupj@igc.org,

beverley@erols.com,

andrewsa@saic.com

Subject: September 4 2002 Outreach Committee Minutes

Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 18:11:07 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: text/plain

All - my apologies for the minutes taking weeks to draft.

Tony

Minutes of the Meeting of the Outreach Committee, BUMC

September 4, 2002

Members present: Dwight, Haven, Jeanne, Tony, Pat, Kerri, Gene, Marianne,
and Rev. Ron. The meeting was chaired by Dwight Smith.

Minutes from Previous Meetings

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

Mental Health and Homelessness series

Jeanne reviewed her plans for four sessions, the first three of which had invited speakers. The fourth meeting is to be a poster session, and material for that session is solicited. Kerri is to send an e-mail to our Stephen Ministry folks to elicit their participation. Flyers to advertise the poster session were discussed, these will be worked by Jeanne and Haven.

30th Anniversary CMMC dinner

A dinner is to be held 30 September as part of CMMC's 30th-anniversary activities. Additional attendees are invited; the cost is \$25. An announcement is available for anyone who is interested.

Support of the Community-Based Center in Rockville

Pat discussed the possibility of the committee taking on one or more days of food service at the center. This entails shopping, cooking, preparation of bag lunches, and service at dinner. Our last stint (a full week) proved to be quite an effort, and the center staff proved less than fully organized. As a result, some of the effort and expense went to waste. It was agreed that Pat would inquire with the current manager and assess the situation at present, and report back to the committee.

Volunteers in Mission

There was some discussion of a project in El Salvador, perhaps to rebuild a church there. The principals are David and Ron Stum. The overall funding source was not known, and any possible contribution to the effort by the committee would await additional information.

Matt Nealy concert of 13 September

Because of a concern expressed by Rev. Ron about the collection to be taken at the concert being sufficient to cover his fee and expenses, the committee discussed a contribution to that end. A motion passed to allocate up to \$300 to top-up the collection as required, against an estimated requirement of ~ \$600. Any expenditure was to be taken from the (soon to disappear) BFF budget. Kerri agreed to spur publicity for the event.

Other Business

Jeanne was given a flyer advocating that churches sponsor a "bread for the world" Sunday as a fundraising technique for a political and legal lobbying/advocacy group. (The flyer itself was unavailable at the meeting.) The committee agreed to pass the flyer along to Rev. Ron to get a first opinion; if favorable, the committee could then investigate and make a recommendation, or another committee might be asked to sponsor the activity.

Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting date was not fixed at this meeting

Prepared by: Tony Andrews

Status: U

Return-Path: <granoff@gsinstitute.org>

Received: from citrine.propagation.net ([209.164.121.1])

by hazard.mail.atl.earthlink.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17ROqyJhn3NI3qG0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 18 Sep 2002 19:40:14 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from vaio (pcp01345217pcs.lowmnrn01.pa.comcast.net [68.80.137.161])

by citrine.propagation.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id SAA03522;
Wed, 18 Sep 2002 18:40:06 -0500

Message-ID: <003001c25f6b\$f864f320\$0500a8c0@lowmnrn01.pa.comcast.net>

From: "Jonathan Granoff" <granoff@gsinstitute.org>

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

Cc: <jgg786@aol.com>

References: <008101c25f59\$d6e8bc20\$f857f7a5@default>

Subject: Re: Our new web site

Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 19:34:43 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Priority: 3

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

Congratulations on such excellent and timely work. I hope that every person
of God gets the message of peace. Sincerely, Jonathan

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

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

To: <granoff@gsinstitute.org>

Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2002 5:24 PM

Subject: Our new web site

> Dear Jonathan,

>

> Even as Iraq is receiving the world's attention for its possible
possession

> of weapons of mass destruction, the huge nuclear arsenals of the United

> States and Russia and the lesser arsenals of other known possessors remain

a

> major concern for the peace and security of Earth. In spite of being a
step

> in the right direction, the Moscow Treaty of 2002 retains so many U.S. and

> Russian strategic warheads that in practice the Cold War doctrine of
mutual

> assured destruction (MAD) remains in place.

>

> The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, is

> convinced that the world can do better. Accordingly we have established a

> new web

> site called www.zero-nukes.org. It has two purposes: (1) provide a
source

> for statements on nuclear disarmament by religious organizations, military

> leaders, civil sector organizations, commissions and international bodies;
> and (2) offer opportunity for presentation of proposals and dialogue on
how
> to get to zero nuclear weapons.
>
> If you visit the site, you will find that we have drawn on the Global
> Security Institute for the statement of international generals and
admirals,
> the statement from the 1999 Parliament of World's Religions, and your
views
> on the Nuclear Posture Review. When I finish constructing the Civil
Sector
> Statements page, we will include reference to the civilian leaders'
> statement, the Middle Powers Initiative, and more about the Global
Security
> Institute.
>
> We invite you to contribute to the dialogue on nuclear disarmament by
> writing a short article on your current thinking about concrete steps
> required to eliminate nuclear weapons. Your scenario might go to zero or
> only approach zero if you don't see how to go all the way. You might deal
> with stages of reduction, categories of weapons, priorities for action,
> methods of verification, or however you want to address the issue.
>
> We are suggesting an article around 2,000 words, but we will accept less
and
> more. We will post your article on the site at
> <http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero.html#scenarios>.
> We are unable to provide compensation, but we hope that you will be
willing
> to contribute your ideas to this forum for public discussion.
>
> You can send your submission to me at proposal@zero-nukes.org. It would
be
> helpful to receive the article as a Word attachment or equivalent.
>
> If you want to comment on the views of others, you can do so at
> <http://www.zero-nukes.org/yourfeedback.html#comments>.
>
> Lastly we want to invite retired military leaders to write similar
articles.
> Would you be able to supply us with contact information for those who
signed
> the 2000 Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament statement and the recent
> Reaffirmation?
>
> Thank you for your cooperation,
>
> Howard
>
> Howard W. Hallman is Chair of
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice
> 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org

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

X-POP3-Rcpt: proposal@holliday
Return-Path: <granoff@gsinstitute.org>
Received: from citrine.propagation.net (citrine.propagation.net [209.164.121.1])
by holliday.lighthost.com (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id SAA27203
for <proposal@zero-nukes.org>; Wed, 18 Sep 2002 18:39:07 -0500
Received: from vaio (pcp01345217pcs.lowmnrn01.pa.comcast.net [68.80.137.161])
by citrine.propagation.net (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id SAA03212;
Wed, 18 Sep 2002 18:38:58 -0500
Message-ID: <002901c25f6b\$cfedc200\$0500a8c0@lowmnrn01.pa.comcast.net>
From: "Jonathan Granoff" <granoff@gsinstitute.org>
To: <proposal@zero-nukes.org>
Subject: Legal and Moral Aspects
Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 19:33:36 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0026_01C25F4A.48451220"
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_0026_01C25F4A.48451220

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

http://www.gsinstitute.org/resources/extras/gran_12-9-00.pdf

Here is an article on the moral and legal aspects of the issue of =
nuclear abolition which you might want to post. Jonathan Granoff
www.gsinstitute.org

Status: U
Return-Path: <sojourners@sojo.net>
Received: from sojonet1.dedicated.expresstech.net ([216.26.147.11])
by nils.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17ROCPnq3Nl3pm0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Wed, 18 Sep 2002 19:52:55 -0400 (EDT)
Received: from 127.0.0.1 ([127.0.0.1]) by sojonet1.dedicated.expresstech.net with Microsoft
SMTPSVC(5.0.2195.2966);
Wed, 18 Sep 2002 19:50:53 -0400
Content-type: text/plain
Date: Wed, 18 Sep 2002 18:31:50 -0400
From: sojourners@sojo.net
Subject: SojoMail 09.18.2002 - Disarm Iraq Without War
To: mupj@igc.org
X-mailer: SojoNet
Message-ID: <SOJONET159mLd6Cd8nU0004c54c@sojonet1.dedicated.expresstech.net>
X-OriginalArrivalTime: 18 Sep 2002 23:50:53.0517 (UTC) FILETIME=[397A8FD0:01C25F6E]

S O J O M A I L

Promoting values at the crossroads where
spirituality, politics, and culture meet

Brought to you by the publishers
of Sojourners magazine
<http://www.sojo.net>

+++++ 18-September-2002 +++++
+++++ Disarm Iraq Without War +++++

Q u o t e o f t h e W e e k

*Jacques Ellul on violence and propaganda

H e a r t s & M i n d s

*Disarm Iraq without war

B u i l d i n g a M o v e m e n t

*SojoCircles respond to drums of war

B y t h e N u m b e r s

*Contrasting casualties in the Middle East

P o l i t i c a l l y C o n n e c t

*All the news unfit to print: Top 10 censored stories

P. O. V.

*Occupation and resurrection: Images of Palestine

S o u l W o r k s

*How did you pray this year?

Culture Watch

*Trashing trailer parks: Reputation and reality

Boomerang

*SojoMail readers reply

Web scene

- *Mystery worshippers
- *Software for nonprofits
- *Images with impact

=====

SEND A FREE GIFT TO A FRIEND - deliver a generous message
to your family and friends to sign up to receive SojoMail:
<http://www.sojo.net/sojomail/index.cfm/mode/display/action/share.html>

=====

Quote of the Week

+++++

"Almost always, it is the conviction that 'I am right' or 'my cause is the cause of justice' that triggers violence. That is, ...the moment propaganda does its work, violence is unleashed. And violence can be reduced by countering this propaganda."

- Jacques Ellul

Hearts & Minds

+++++

Disarm Iraq without war

by Jim Wallis

Saddam Hussein is an evil ruler, no doubt about it. But that is not enough for a war. Other heads of state have been evil, including some who have been allies of the United States (including Saddam during Iraq's war with Iran). Iraq has weapons of mass destruction. But that is not enough for a war either. Many other nations have them, too, including U.S. allies, Israel, and ourselves. The question is what Saddam's evil portends for the world, whether there is an imminent and urgent threat from his weapons, and, of course, what response would be both effective and consistent with Christian ethics.

Saddam Hussein is not a suicide bomber. Rather, the only consistent commitment he has ever shown has been to the preservation of his own power. Those who minimize his evil are morally irresponsible; those who underestimate his willingness to commit mass murder are making a serious

mistake. But the question is, what's our best response? What would protect lives in danger rather than threaten even more and potentially make everything worse?

Christian peacemaking calls us to seek alternatives to war in resolving conflicts. There are alternative means to contain Iraq's development of weapons of mass destruction. What is needed is a "carrot and stick" diplomacy. U.N. Security Council resolutions have called for the "destruction, removal, or rendering harmless" of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons along with ballistic missiles in Iraq. The expressed willingness of Iraq to allow the unconditional return of U.N. weapons inspectors should be welcomed and tested rather than dismissed. We should cooperate with the U.N. in enforcing these resolutions through effective and comprehensive weapons inspections. But the incentive should be a gradual lifting of sanctions and a pledge of no military attack if Iraq really cooperates. This combination would strengthen the containment of Saddam Hussein without the risks and costs of military attack, and provide a reason for him to comply. Saddam and his Iraqi regime must indeed be disarmed of weapons of mass destruction, but it should be done without war.

The international community can either unite in an effective strategy to isolate, contain, disarm, and ultimately undermine the brutal and dangerous regime of Saddam Hussein, or simply agree to the war agenda of the world's last remaining superpower. As for the reasonable goal of "regime change," the Iraqi people themselves must create the nonviolent civil resistance within their country to help achieve that goal, as Jack DuVall and Peter Ackerman described in the September-October issue of *Sojourners*.

We are launching a "Disarm Iraq Without War" campaign to help mobilize the religious community. We've initiated a statement to President Bush and Prime Minister Blair from religious leaders in the United States and the United Kingdom opposing preemptive military action as illegal, unwise, and immoral. We are posting a new section on our Web page with ideas for action, resources for further information, and an online forum where you can share your thoughts. We will be regularly updating the page with new information. See this campaign at:
<http://www.sojo.net/action>

The next several months will show what lessons we have learned from Sept. 11, as the U.S. government and the United Nations determine their course of action in Iraq. Our choices include the rule of law or the habit for war, unilateral decisions or collective action, effective containment or unpredictable escalations. It is a time for

just peacemaking instead of unjust war-making.

=====
THANK YOU!

Many of our readers have made a tax-deductible gift to Sojourners' campaign to mobilize the religious community in strong and visible opposition to war with Iraq. Your donations, which we spend carefully on the people, additional time, and technology that are necessary to organize a critical campaign, and your feedback and prayers are making a difference as we continue this important call to action.

We know that not all of you are in a position to help financially at this time, but if you are able to make a gift and haven't yet done so, we need your help.

https://www.sojo.net/online_giving/

Thank you!

=====
B u i l d i n g a M o v e m e n t

++++
SojoCircles respond to drums of war

In the ominous shadow of Sept. 11th, SojoCircles are developing all over the world as people gather together in community to make sense of the tragedy, pray for healing, and discuss where to go from here. And now, with a possible war on Iraq, these groups are becoming even more relevant. To find the SojoCircle nearest you, to inquire about starting one, and for a complete list of locations, go to:
http://www.sojo.net/get_connected/index.cfm/action/sojocircles.html

Our newest members are:

- London, England. Kori Winter: winter.blue@virgin.net
- Athens, Georgia: John Richardson: JRichardsonR@peoplepc.com
- Las Cruces, New Mexico. Barbara Scoville: barbaras@zianet.com

***** ADVERTISEMENT *****

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY announces search for Religious Education position funded by Lilly Endowment, Inc. grant: DEPTH Youth Program. Teaching load divided between directing DEPTH programming and teaching within regular curriculum. Successful candidates have strength in cross-cultural communication, orientation toward innovative pedagogy, and

competence in religious education, youth ministry, or developmental psychology. Three-year term. Non-tenure track. Position begins Fall 2003.

Contact Leah K. Robberts, Interim Coordinator, DEPTH Youth Program, Chicago Theological Seminary. Phone: (773) 322-0265. Email: depth@ctschicago.edu

By the Numbers

+++++

Contrasting casualties in the Middle East

* Number of Israelis killed by Palestinians from Sept. 29, 2000 to August 19, 2002: 619

* Number of Israeli children killed: 72

* Israelis killed outside the green line in the Occupied Territories: 328

* Members of the Israeli security forces among them: 118

* Number of Palestinians killed by Israelis from Sept. 29, 2000 to August 19, 2002: 1,658

* Killed by Israeli security forces: 1,576

* Killed by Israeli settlers: 21

* Died at check points: 61

* Number of Palestinian children (under 18) killed: 294

* Chance that an Israeli assassination of terrorist suspects will result in the death of an innocent bystander: 48% (44 bystanders killed in 91 assassinations)

Source: A Jewish Voice For Peace
<http://www.jewishvoiceforpeace.org>

***** ADVERTISEMENT *****

Why NOT Attack Iraq? How to Topple Saddam - Without War. Remembering - and learning from - Sept. 11.

FREE of charge and available online at <http://www.sojo.net>, "A World at Odds: Conscience in a Time of Terror" outlines Sojourners' alternative perspective on Iraq,

globalization, fundamentalism, and the Middle East.
This special guide - the latest resource from the editors
of Sojourners - includes stimulating questions for study
groups as well as worship materials.

Sojourners invites you to experience this free resource at
<http://www.sojo.net>

Politically Connect

+++++

All the news unfit to print: Top 10 censored stories

Project Censored's annual list always serves as a
fascinating chronicle of recent political history. Their
broad definition of censorship reflects the fact that
these stories often emerge only to disappear and lurk below
the surface, often for months or years, before being noticed
by our less than fearless corporate media.

Here are their picks for 2001:

1. Corporate Takeover of the Airwaves
2. General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) For-Profit
Model Threatens to Gobble Up World's Water
3. U.S. Policy Funds Human Rights Abuses in Colombia
4. Bush Administration Ordered FBI Off Bin Laden Trail
5. U.S. Destruction of Iraqi Water Supply
6. Renewed Threat of Nuclear Warfare
7. Public Schools Become Guinea Pigs for HMO Model
8. NAFTA Impoverishes Small Family Farmers
9. Housing Crisis in the U.S.
10. CIA Spooks Destabilize Macedonia

Get the details on these under-reported stories at:
<http://www.alternet.org/story.html?StoryID=14016>

And for a daily news source that goes beyond the mainstream:
<http://www.sojo.net/news>

P. O. V.

+++++

Occupation and resurrection: Images of Palestine

Sojourners presents a special online project of photos,
music, and narration describing life in the West Bank city of
Bethlehem. With sections on occupation, curfew, solidarity,
and resurrection, this multimedia presentation communicates
harsh realities of life in Palestine, but also offers hopeful
stories and unique perspectives on the conflict.

Go to:
<http://www.sojo.net/special/index.cfm/action/multimedia/content/palestine.html>

*****ADVERTISEMENT*****

Get your own copy.

Have you read Sojourners (the paper version) lately?
You ought to check it out for yourself. Produced by
the fine folks who bring you SojoMail each week.

https://www.sojo.net/magazine/index.cfm/action/subscribe_ASM.html

S o u l W o r k s

++++
How did you pray this year?

Spiritual teachers from a variety of traditions were asked
how they prayed following the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks:

"I have found myself praying more for our country in recent
months than I have in the past. It's a prayer that we should
be true to our best selves, our best values, and not fall
prey to imitating the enemy, becoming vengeful."
– The Rev. Donald Shriver, Presbyterian minister

"My prayer is that our faith will continue to be strong and
our prayers will not just be words. That they will lead us
to act in ways that will lead to tolerance, goodness,
compassion, and to courageousness and peace."
– Naomi Levy, rabbi and author of "Talking to God"

"...It is important to pray for peace and security based on
justice, not peace at all costs. If there is not justice,
peace will not take place, and, in fact, it is an offense
to God."
– Seyyed Hossein Nasr, professor of Islamic studies
at George Washington University

read more responses at:
<http://www.csmonitor.com/2002/0912/p11s01-ussc.html>

C u l t u r e W a t c h

++++
Trashing trailer parks: Reputation and reality

by Jesse Walker, Reason

"Mobile homes are always being attacked," Stewart Brand wrote in his 1994 book "How Buildings Learn." "By aesthetes for their appearance. By bigots for housing the 'wrong' people. By the construction industry for 'unfair' competition. By local government for paying insufficient taxes." Even the last charge is invalid: As Brand notes, trailer parks often save governments money, by taking on the costs of sewage, water, trash collection, and road maintenance. Yet the foul reputation remains.

Lately, the war on manufactured housing has been stepped up. If the local sheriff isn't pushing to evict a park, developers may be itching to build something more conventionally attractive - and profitable - on the land. Sometimes, of course, this takes place privately, between the developer and the landlord. (For that reason, among many others, some mobile home owners have been forming trailer park co-ops, thus cutting the landlord out of the picture.)

Read the full story:

<http://reason.com/0208/ci.jw.trashing.shtml>

***** ADVERTISEMENT *****

DRINK YOUR MORNING CUP OF JAVA IN GOOD CONSCIENCE

BUY SOJOBLEND COFFEE

All of our coffee is "fair trade," which guarantees coffee farmers a set price at least four times higher than the industry average. All of our SojoBlend coffee is shade-grown and organic as well. Call it the "triple seal" of java justice. And just to show that justice doesn't have bad taste, the coffee is just as good or better than you can get at a premium coffee house.

Consider making your coffee drinking an act of justice. You can order individual bags - \$9.95 a pound - or become a "Constant Cup" member and we'll deliver to you a fresh pound every month. Order now at:

http://www.puravidacoffee.com/store_aff_frameset.asp?Aff=5410

B o o m e r a n g

+++++

SojoMail readers hit reply

David Morgan writes from Vancouver, Canada:

Why is President Bush right to call Saddam Hussein an international threat? If he is such a threat then why is it that none of Iraq's neighbors, except for Kuwait, are eager to see George Bush attack Iraq?

Iraq has 18 cubic km of low-production cost oil reserves; the U.S. has 4 cubic km of high-production cost oil reserves. It is not Saddam's weapons of mass destruction that oil men George Bush and Dick Cheney are concerned with, it is his Resources of Mass Attraction.

Page Shelton writes from St. Simons Island, Georgia:

In our nation, war has become part of the usual business of the government and the people. We were founded in war and most of the history that we teach or that we celebrate is about war. War is the taking of human life that is a gift of God and that belongs only to God.

As Christians we are called to find ways to contain, to protect, and to reconcile short of war. War is a last resort when all else fails. Not all else has failed, but war seems inevitable. When it comes, we need to be prepared to limit the killing and to confess that the war is an admission of our failure to honor God's calling to respect and protect the lives of God's children in Iraq and in the USA.

Paul L. Whiteley Sr. writes from Louisville, Kentucky:

Talk of war diverts attention from the country's unstable economy and corporate scandals that affect every citizen. Republicans do not want to talk about the economy or the scandals. They want to start a war in the Middle East that has the potential to be the war to end all wars. The Bush administration has said it would not attack Iraq before the election. If it does, that is a sure sign President Bush's call for war is politically motivated and not in America's or the world's best interests.

America is on the verge of getting trapped in the never-ending cycle of violence that has plagued Israel for so long. An eye for an eye is a losing philosophy. Jesus Christ, George W. Bush's favorite author-philosopher, pointed that out 2,000 years ago.

Scott Rosner writes from Placentia, California:

It was with great anticipation and enthusiasm that I ordered, received and read your entire package of materials on terrorism, "A Moral Response to Terror." I was bitterly disappointed. Are you a Christian organization? I have read through several emails you have delivered since hearing of you and consistently am stunned by the virtual non-existence of Christianity. In dozens of articles covering nearly 50 pages of text, how many times did you mention the name "Jesus Christ"? His name somehow came up a handful of times in three articles.

What a pathetic, disgusting performance. You have made a mockery of the entire theme of the study. Your "worship" suggestions never included a mention of our Lord and Savior's name. Who exactly were you encouraging us to worship? Do you want to know how to cure hatred and AIDS, violence and greed, terrorism and corruption? Preach Jesus Christ!

Susan E. Siens writes from Unity, Maine:

I would like to dissent from the opinion expressed in Boomerang [09-04-02] regarding bettybowers.com. The site is hilarious! For all I know, there may be a site for Jews who worship a loving God to laugh about their horrifying brethren as well. As long as there are Christians picketing funerals of homosexuals and toting signs that say "God Hates Fags," we need bettybowers!

Hillel Arnold writes from Bridgeport, Connecticut:

Please tell me that Sojourners has not fallen for the hype surrounding major musical figures. First it was the almost completely uncritical review of Springsteen's horrible new album [SojoMail 08-14-02], and now it's a celebration of Lauryn Hill's withdrawal into shameless self-indulgence. ["Hip Hop, Psalms, and Lamentations," SojoMail 09-11-02]

[Springsteen's] "The Rising" is a completely cowardly attempt to cash in on Sept. 11. The songs all dwell in the cozy and uncritical realm of the personal drama, never daring to venture into anything as dangerous as the political reality in the months following Sept. 11.

Bethany Versluis' review of Lauryn Hill's "MTV Unplugged 2.0", while beautifully written, forgets one important thing. While it's nice for Hill to claim that she "doesn't consider herself a performer anymore," the reality is that a lot of people will pay a lot of money to see her, whether

she's performing or not. Wake up Lauryn, you're a superstar and you sold your soul the day that you signed your record contract.

As a magazine that claims to be in touch with culture, I hope that Sojourners is swayed less by a five-star review in Rolling Stone and more by an educated, intelligent Gospel-based sense of our culture.

Boomerang is an open forum for all kinds of views. The views expressed are not necessarily those of Sojourners. Want to make your voice heard? Send Boomerang e-mails to the editor:

"boomerang@sojo.net"

W e b s c e n e

+++++

This week's best of the Web

*Mystery worshippers

Ship-of-Fools.com has an intrepid team of mystery worshippers travelling incognito in the British aisles and beyond, reporting on the comfort of the pews, the warmth of the welcome, the length of the sermon.... The only clue that they have been there at all is the Mystery Worshipper calling card, dropped discreetly into the collection plate.

visit:

<http://ship-of-fools.com/Mystery/index.html>

*Software for nonprofits

Does your nonprofit organization struggle to meet its technology needs? (We do!) One ray of light in the techno-darkness is DiscounTech, a service that offers top names in software at unbeatable prices for organizations trying to make a difference.

visit:

<http://www.techsoup.org/DiscounTech>

*Images with impact

Impact Digital is a coalition of independent photojournalists and social documentary photographers that market to media worldwide, including nonprofit organizations, textbook publishers, unions, religious

publications, alternative media, mainstream newsweeklies and consumer magazines.

visit:
<http://www.impactdigitals.com/>

.....

To make a secure donation to support our work,
go to https://www.sojo.net/Online_Giving/

.....

Get the online version of SojoMail with clickable contents:
<http://www.sojo.net/sojomail/index.cfm/action/sojomail/issue/091102.html>

Printer-friendly version:
http://www.sojo.net/sojomail/index.cfm/action/sojomail/mode/printer_friendly/issue/091102.html

..... EDITORIAL

David Batstone T 415.422.6660
Executive Editor batstoned@sojo.net

Molly Marsh T 202.328.8842
Assistant Editor mmarsh@sojo.net

Ryan Beiler T 202.328.8842
Web Editor rbeiler@sojo.net

Kate Bowman T 202.328.8842
Internet Assistant kbowman@sojo.net

..... ADVERTISING

Larry Bellinger T 202.328.8842
Advertising Manager lbellinger@sojo.net

..... TECHNICAL

Bob Sabath T 202.328.8842
Chief Technologist bsabath@sojo.net

.....

Sojourners T 202.328.8842
2401 15th Street NW F 202.328.8757
Washington, DC 20009 <http://www.sojo.net>

To make a secure donation to support our work,

go to https://www.sojo.net/Online_Giving/

For more information, e-mail us: info@sojo.net

..... L E G A L N O T I C E S

Copyright (c) 2002 Sojourners. All Rights Reserved.

SojoMail material may be freely distributed, as long as it bears the following attribution:

Source: Sojourners 2002 (c) <http://www.sojo.net>

..... A R C H I V E S

For a history of SojoMail, visit
http://www.sojo.net/sojomaindex.cfm/action/back_issues.html

..... S U B S C R I P T I O N S

SojoMail is published weekly. Subscriptions are free.

SUBSCRIBE online at:
<http://www.sojo.net/sojomaindex.cfm>
or by e-mail: subscribe@sojo.net

UNSUBSCRIBE online at:
<http://www.sojo.net/sojomaindex.cfm/action/unsubscribe.html>
or by e-mail: unsubscribe@sojo.net

---- SOJOMAIL IS A SPAM-FREE ZONE ----
(Sojourners won't trade, sell, or give away your address.)

Status: U

Return-Path: <millerph@att.net>

Received: from mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net ([204.127.131.47])

by walker.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17S2P8NSu3NI3s71
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 19 Sep 2002 11:02:34 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from mtiwebc20 ([204.127.135.59]) by mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net

(InterMail vM.4.01.03.27 201-229-121-127-20010626) with SMTP
id <20020919150234.ZNAS15461.mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net@mtiwebc20>;

Thu, 19 Sep 2002 15:02:34 +0000

Received: from [12.91.127.57] by mtiwebc20;

Thu, 19 Sep 2002 15:02:30 +0000

From: millerph@att.net

To: debate44646@yahoo.com (James Hipkins), mupj@igc.org (Howard Hallman)

Subject: East Ohio Conference

Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 15:02:30 +0000

X-Mailer: AT&T Message Center Version 1 (Sep 18 2002)

X-Authenticated-Sender: MjhQWVFHYkYpOkNTTVtMU1hANFVDRilfPVVYQD1XWYw=

Message-Id: <20020919150234.ZNAS15461.mtiwmhc22.worldnet.att.net@mtiwebc20>

I received your letter and the returned check, Jim, on Sunday.

After examining the matter one more time, my email to you had a mistake in it but it was not relevant. I spoke with Barbara Stockert, she agreed to look into whether the second check we wrote for \$128 did not, in fact, make up for the earlier one. She called yesterday, said it did, and that MUPJ is again in good standing with the East Ohio Conference.

Thanks for helping to clear this matter up.

Phil (Your sometimes baffled but usually careful treasurer.)

Status: U

Return-Path: <edbruegge@attbi.com>

Received: from sccrmhc01.attbi.com ([204.127.202.61])

by farley.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17S6NA3z73Nl3pa0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 19 Sep 2002 15:17:14 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from [24.147.233.187] by sccrmhc01.attbi.com

(InterMail vM.4.01.03.27 201-229-121-127-20010626) with ESMTP
id <20020919191347.OKBW14978.sccrmhc01.attbi.com@[24.147.233.187]>;
Thu, 19 Sep 2002 19:13:47 +0000

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

Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 15:16:51 -0400

Subject: welcome to Don and Marjorie

From: Edward Brueggemann <edbruegge@attbi.com>

To: Walter Brueggemann <brueggemannw@ctsnet.edu>,

Mary Brueggemann <mubruegg@aol.com>,

Jim Brueggemann <jbbruegg@aol.com>,

John Brueggemann <jbruegge@skidmore.edu>,

Barb Brueggemann <bbrueggemann@berkshireschool.org>,

David J Sanborn <dsanborn@berkshireschool.org>,

Debby Guarino <Guari@attbi.com>,

Quinn Brueggemann <qbrueggemann@berkshireschool.org>,

Cait Guarino <nikegirl12@attbi.com>,

Tyler Guarino <birdhouse19@attbi.com>,

Thom Gleiber <tgleiber@mobium.com>,

Carol Matthias <carol_matthias@hotmail.com>,

Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>

CC: Don Brueggemann <donbruegge@attbi.com>

Message-ID: <B9AF9AE3.1B42%edbruegge@attbi.com>

Mime-version: 1.0

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Don and Marjorie have joined the 21st Century and are now on the Internet.
You can note above that Don's address is <donbruegge@attbi.com>. Marjorie
may later open her own account.

By copy of this to Don he will have your addresses. Join us in welcoming
them to this brave new world. edb

Status: U

Return-Path: jdean@ucsusa.org

Received: from mail.ucsusa.org ([208.50.113.51]) by osgood.mail.atl.earthlink.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17S78Z5lp3NI3pt0 for <Mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 19 Sep 2002 15:39:20 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from UCSUSA-Message_Server by mail.ucsusa.org with Novell_GroupWise; Thu, 19 Sep 2002 15:39:35 -0400

Message-Id: sd89efb7.099@mail.ucsusa.org

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5.5

Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 15:39:19 -0400

From: "Jonathan Dean" jdean@ucsusa.org

To: Mupj@igc.org

Subject: Nuclear Posture Review

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="=_1F43A5E7.2D4C23F6"

Dear Howard Hallman,

Attached is the paper on the Nuclear Posture Review.

Best regards,

Jonathan Dean

Jonathan Dean
Adviser on International Security Issues
Union of Concerned Scientists
1707 H Street, NW, 6th Floor
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: 202-223-6133
FAX: 202-223-6162
e-mail: jdean@ucsusa.org

July 15, 2002

The Nuclear Weapons Policy of the Bush Administration And Why It Should Frighten You

This article evaluates the nuclear weapons policy of the Bush administration and its implications for our defense and foreign policy. To start with, it deals with three key questions:

First, how many nuclear weapons will the U.S. have under the administration policy?

Second, how long will the U.S. have nuclear weapons?

And third, what would U.S. nuclear weapons be used for?

The partial answer to this last question, what would U.S. nuclear weapons be used for, is that no recent U.S. administration has foreseen a wider range of situations where U.S. nuclear weapons may be used than the Bush administration. This is one main reason why the administration's nuclear weapons policy should scare you. And there are many other reasons.

But first, how many nuclear weapons will the U.S. have under the policy of the administration, including the Moscow Treaty of May 24, which reflects that policy?

The answer is, not much less than the number we have now, but in different categories of readiness for use.

In the fall of 2000, before the presidential elections, Congress mandated a nuclear posture review by the incoming administration. The review was delivered to Congress on January 8 of this year. A small portion of the Review was made public officially and a large portion was leaked without serious refutation. It is customary and useful for incoming presidents to request government agencies to review the U.S. nuclear arsenal and U.S. nuclear strategy. The usual sequel some time later is a presidential decision document which directs the Defense and Energy Departments to take specific actions.

This time, the incoming Bush administration had radically different ideas about nuclear weapons from past administrations. It believed Russia was no longer a serious threat to the U.S., that U.S. nuclear policy should reflect that evaluation, and also that arms control -- negotiation to limit the risks between possible antagonists -- is archaic and belongs, along with communism, on the trash heap of history.

As the administration was working on the Posture Review, it was primarily concerned about the possibility of missile attack on the United States by rogue states and about the

possibility of acts of terrorism. Then came the actual September 11 attacks. At the end of January 2002, the administration merged together these two different threats, rogue states and terrorists, into what it seemed to argue was an active alliance among all of them, an alliance which it called the "axis of evil." Combining these two highly feared threats was an inspired stroke of public presentation. However, there is only limited evidence of the existence of such an alliance.

Today, as the Nuclear Posture Review indicates, the United States has about 8,000 nuclear warheads in the field. About six thousand strategic warheads are operationally deployed. That is, they are attached to long-range missiles ready to fire, or are ready to be loaded on intercontinental bombers. About 1,600 so-called tactical warheads, mostly aircraft bombs, are deployed in a similar way. The United States today also has over 2,000 warheads in a reserve stockpile. This is the so-called "hedge" force established under the Clinton administration as insurance against sudden reversal in newly de-communized Russia. Counting about 1,000 warheads for spares, this gives a total of about 11,000 warheads.

In 2012, when the new Moscow treaty expires, the U.S. will have about 8,000 nuclear warheads, but only 1,700-2,200 strategic warheads will be deployed. Let's add about 1,000 tactical warheads and 500-600 for spares and warheads assigned to submarines in maintenance, which are not to be included in the U.S. total. Beyond this, Secretary of State Powell indicated on July 9 in testifying on the Moscow Treaty that about 2,400 warheads will be in an active responsive reserve, ready to be remounted on delivery vehicles. About 2,000 warheads will be in an inactive reserve, with tritium components and neutron generators removed. The first group, the active reserve, would take from several weeks to several months to be reloaded on delivery systems; the second group would take many months to prepare for use.

In practical terms, one result of the Nuclear Posture Review and of the Moscow Treaty is large-scale "de-alerting" -- removal of warheads from delivery systems and their separate storage to prevent premature use. This action, which has long been urged by Bruce Blair of the Center for Defense Information and by other NGOs, creates additional time to check the facts before launching missiles and reduces the risk of accidental or unauthorized launch of nuclear weapons or of wholesale launch on warning. But these dangers are not eliminated unless the entire force on both sides is de-alerted. This should happen under the Posture Review, but it will not. Instead, unless further action is taken, for the duration of this agreement, thousands of U.S. and Russian warheads will remain on alert. Other thousands of Russian warheads and Russian weapons materials remain scattered around that vast country, with a risk of illegal sale, theft and forcible seizure. Russian nuclear forces, whether operational or open to illegal diversion, remain our greatest nuclear danger -- not the "axis of evil."

Russia did not gain agreement to four points it asked for during the five months of negotiation that led to the May 24 Moscow treaty. The first of these was "transparency," data exchange on stockpiles of strategic nuclear weapons with some verification of their numbers. The second was destruction of reduced warheads, leading to irreversibility of arms reductions. After long resistance on its part, Russia took over these two points from Clinton administration arms controllers. It is a great pity that this conversion of views was not consolidated through formal agreement with Russia in the May 24 treaty.

The third Russian point was a prohibition against space weapons, a key ABM concept. We will hear much more in the future about the worrying consequences of Russia's failure to gain agreement on this point.

The fourth thing Russia asked for and did not receive was a numerical limit on the number of missile interceptors deployed in the U.S. missile defense program. This limit was the core concept of the ABM Treaty that the administration nullified this past June 13. Without this limit on deployed interceptors, the steady expansion of U.S. missile defenses, which form an important part of the new U.S. nuclear posture, will be a durable engine driving the long-term growth of the world's nuclear arsenals. As the number of deployed U.S. interceptors grows, even if they will not work under attack, there will ultimately be increases in Chinese and Russian nuclear forces to keep up. Indian, Pakistani, and even UK and French nuclear forces will grow to keep up with the Russians and the Chinese. In the end, the U.S. will increase its own nuclear forces. These consequences may be like the progress of a glacier -- very slow. But they will move relentlessly onward.

Owing to the administration's dropping of START II, there is no ban in the Moscow Treaty on MIRVs, multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles -- separate targetable warheads attached to a single missile. Russia can now maintain a higher level of operationally deployed warheads with fewer missiles. Because multiple warhead missiles are a prime target, Moscow is likely to keep its MIRVed missiles on hair-trigger alert, not a healthy situation for the United States. The Moscow treaty also has no provision for destruction of excess missiles and their silos, which has been a solid virtue of the START treaties because missiles and silos can take a long time to replace and install. As a consequence of this deliberate omission and of the U.S. concept of keeping thousands of warheads in an active reserve, which will doubtless be adopted by Russia, both countries can increase their deployed arsenals rapidly and to a large extent, uploading both operational and retained missiles. There will be no limit on the number of warheads each side has as long as they are not operationally deployed.

This capability, combined with the short 90-day period of withdrawal from the treaty and the treaty's expiration on the very day in 2012 when the reduced level is to be achieved undermines nuclear stability and adds to the volatility of the Moscow agreement. The agreement specifies neither the type of reduction to be made by each government nor how progress toward compliance is to be measured. A lot of thought has been given to making this treaty easily reversible and loaded with potential for dangerous disagreements. Despite the seriousness of the problem of tactical nuclear weapons, the two governments failed to tackle it in the Moscow Treaty. Russia has up to 12,000 of these smaller, more portable weapons, and the U.S. about 1,600. These weapons can also be used for strategic attack and they are a prime target for illegal sale or seizure.

The second question, How long will we have nuclear weapons?

Article VI of the 1970 Non-Proliferation Treaty commits the United States and the other permanent members of the Security Council to eliminate their entire nuclear arsenals. In a 1996 advisory opinion -- this point was unanimous and included U.S. judge Steven Schwebel -- the International Court of Justice in the Hague stated that this NPT obligation remains binding and that the weapon states should proceed to fulfill it.

But under the 2002 Nuclear Posture Review, the U.S. nuclear arsenal is planned to be with us for the next half century and beyond. The Review foresees comprehensive modernization of the entire U.S. nuclear weapons complex. This starts with development of three new nuclear warheads: a deep penetrating warhead, perhaps two of them, a nuclear and a conventional version; a so-called Agent Defeat weapon that can neutralize and destroy chemical and biological weapons (this too could be in conventional and nuclear versions); and low-yield mini-nukes.

These new nuclear weapons will have to be tested. The Posture Review says nuclear testing may have to be resumed at some future point and has ordered a shorter preparation time for the Nevada Test Site.

In fact, after nullifying the ABM Treaty and dealing a body blow to the Biological Weapons Convention by withdrawing from verification negotiations, the administration seems to be moving slowly but deliberately toward dismantling a third key structure of multilateral arms control, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. One problem here is that if the U.S. can withdraw from multilateral arms control treaties, other governments can too.

As regards testing, the computer and engineering work for new warheads is under way, the test site is being prepared, concerns are being expressed by the weapons laboratories and the administration about the aging of the current nuclear stockpile and the Stockpile Stewardship Program, which is designed to assure its effectiveness. The administration seems to be waiting only for a precipitating incident to justify recommencement of testing.

The administration's comprehensive nuclear weapons modernization program includes a new plant to produce tritium gas; a new warhead assembly plant; rebuilding a plant for uranium weapon components; a new land-based intercontinental missile; a new submarine-based missile; a new missile firing submarine; and a new strategic bomber. The new submarine is due by 2030, the new bomber by 2040.

The May 24 treaty does refer in passing to Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Perhaps the Russians are responsible for this reference. But there is no mention in the Posture Review of the long-term prospect of eliminating nuclear weapons. The administration view is unambiguous, that nuclear weapons are with us forever. Taking together the expansionary effects of unlimited missile defense on nuclear arsenals and this comprehensive modernization program, the administration may be right about that. But what has happened to the pledge, implicit in the Non-Proliferation treaty, that, when the cold war nuclear confrontation ended, the U.S. would make a serious effort to move to elimination of its nuclear weapons?

The third question, What would U.S. nuclear weapons be used for?

Over the years, the norm has emerged that nuclear weapons should be used only in response to the threat or use of nuclear weapons. Perhaps this concept was more a hope of the Canberra Commission and of non-nuclear states for the post Cold War period than a norm, because it was not official U.S. policy. NATO doctrine foresaw possible use of nuclear weapons in the face of overwhelming Soviet conventional attack in Europe. This danger dissolved with withdrawal of Soviet troops from Eastern Europe and the collapse of the Soviet Union, but, after a promising initial move to consider nuclear weapons as weapons of last resort, NATO has not fundamentally changed its first-use policy, mainly, despite the views of the majority of NATO governments, in order to maintain conformity with the first-use policy of the United States.

The Clinton administration, faced by new fears of rogue missile attack, adopted a policy of deliberate ambiguity, hinting but not confirming that it would consider response with nuclear weapons if attacked by chemical or biological as well as by nuclear weapons. In the administration's Nuclear Posture Review, this ambiguity is stripped away. The Review is explicit that, henceforth, U.S. nuclear weapons may be used in response to nuclear, chemical, biological or conventional attack. Beyond that, the number and type of situations in which nuclear weapons may be used has been considerably expanded. In the words of the Review, nuclear strike forces are to be prepared to deal with "immediate contingencies," like an Iraqi attack on Israel, a North Korean attack on South Korea, or a military confrontation over Taiwan. Strike forces might also be used to deal with "potential contingencies," like emergence of a new hostile coalition against the U.S. -- presumably headed by China; nuclear forces could be used to deal with a third category of "unexpected contingencies," sudden and unpredicted security challenges. Taken together, these form a very broad spectrum of situations in which U.S. nuclear weapons might be used.

The Posture Review suggests that new long-range conventional weapons be developed for use instead of nuclear weapons in some situations. While this is in one sense a positive decision, it blurs the distinction between the two types of weapons because it suggests that nuclear and conventional weapons belong on the same unbroken continuum.

In the Nuclear Posture Review, the circle of target countries, those kept under constant targeting, has also been expanded. In addition to Russia, which remains targeted in spite of our improved relations, and China, the targeted countries now include Libya, Syria, Iraq, Iran and North Korea. With the possible exception of Iraq, which violated its NPT commitment, these countries are non-nuclear states which remain covered by U.S. negative security guarantees in connection with the Non-Proliferation Treaty not to use nuclear weapons against non-weapon states unless they are allied with an attacking weapon state. Targeting these countries is a case of deliberate inconsistency on the part of the United States. Especially for the non-nuclear states that are party to the Nonproliferation Treaty, it raises a serious question about what U.S. commitments are worth.

All in all, the range of situations and target countries in which the United States would consider use of nuclear weapons has been considerably expanded for the Policy Review. As a

consequence, the nuclear threshold, the point at which a United States administration would begin to seriously examine the possibility of using nuclear weapons, has been significantly lowered. The end result here is very far from a policy of nuclear weapons as a weapon of last resort. This is an aggressively forward-leaning threat of early first use. The fact that Russia has similarly broad views adds to the risk that nuclear weapons will actually be used.

It must be a source of real concern that the United States, a country which has huge conventional military superiority over all other countries of the world, and which has in addition huge diplomatic and economic resources, should now envision so many potential uses for nuclear weapons. It is unsettling that this is happening in a situation where the danger of total national destruction through all-out attack by nuclear or biological weapons has largely passed, and the United States is now concerned by the very different possibility of a localized rogue state or terrorist attack which could be very serious, but whose effects can be contained with proper preparation.

A final question, what kind of world will this new nuclear weapon strategy be operating in?

Viewed objectively, the U.S. is faced by a deteriorating proliferation situation. In the 1990s, nuclear non-proliferation failed in Iraq and nearly failed in North Korea. Then it failed in Pakistan and India. Missile proliferation has expanded, with exports from North Korea and China, and with North Korea, India, Pakistan and Iran building new missiles. This is the situation the Nuclear Policy Review seeks to deal with.

Quite rightly, President Bush takes proliferation seriously. He is determined to deal with the main threats to the U.S. population, threats which he sees as terrorist attacks or rogue missile attacks. It may be that the President hopes to go down in history as the American leader who decisively ended these threats. As he originally said before the negative connotations of this word for Muslims became clear for him, this is a crusade, a crusade involving the whole nation. As part of this effort, the President is trying to make the threat of use of American nuclear weapons more credible and more terrifying. He is also threatening to strike unilaterally at proliferators instead of leading an intense international effort to get on top of this proliferation situation and to control it. Using armed force against proliferators may be necessary in exceptional circumstances. But it should be joint action. Convincing other governments to join in such enterprises may be difficult but it can be done, as the older President Bush proved in the Gulf War and as President Clinton proved with NATO members in Kosovo. Moreover, the administration's solo approach on this and other issues is leaching away the reserves of gratitude, respect, and shared views which the U.S. has with much sacrifice built up over the past half-century.

We do not have access to the stream of secret information that shapes the President's views, but the administration's war against terrorism seems to reflect both the President's genuine personal convictions and a deliberate administration effort to maintain public concerns over terrorist attacks at a high level in order to support the war on terrorism.

Now, in his June 1, 2002 West Point speech, the President has publicly announced a concept of preemptive action against possible proliferators. This concept is questionable on practical and moral grounds. Nonetheless, the administration has indicated that this concept will form part of an overall National Security Strategy now being drafted. It is probable that only future historians will see the text of this document, and then only after its damage has been done. In addition to other important problems, preemptive attack depends on reliable intelligence that there is an immediate threat. The consequences of error could be very serious and often are, as the July, 2002 U.S. attack on an Afghan wedding party demonstrates. However, according to press reports, Secretary Rumsfeld speaking at NATO on June 6 said that the Alliance could not wait for "absolute proof" before a preemptive attack is launched. Preemptive use of weapons, possibly including nuclear weapons, on the basis of incomplete evidence is a very disquieting prospect.

It is legitimate to act preemptively in self defense in the face of a specific, imminent and evident challenge. But the new U.S. doctrine is general rather than specific. It refers to a whole class of potential offenders, the governments and terrorist groups that may be participating in the axis of evil.

There is an unevaluated and probably incorrect assumption in the preemption approach that all these target countries would try to attack the United States and its allies as soon as they are able. However, it is not legitimate to threaten early use of weapons, possibly including nuclear weapons, when threats from others are not pressing or evident and may not become so. It is not legitimate to threaten early use of weapons when approaches of diplomacy and negotiation are either untried or not exhausted.

In the cold war nuclear confrontation, preemption or even the appearance of possible preemptive action was regarded as something which must be avoided because it could trigger a full nuclear exchange. Its use today could still bring serious counterattack. Preemption is also not legitimate or moral if the actual political or military objective is broader than the announced target of preemption. This could be the situation with regard to Iraq, where the ostensible objective would be to block imminent attack on the U.S. or its allies, but the actual objective would be regime change. Preemption as a general policy is the essence of U.S. unilateralism. It is a generalized threat that the U.S. will decide for itself when to take drastic action when its information, whose details must remain secret, indicates that preemptive attack may be useful. Because a policy of preemption has no congressional authorization although it indicates unannounced warlike action against a wide range of states and groups, it has an unconstitutional quality.

It was not force of arms, but diplomacy and sanctions that brought the North Korean regime to the negotiating table. We can still talk to the Syrian, Libyan and Iranian governments, and even to the Iraqi government, and frame requirements and inducements.

Now that military action in Afghanistan has ended the Taliban regime, Saddam Hussein is first on the administration's destruct list. For a while, it appeared that there might be a long way to travel before this goal can be reached. First, the India-Pakistan confrontation has had to

be calmed. The effort to do this is underway. Then the Arab-Israeli confrontation had to be mitigated. And then must come renewed UN inspections in Iraq.

The administration's June 25 proposal that Arafat be removed before negotiating a possible resolution of the Palestinian-Israeli confrontation provides grounds for U.S. inaction on this issue until after the November U.S. elections. In terms of U.S. public opinion, this development may put military action against Iraq back on track. In any event, some specific administration decision on what actually to do about Iraq cannot be delayed much beyond the November elections. Without damage to its credibility, the administration cannot continually proclaim Saddam to be public enemy number one, and then fail to take decisive action against him.

What It All Means

What this all amounts to is that we are talking ourselves into war with Iraq using preemptive means. At least three countries involved in the Iraqi confrontation -- the U.S., possibly Iraq itself, and Israel -- have weapons of mass destruction. Perhaps preemption as now being considered by the administration refers to use of conventional forces. Perhaps the public announcement of a preemption policy is a deliberate tactic intended to add to pressures on Saddam Hussein. Nonetheless, preemption means first use of military force. With Iraq, Iran, and North Korea on the administration's nuclear target list, there is an unavoidable, in fact presumably desired, implication that preemption could include nuclear weapons.

To summarize, except in cases of immediately evident danger, preemption is the essence of unilateralism in foreign policy. Preemptive military action is immoral in causing loss of life without full prior exploration of alternatives to the use of force. If carried out without prior consultation with the Congress and the American public, including public presentation and discussion of convincing evidence, it is behavior which we would term authoritarian if other governments engaged in it. Where is the administration's insistence on tough, effective, continuing inspections in Iraq which will either produce that convincing evidence of Saddam Hussein's aggressive WMD activities or restrict his ability to produce or deliver these weapons?

The net result of these moves, of the administration's lowering of the nuclear threshold, its indefinite postponement of elimination of nuclear weapons, its nearly exclusive focus on military solutions, its bellicose vocabulary, its support for preemptive attack, and of the fact that the administration implausibly sees terrorists supplied by rogue nations ready to attack the United States with WMD in locations all over the globe, is that the situations in which Washington may be prepared to use nuclear weapons are becoming increasingly numerous.

As a consequence, people all over the world, as well as the terrorists and rogue state governments who are the presumed targets of these policies, have become frightened about the future and about what the United States might do.

This is not the responsible leadership on nuclear weapons policy that we and the rest of the world hope for from the United States. The assessment seems unavoidable that, instead, it is nuclear bullying -- counterproductive, dangerous, and immoral.

There is in fact a risk in the overheated atmosphere of the war on terrorism that things could get out of control in Iraq, in Israel, or in Pakistan, where an unstable nuclear regime is vulnerable to a coup by military or Islamic extremists. Of these problems, the Pakistan situation alone is a source of danger to the United States and the world that overshadows the dangers of the "axis of evil," but it is receiving insufficient emphasis in U.S. policy. In all these hot spots, India-Pakistan, the Palestinian-Israeli confrontation, in Iran, North Korea -- and also in Iraq -- the United States should give diplomacy and negotiation, backed by international cooperation, a full opportunity before considering the use of force.

Those of us who are alarmed at these developments in U.S. policy must speak up and raise our voices. It is only through more questions and more critical evaluation that the American public, which has instinctively rallied around national leadership in an emergency situation, will begin to raise its own necessary questions.

Jonathan Dean
Adviser on International Security Issues
Union of Concerned Scientists
1707 H Street, NW, 6th Floor
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: 202-223-6133
FAX: 202-223-6162
e-mail: jdean@ucsusa.org

July 15, 2002

The Nuclear Weapons Policy of the Bush Administration And Why It Should Frighten You

This article evaluates the nuclear weapons policy of the Bush administration and its implications for our defense and foreign policy. To start with, it deals with three key questions:

First, how many nuclear weapons will the U.S. have under the administration policy?

Second, how long will the U.S. have nuclear weapons?

And third, what would U.S. nuclear weapons be used for?

The partial answer to this last question, what would U.S. nuclear weapons be used for, is that no recent U.S. administration has foreseen a wider range of situations where U.S. nuclear weapons may be used than the Bush administration. This is one main reason why the administration's nuclear weapons policy should scare you. And there are many other reasons.

But first, how many nuclear weapons will the U.S. have under the policy of the administration, including the Moscow Treaty of May 24, which reflects that policy?

The answer is, not much less than the number we have now, but in different categories of readiness for use.

In the fall of 2000, before the presidential elections, Congress mandated a nuclear posture review by the incoming administration. The review was delivered to Congress on January 8 of this year. A small portion of the Review was made public officially and a large portion was leaked without serious refutation. It is customary and useful for incoming presidents to request government agencies to review the U.S. nuclear arsenal and U.S. nuclear strategy. The usual sequel some time later is a presidential decision document which directs the Defense and Energy Departments to take specific actions.

This time, the incoming Bush administration had radically different ideas about nuclear weapons from past administrations. It believed Russia was no longer a serious threat to the U.S., that U.S. nuclear policy should reflect that evaluation, and also that arms control -- negotiation to limit the risks between possible antagonists -- is archaic and belongs, along with communism, on the trash heap of history.

As the administration was working on the Posture Review, it was primarily concerned about the possibility of missile attack on the United States by rogue states and about the possibility of acts of terrorism. Then came the actual September 11 attacks. At the end of January 2002, the administration merged together these two different threats, rogue states and terrorists, into what it seemed to argue was an active alliance among all of them, an alliance which it called the "axis of evil." Combining these two highly feared threats was an inspired stroke of public presentation. However, there is only limited evidence of the existence of such an alliance.

Today, as the Nuclear Posture Review indicates, the United States has about 8,000 nuclear warheads in the field. About six thousand strategic warheads are operationally deployed. That is, they are attached to long-range missiles ready to fire, or are ready to be loaded on intercontinental bombers. About 1,600 so-called tactical warheads, mostly aircraft bombs, are deployed in a similar way. The United States today also has over 2,000 warheads in a reserve stockpile. This is the so-called "hedge" force established under the Clinton administration as insurance against sudden reversal in newly de-communized Russia. Counting about 1,000 warheads for spares, this gives a total of about 11,000 warheads.

In 2012, when the new Moscow treaty expires, the U.S. will have about 8,000 nuclear warheads, but only 1,700-2,200 strategic warheads will be deployed. Let's add about 1,000 tactical warheads and 500-600 for spares and warheads assigned to submarines in maintenance, which are not to be included in the U.S. total. Beyond this, Secretary of State Powell indicated on July 9 in testifying on the Moscow Treaty that about 2,400 warheads will be in an active responsive reserve, ready to be remounted on delivery vehicles. About 2,000 warheads will be in an inactive reserve, with tritium components and neutron generators removed. The first group, the active reserve, would take from several weeks to several months to be reloaded on delivery systems; the second group would take many months to prepare for use.

In practical terms, one result of the Nuclear Posture Review and of the Moscow Treaty is large-scale "de-alerting" -- removal of warheads from delivery systems and their separate storage to prevent premature use. This action, which has long been urged by Bruce Blair of the Center for Defense Information and by other NGOs, creates additional time to check the facts before launching missiles and reduces the risk of accidental or unauthorized launch of nuclear weapons or of wholesale launch on warning. But these dangers are not eliminated unless the entire force on both sides is de-alerted. This should happen under the Posture Review, but it will not. Instead, unless further action is taken, for the duration of this agreement, thousands of U.S. and Russian warheads will remain on alert. Other thousands of Russian warheads and Russian weapons materials remain scattered around that vast country, with a risk of illegal sale, theft and forcible seizure. Russian nuclear forces, whether operational or open to illegal diversion, remain our greatest nuclear danger -- not the "axis of evil."

Russia did not gain agreement to four points it asked for during the five months of negotiation that led to the May 24 Moscow treaty. The first of these was "transparency," data exchange on stockpiles of strategic nuclear weapons with some verification of their numbers. The second was destruction of reduced warheads, leading to irreversibility of arms reductions. After long resistance on its part, Russia took over these two points from Clinton administration

arms controllers. It is a great pity that this conversion of views was not consolidated through formal agreement with Russia in the May 24 treaty.

The third Russian point was a prohibition against space weapons, a key ABM concept. We will hear much more in the future about the worrying consequences of Russia's failure to gain agreement on this point.

The fourth thing Russia asked for and did not receive was a numerical limit on the number of missile interceptors deployed in the U.S. missile defense program. This limit was the core concept of the ABM Treaty that the administration nullified this past June 13. Without this limit on deployed interceptors, the steady expansion of U.S. missile defenses, which form an important part of the new U.S. nuclear posture, will be a durable engine driving the long-term growth of the world's nuclear arsenals. As the number of deployed U.S. interceptors grows, even if they will not work under attack, there will ultimately be increases in Chinese and Russian nuclear forces to keep up. Indian, Pakistani, and even UK and French nuclear forces will grow to keep up with the Russians and the Chinese. In the end, the U.S. will increase its own nuclear forces. These consequences may be like the progress of a glacier -- very slow. But they will move relentlessly onward.

Owing to the administration's dropping of START II, there is no ban in the Moscow Treaty on MIRVs, multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles -- separate targetable warheads attached to a single missile. Russia can now maintain a higher level of operationally deployed warheads with fewer missiles. Because multiple warhead missiles are a prime target, Moscow is likely to keep its MIRVed missiles on hair-trigger alert, not a healthy situation for the United States. The Moscow treaty also has no provision for destruction of excess missiles and their silos, which has been a solid virtue of the START treaties because missiles and silos can take a long time to replace and install. As a consequence of this deliberate omission and of the U.S. concept of keeping thousands of warheads in an active reserve, which will doubtless be adopted by Russia, both countries can increase their deployed arsenals rapidly and to a large extent, uploading both operational and retained missiles. There will be no limit on the number of warheads each side has as long as they are not operationally deployed.

This capability, combined with the short 90-day period of withdrawal from the treaty and the treaty's expiration on the very day in 2012 when the reduced level is to be achieved undermines nuclear stability and adds to the volatility of the Moscow agreement. The agreement specifies neither the type of reduction to be made by each government nor how progress toward compliance is to be measured. A lot of thought has been given to making this treaty easily reversible and loaded with potential for dangerous disagreements. Despite the seriousness of the problem of tactical nuclear weapons, the two governments failed to tackle it in the Moscow Treaty. Russia has up to 12,000 of these smaller, more portable weapons, and the U.S. about 1,600. These weapons can also be used for strategic attack and they are a prime target for illegal sale or seizure.

The second question, How long will we have nuclear weapons?

Article VI of the 1970 Non-Proliferation Treaty commits the United States and the other permanent members of the Security Council to eliminate their entire nuclear arsenals. In a 1996 advisory opinion -- this point was unanimous and included U.S. judge Steven Schwebel -- the International Court of Justice in the Hague stated that this NPT obligation remains binding and that the weapon states should proceed to fulfill it.

But under the 2002 Nuclear Posture Review, the U.S. nuclear arsenal is planned to be with us for the next half century and beyond. The Review foresees comprehensive modernization of the entire U.S. nuclear weapons complex. This starts with development of three new nuclear warheads: a deep penetrating warhead, perhaps two of them, a nuclear and a conventional version; a so-called Agent Defeat weapon that can neutralize and destroy chemical and biological weapons (this too could be in conventional and nuclear versions); and low-yield mini-nukes.

These new nuclear weapons will have to be tested. The Posture Review says nuclear testing may have to be resumed at some future point and has ordered a shorter preparation time for the Nevada Test Site.

In fact, after nullifying the ABM Treaty and dealing a body blow to the Biological Weapons Convention by withdrawing from verification negotiations, the administration seems to be moving slowly but deliberately toward dismantling a third key structure of multilateral arms control, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. One problem here is that if the U.S. can withdraw from multilateral arms control treaties, other governments can too.

As regards testing, the computer and engineering work for new warheads is under way, the test site is being prepared, concerns are being expressed by the weapons laboratories and the administration about the aging of the current nuclear stockpile and the Stockpile Stewardship Program, which is designed to assure its effectiveness. The administration seems to be waiting only for a precipitating incident to justify recommencement of testing.

The administration's comprehensive nuclear weapons modernization program includes a new plant to produce tritium gas; a new warhead assembly plant; rebuilding a plant for uranium weapon components; a new land-based intercontinental missile; a new submarine-based missile; a new missile firing submarine; and a new strategic bomber. The new submarine is due by 2030, the new bomber by 2040.

The May 24 treaty does refer in passing to Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Perhaps the Russians are responsible for this reference. But there is no mention in the Posture Review of the long-term prospect of eliminating nuclear weapons. The administration view is unambiguous, that nuclear weapons are with us forever. Taking together the expansionary effects of unlimited missile defense on nuclear arsenals and this comprehensive modernization program, the administration may be right about that. But what has happened to the pledge, implicit in the Non-Proliferation treaty, that, when the cold war nuclear confrontation ended, the U.S. would make a serious effort to move to elimination of its nuclear weapons?

The third question, What would U.S. nuclear weapons be used for?

Over the years, the norm has emerged that nuclear weapons should be used only in response to the threat or use of nuclear weapons. Perhaps this concept was more a hope of the Canberra Commission and of non-nuclear states for the post Cold War period than a norm, because it was not official U.S. policy. NATO doctrine foresaw possible use of nuclear weapons in the face of overwhelming Soviet conventional attack in Europe. This danger dissolved with withdrawal of Soviet troops from Eastern Europe and the collapse of the Soviet Union, but, after a promising initial move to consider nuclear weapons as weapons of last resort, NATO has not fundamentally changed its first-use policy, mainly, despite the views of the majority of NATO governments, in order to maintain conformity with the first-use policy of the United States.

The Clinton administration, faced by new fears of rogue missile attack, adopted a policy of deliberate ambiguity, hinting but not confirming that it would consider response with nuclear weapons if attacked by chemical or biological as well as by nuclear weapons. In the administration's Nuclear Posture Review, this ambiguity is stripped away. The Review is explicit that, henceforth, U.S. nuclear weapons may be used in response to nuclear, chemical, biological or conventional attack. Beyond that, the number and type of situations in which nuclear weapons may be used has been considerably expanded. In the words of the Review, nuclear strike forces are to be prepared to deal with "immediate contingencies," like an Iraqi attack on Israel, a North Korean attack on South Korea, or a military confrontation over Taiwan. Strike forces might also be used to deal with "potential contingencies," like emergence of a new hostile coalition against the U.S. -- presumably headed by China; nuclear forces could be used to deal with a third category of "unexpected contingencies," sudden and unpredicted security challenges. Taken together, these form a very broad spectrum of situations in which U.S. nuclear weapons might be used.

The Posture Review suggests that new long-range conventional weapons be developed for use instead of nuclear weapons in some situations. While this is in one sense a positive decision, it blurs the distinction between the two types of weapons because it suggests that nuclear and conventional weapons belong on the same unbroken continuum.

In the Nuclear Posture Review, the circle of target countries, those kept under constant targeting, has also been expanded. In addition to Russia, which remains targeted in spite of our improved relations, and China, the targeted countries now include Libya, Syria, Iraq, Iran and North Korea. With the possible exception of Iraq, which violated its NPT commitment, these countries are non-nuclear states which remain covered by U.S. negative security guarantees in connection with the Non-Proliferation Treaty not to use nuclear weapons against non-weapon states unless they are allied with an attacking weapon state. Targeting these countries is a case of deliberate inconsistency on the part of the United States. Especially for the non-nuclear states that are party to the Nonproliferation Treaty, it raises a serious question about what U.S. commitments are worth.

All in all, the range of situations and target countries in which the United States would consider use of nuclear weapons has been considerably expanded for the Policy Review. As a

consequence, the nuclear threshold, the point at which a United States administration would begin to seriously examine the possibility of using nuclear weapons, has been significantly lowered. The end result here is very far from a policy of nuclear weapons as a weapon of last resort. This is an aggressively forward-leaning threat of early first use. The fact that Russia has similarly broad views adds to the risk that nuclear weapons will actually be used.

It must be a source of real concern that the United States, a country which has huge conventional military superiority over all other countries of the world, and which has in addition huge diplomatic and economic resources, should now envision so many potential uses for nuclear weapons. It is unsettling that this is happening in a situation where the danger of total national destruction through all-out attack by nuclear or biological weapons has largely passed, and the United States is now concerned by the very different possibility of a localized rogue state or terrorist attack which could be very serious, but whose effects can be contained with proper preparation.

A final question, what kind of world will this new nuclear weapon strategy be operating in?

Viewed objectively, the U.S. is faced by a deteriorating proliferation situation. In the 1990s, nuclear non-proliferation failed in Iraq and nearly failed in North Korea. Then it failed in Pakistan and India. Missile proliferation has expanded, with exports from North Korea and China, and with North Korea, India, Pakistan and Iran building new missiles. This is the situation the Nuclear Policy Review seeks to deal with.

Quite rightly, President Bush takes proliferation seriously. He is determined to deal with the main threats to the U.S. population, threats which he sees as terrorist attacks or rogue missile attacks. It may be that the President hopes to go down in history as the American leader who decisively ended these threats. As he originally said before the negative connotations of this word for Muslims became clear for him, this is a crusade, a crusade involving the whole nation. As part of this effort, the President is trying to make the threat of use of American nuclear weapons more credible and more terrifying. He is also threatening to strike unilaterally at proliferators instead of leading an intense international effort to get on top of this proliferation situation and to control it. Using armed force against proliferators may be necessary in exceptional circumstances. But it should be joint action. Convincing other governments to join in such enterprises may be difficult but it can be done, as the older President Bush proved in the Gulf War and as President Clinton proved with NATO members in Kosovo. Moreover, the administration's solo approach on this and other issues is leaching away the reserves of gratitude, respect, and shared views which the U.S. has with much sacrifice built up over the past half-century.

We do not have access to the stream of secret information that shapes the President's views, but the administration's war against terrorism seems to reflect both the President's genuine personal convictions and a deliberate administration effort to maintain public concerns over terrorist attacks at a high level in order to support the war on terrorism.

Now, in his June 1, 2002 West Point speech, the President has publicly announced a concept of preemptive action against possible proliferators. This concept is questionable on practical and moral grounds. Nonetheless, the administration has indicated that this concept will form part of an overall National Security Strategy now being drafted. It is probable that only future historians will see the text of this document, and then only after its damage has been done. In addition to other important problems, preemptive attack depends on reliable intelligence that there is an immediate threat. The consequences of error could be very serious and often are, as the July, 2002 U.S. attack on an Afghan wedding party demonstrates. However, according to press reports, Secretary Rumsfeld speaking at NATO on June 6 said that the Alliance could not wait for "absolute proof" before a preemptive attack is launched. Preemptive use of weapons, possibly including nuclear weapons, on the basis of incomplete evidence is a very disquieting prospect.

It is legitimate to act preemptively in self defense in the face of a specific, imminent and evident challenge. But the new U.S. doctrine is general rather than specific. It refers to a whole class of potential offenders, the governments and terrorist groups that may be participating in the axis of evil.

There is an unevaluated and probably incorrect assumption in the preemption approach that all these target countries would try to attack the United States and its allies as soon as they are able. However, it is not legitimate to threaten early use of weapons, possibly including nuclear weapons, when threats from others are not pressing or evident and may not become so. It is not legitimate to threaten early use of weapons when approaches of diplomacy and negotiation are either untried or not exhausted.

In the cold war nuclear confrontation, preemption or even the appearance of possible preemptive action was regarded as something which must be avoided because it could trigger a full nuclear exchange. Its use today could still bring serious counterattack. Preemption is also not legitimate or moral if the actual political or military objective is broader than the announced target of preemption. This could be the situation with regard to Iraq, where the ostensible objective would be to block imminent attack on the U.S. or its allies, but the actual objective would be regime change. Preemption as a general policy is the essence of U.S. unilateralism. It is a generalized threat that the U.S. will decide for itself when to take drastic action when its information, whose details must remain secret, indicates that preemptive attack may be useful. Because a policy of preemption has no congressional authorization although it indicates unannounced warlike action against a wide range of states and groups, it has an unconstitutional quality.

It was not force of arms, but diplomacy and sanctions that brought the North Korean regime to the negotiating table. We can still talk to the Syrian, Libyan and Iranian governments, and even to the Iraqi government, and frame requirements and inducements.

Now that military action in Afghanistan has ended the Taliban regime, Saddam Hussein is first on the administration's destruct list. For a while, it appeared that there might be a long way to travel before this goal can be reached. First, the India-Pakistan confrontation has had to

be calmed. The effort to do this is underway. Then the Arab-Israeli confrontation had to be mitigated. And then must come renewed UN inspections in Iraq.

The administration's June 25 proposal that Arafat be removed before negotiating a possible resolution of the Palestinian-Israeli confrontation provides grounds for U.S. inaction on this issue until after the November U.S. elections. In terms of U.S. public opinion, this development may put military action against Iraq back on track. In any event, some specific administration decision on what actually to do about Iraq cannot be delayed much beyond the November elections. Without damage to its credibility, the administration cannot continually proclaim Saddam to be public enemy number one, and then fail to take decisive action against him.

What It All Means

What this all amounts to is that we are talking ourselves into war with Iraq using preemptive means. At least three countries involved in the Iraqi confrontation -- the U.S., possibly Iraq itself, and Israel -- have weapons of mass destruction. Perhaps preemption as now being considered by the administration refers to use of conventional forces. Perhaps the public announcement of a preemption policy is a deliberate tactic intended to add to pressures on Saddam Hussein. Nonetheless, preemption means first use of military force. With Iraq, Iran, and North Korea on the administration's nuclear target list, there is an unavoidable, in fact presumably desired, implication that preemption could include nuclear weapons.

To summarize, except in cases of immediately evident danger, preemption is the essence of unilateralism in foreign policy. Preemptive military action is immoral in causing loss of life without full prior exploration of alternatives to the use of force. If carried out without prior consultation with the Congress and the American public, including public presentation and discussion of convincing evidence, it is behavior which we would term authoritarian if other governments engaged in it. Where is the administration's insistence on tough, effective, continuing inspections in Iraq which will either produce that convincing evidence of Saddam Hussein's aggressive WMD activities or restrict his ability to produce or deliver these weapons?

The net result of these moves, of the administration's lowering of the nuclear threshold, its indefinite postponement of elimination of nuclear weapons, its nearly exclusive focus on military solutions, its bellicose vocabulary, its support for preemptive attack, and of the fact that the administration implausibly sees terrorists supplied by rogue nations ready to attack the United States with WMD in locations all over the globe, is that the situations in which Washington may be prepared to use nuclear weapons are becoming increasingly numerous.

As a consequence, people all over the world, as well as the terrorists and rogue state governments who are the presumed targets of these policies, have become frightened about the future and about what the United States might do.

This is not the responsible leadership on nuclear weapons policy that we and the rest of the world hope for from the United States. The assessment seems unavoidable that, instead, it is nuclear bullying -- counterproductive, dangerous, and immoral.

There is in fact a risk in the overheated atmosphere of the war on terrorism that things could get out of control in Iraq, in Israel, or in Pakistan, where an unstable nuclear regime is vulnerable to a coup by military or Islamic extremists. Of these problems, the Pakistan situation alone is a source of danger to the United States and the world that overshadows the dangers of the "axis of evil," but it is receiving insufficient emphasis in U.S. policy. In all these hot spots, India-Pakistan, the Palestinian-Israeli confrontation, in Iran, North Korea -- and also in Iraq -- the United States should give diplomacy and negotiation, backed by international cooperation, a full opportunity before considering the use of force.

Those of us who are alarmed at these developments in U.S. policy must speak up and raise our voices. It is only through more questions and more critical evaluation that the American public, which has instinctively rallied around national leadership in an emergency situation, will begin to raise its own necessary questions.

Status: U

Return-Path: <cjpoelman@yahoo.com>

Received: from web13008.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.174.18])

by hazard.mail.atl.earthlink.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17S8iI1PrZ3Nl3qG0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 19 Sep 2002 16:53:28 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: <20020919205327.27391.qmail@web13008.mail.yahoo.com>

Received: from [66.149.148.194] by web13008.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Thu, 19 Sep 2002 13:53:27 PDT

Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 13:53:27 -0700 (PDT)

From: Christel Poelman <cjpoelman@yahoo.com>

Subject: RELIGIOUS LEADERS ACTION DAYS

To: bgirtonm@nccusa.org, redgar@nccusa.org, hoc@list.nccusa.org,
ecumenicalofficers@list.nccusa.org, nab@list.nccusa.org,
retreat@list.nccusa.org, Bp Vicken Aykozion <avicken@aol.com>,
John Brisco <jbriscoe@nccusa.org>, Mark Brown <marsusab@aol.com>,
Daryl Byler <jbd@mcc.org>, Rob Cavenaugh <rcavenaugh@uua.org>,
Clayton Childers <cchilders@nmc-gbcs.org>,
Mary Elizabeth Clark <meclark@networklobby.org>,
Catherine Gordon <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>, Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>,
Bryan Hissony <washofc@aol.com>, Chris Hobgood <chobccca@aol.com>,
Robin Hoecker <rhoecker@uua.org>, Janet Horman <jhorman@umc-gbcs.org>,
Ken Brooker Langstor <auathome@aol.com>, James Matlack <jmatlack@erols.com>,
"J.E. Mc Neil" <jmcenrick@erols.com>,
Doug Nurell <dnorell@catholicrelief.org>, Meg Riley <RMiley@uua.org>,
David Sapertein <dsapertein@RAC.org>, Duane Shank <dshank@sojo.net>,
Ron Stief <stiefr@ucc.org>, Jean Stokan <jeanstokan@hotmail.com>,
Joe Volk <joe@fcl.org>, Corinne Whitlatch <cmep@cmep.org>,
Jim Winkler <jwinkler@umc-gbcs.org>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="0-650140298-1032468807=:26475"

--0-650140298-1032468807=:26475

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

Greetings,

Things are beginning to fall into place for the Religious Leaders Actions Days on Iraq in Washington.

There will be a time of prayer at the NCC each morning at 8:30 am. On Monday it will be led by Christel Poelman, on Tuesday by Brenda Girton-Mitchell, on Wednesday by Rev. Jim Winkler and on Friday by Rev. Bob Edgar.

For those of you inquiring about a schedule of events, there is a section of the National Council of Churches website that is dedicated to next week. It has denominational statements, a schedule of events that will be added to as things become confirmed, and various talking points. By tomorrow a concise, compact version of the talking points will be available on the website.

Continue to encourage your heads of communion to come to Washington next week to lend their voice to this cause.

Sincerely,

Christel Poelman

(intern for National Council of Churches)

Status: U

Return-Path: cjpoelman@yahoo.com

Received: from web13007.mail.yahoo.com ([216.136.174.17]) by tyner.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with SMTP id 17S8Px5CX3NI3rs0 for <mupj@igc.org>; Thu, 19 Sep 2002 17:27:23 -0400 (EDT)

Message-ID: 20020919212722.48379.qmail@web13007.mail.yahoo.com

Received: from [66.149.148.194] by web13007.mail.yahoo.com via HTTP; Thu, 19 Sep 2002 14:27:22 PDT

Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 14:27:22 -0700 (PDT)

From: Christel Poelman cjpoelman@yahoo.com

Subject: Press Club Event

To: Bp Vicken Aykozion <avicken@aol.com>, John Brisco <jbriscoe@nccusa.org>,

Mark Brown <marsusab@aol.com>, Daryl Byler <jdb@mcc.org>,

Rob Cavanaugh <rcavanaugh@uua.org>,

Clayton Childers <cchilders@umc-gbcs.org>,

Mary Elizabeth Clark <meclark@networklobby.org>,

Robert Edgar <redgar@nccusa.org>,

Brenda Girton-Mitchell <bgirtonm@nccusa.org>,

Catherine Gordon <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>, Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>,

Bryan Hissony <washofc@aol.com>, Chris Hobgood <chobccca@aol.com>,

Robin Hoecker <rhoecker@uua.org>, Janet Horman <jhorman@umc-gbcs.org>,

Ken Brooker Langstor <auathome@aol.com>, James Matlack <jmatlack@erols.com>,

"J.E. Mc Neil" <jmcnrick@erols.com>,

Doug Nurell <dnorell@catholicrelief.org>, Meg Riley <MRiley@uua.org>,

David Sapertein <dsapertein@rac.org>, Duane Shank <dshank@sojo.net>,

Ron Stief <stiefr@ucc.org>, Jean Stokan <jeanstokan@hotmail.com>,

Joe Volk <joe@fcl.org>, Corinne Whitlatch <cmep@cmep.org>,

Jim Winkler <jwinkler@umc-gbcs.org>

Cc: cjpoelman@yahoo.com

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="0-1076115860-1032470842=:47864"

see attached flyer



NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

529 14TH Street, NW
Washington, DC 20045

(202) 662-7516
FAX (202) 662-7537

NATIONAL PRESS CLUB NEWSMAKER LUNCHEON **SERIES**

Presents

Reverend Bob Edgar **General Secretary** **National Council of Churches** *"Declaring War on the Axis of Evil."*

September 27, 2002

12:30 - 2:00 PM

National Press Club Ballroom

The luncheon will begin at **12:30 p.m.** Remarks will begin just after **1:00 p.m.**, followed by a question-and-answer session.

Advance reservations may be made by calling
Patricia Nelson at (202) 662-7501 or by email at pnelson@press.org.

The club is located at 14th and F Streets, one block from Metro Center, on the 13th floor of the National Press Building.

!!!! RESERVATIONS MUST BE MADE BY SEPTEMBER 26TH AT 2 P.M.
!!!!

Cost for the luncheon:

Members and Students \$16 • Guests of Members and Speaker \$28 • General \$35

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Kayser, Marie" <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
Subject: Touch up for Iraq section
Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 16:07:46 -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

Marie,

Here are a few more touch-up items for Disarming Iraq.

Go to How to Get to Zero. In index click Disarming Iraq without War. This gets you to sub-index above map. Link the two items -- Statements of Religious Organizations & Articles and Reports -- to where the subsections appear below.

In the Statements of Religious Organizations
Presbyterian Church (USA)

"Church is preparing material on Iraq" linkage goes to the wrong place.

The correct URL is <http://www.pcusa.org/pcnews/02348.htm>

The heading for the Articles and Reports on Alternatives to War didn't come up.

That's all until I get some more entrees.

Thanks.

Howard

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Miller, Phillip H." <millerph@att.net>
Subject: Check request
Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 16:57:44 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Phil,

Please provide a check payable to MCI for \$14.70.

It sounds as if you and Jim are working things out with the East Ohio Conference. Thanks for your persistence.

Howard

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Christel Poelman" <cjpoelman@yahoo.com>
References: <20020919205327.27391.qmail@web13008.mail.yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: RELIGIOUS LEADERS ACTION DAYS
Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 17:15:14 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0047_01C26000.1E72C620"
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_0047_01C26000.1E72C620
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Christel,

On the NCC web site with resources on Iraq, consideration might be given =
to adding the compilation of religious statements that we did. The =
entree could be: "Compilation of Religious Statements" or "Other =
Religious Statements". The linkage is =
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero.html#disarmingiraq>.

The alternative would be to extract the items listed on our site and the =
linkages and add them to the NCC page. That's okay with me and may make =
more sense than merely adding linkage to our compilation.

Howard

----- Original Message -----=20
From: Christel Poelman=20
To: bgirtonm@nccusa.org ; redgar@nccusa.org ; hoc@list.nccusa.org ; =
ecumenicalofficers@list.nccusa.org ; nab@list.nccusa.org ; =
retreat@list.nccusa.org ; Bp Vicken Aykozion ; John Brisco ; Mark Brown =
; Daryl Byler ; Rob Cavanaugh ; Clayton Childers ; Mary Elizabeth Clark =
; Catherine Gordon ; Howard Hallman ; Bryan Hissony ; Chris Hobgood ; =
Robin Hoecker ; Janet Horman ; Ken Brooker Langstor ; James Matlack ; =
J.E. Mc Neil ; Doug Nurell ; Meg Riley ; David Sapertein ; Duane Shank ; =
Ron Stief ; Jean Stokan ; Joe Volk ; Corinne Whitlatch ; Jim Winkler=20
Sent: Thursday, September 19, 2002 4:53 PM
Subject: RELIGIOUS LEADERS ACTION DAYS

Greetings,=20

Things are beginning to fall into place for the Religious Leaders =

Actions Days on Iraq in Washington. =20

There will be a time of prayer at the NCC each morning at 8:30 am. On =
Monday it will be led by Christel Poelman, on Tuesday by Brenda =
Girton-Mitchell, on Wednesday by Rev. Jim Winkler and on Friday by Rev. =
Bob Edgar.=20

For those of you inquiring about a schedule of events, there is a =
section of the National Council of Churches website that is dedicated to =
next week. It has denominational statements, a schedule of events that =
will be added to as things become confirmed, and various talking points. =
By tomorrow a concise, compact version of the talking points will be =
available on the website. =20

Continue to encourage your heads of communion to come to Washington =
next week to lend their voice to this cause.

Sincerely,

Christel Poelman

(intern for National Council of Churches)

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
To: johnburroughs@lcnp.org
Subject: A model deep cuts treaty
Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 17:48:31 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----
=_NextPart_000_005A_01C26004.C5194AE0"
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 John,

On the theory that you can't beat something with nothing, I have been thinking about the possibility of having the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, ask some experts to develop a model treaty for very deep cuts in the U.S. and Russian strategic arsenals. It would put on paper the kind of reductions that a variety of reports have recommended in recent years. Reductions would be irreversible, leading to dismantlement of weapons taken out of service. My ideas are spelled out in the attachment.

I admire the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention that you and others developed five years ago. The first step of your plan was to reduce U.S. and Russian warheads to a level approaching the other nuclear weapon states and then bringing them in. What I am suggesting is a push for a bilateral agreement for deep cuts before going into multilateral negotiations.

A model treaty of this sort could be a useful rallying point for the faith community in the U.S. and counterparts in Canada and Europe. It could also be a rallying point for a broader coalition with civil sector organizations. The drafting process could involve contacts in Russia and maybe some citizen diplomacy through contacts with U.S. and Russian officials. If we do this right, we could fulfill President Eisenhower's warning that some day citizens will insist that their governments give them the peace they crave, in this case, nuclear disarmament.

Would you and your colleagues be interested in exploring this possibility with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament? I'm also initiating conversations with persons from the arms control community in Washington.

At the moment the faith community is concentrating on opposition to war against Iraq. This won't go on forever. Perhaps by the first of next year or springtime we will be able give more attention to broader nuclear disarmament again. Drafting a model treaty could help prepare for that opportunity.

I'll call you next week to discuss this.

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.

Model Strategic Weapons Elimination Treaty (SWEET): A Proposal

The Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT), also known as the Moscow Treaty of 2002, signifies that the United States and Russia are unwilling to find a way to mutually eliminate their nuclear arsenals, as required by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Although SORT provides for useful reductions in deployed strategic weapons, a sizable arsenal remains in active service and a large supply remains in reserve. Moreover, the treaty expires in 2012.

Yet it is in the self-interest of the United States and Russia to eliminate their strategic arsenals. As long as one side maintains a large arsenal deployed for quick launch on warning, the other side will do likewise. This in effect maintains the Cold War doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD) with the risk of accidental launch and quick retaliation. Both nations would be more secure if this threat was eliminated. But their governments are unwilling to act in this manner.

President Eisenhower once said, "I think that people, in the long run, want peace so much that one of these days governments had better get out of the way and let them have it." The time has come to apply this thinking to nuclear weapons. We the people of Earth are tired of the unwillingness of governments to eliminate nuclear weapons. Therefore, we should write a treaty that accomplish this task and insist that governments accept and implement it.

In 1997 citizens did indeed develop a Model Nuclear Weapons Convention that drew considerable praise. Governments, though, ignored it. That model remains as a useful document. However, at this moment it would be appropriate to take the first major step by developing a bilateral treaty between the United States and Russia to reduce their strategic arsenals to 200 to 400 warheads on each side. This is the approximate level of other nuclear weapon states, which would need to be brought into a broader treaty for the final elimination of nuclear weapons.

A Model Strategic Weapons Elimination Treaty (SWEET) should have these features:

- A schedule for de-alerting, deactivation, and dismantlement as rapidly as practicable. Neither side should be at a disadvantage at any stage of reductions.
- Provisions for transparency and verification.
- Of reasonable length, such as 10 to 20 pages with cross-reference to other treaties as appropriate and appendices for detailed schedules if necessary.
- Drafted through an open process that involves U.S. and Russian experts and input from persons living elsewhere. Citizen diplomacy could occur during the drafting process to keep U.S. and Russian government officials informed and gain their feedback.

Citizen education and coalition building would take place during the drafting process in order to set the stage for citizens to demand that the governments accept, ratify, and implement the model treaty. As a beginning, the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, a U.S. coalition, could ask some experts to draft a model treaty and then reach out to faith groups in other countries and to civil sector organizations in the U.S. and abroad to start building support for the model treaty.

Proposed by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice
September 19, 2002

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
To: dkimball@armscontrol.org
Subject: A model deep cuts treaty
Date: Thu, 19 Sep 2002 17:50:09 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----
=_NextPart_000_0064_01C26004.FFE61680"
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 Daryl,

I have further developed my idea for a model treaty on truly deep cuts in U.S. and Russian strategic arsenals. This is spelled out in the attachment.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, could take the initiative by inviting experts to draft such a treaty. Under the theory that you can't beat something with nothing, a model treaty of this sort could be a useful rallying point for the faith community in the U.S. and counterparts in Canada and Europe. It could also be a rallying point for a broader coalition with civil sector organizations. The drafting process could involve contacts in Russia and maybe some citizen diplomacy through contacts with U.S. and Russian officials. If we do this right, we could fulfill President Eisenhower's warning that some day citizens will insist that their governments give them the peace they crave, in this case, nuclear disarmament.

I have written John Burroughs about this idea and will explore with him whether he and his colleagues would be willing to help. It would also be desirable to involve arms control experts in Washington.

At the moment the faith community is concentrating on opposition to war against Iraq. This won't go on forever. Perhaps by the first of next year or springtime we will be able give more attention to broader nuclear disarmament again. Drafting a model treaty could help prepare for that opportunity.

Let's talk about this.

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.

Model Strategic Weapons Elimination Treaty (SWEET): A Proposal

The Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT), also known as the Moscow Treaty of 2002, signifies that the United States and Russia are unwilling to find a way to mutually eliminate their nuclear arsenals, as required by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Although SORT provides for useful reductions in deployed strategic weapons, a sizable arsenal remains in active service and a large supply remains in reserve. Moreover, the treaty expires in 2012.

Yet it is in the self-interest of the United States and Russia to eliminate their strategic arsenals. As long as one side maintains a large arsenal deployed for quick launch on warning, the other side will do likewise. This in effect maintains the Cold War doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD) with the risk of accidental launch and quick retaliation. Both nations would be more secure if this threat was eliminated. But their governments are unwilling to act in this manner.

President Eisenhower once said, "I think that people, in the long run, want peace so much that one of these days governments had better get out of the way and let them have it." The time has come to apply this thinking to nuclear weapons. We the people of Earth are tired of the unwillingness of governments to eliminate nuclear weapons. Therefore, we should write a treaty that accomplish this task and insist that governments accept and implement it.

In 1997 citizens did indeed develop a Model Nuclear Weapons Convention that drew considerable praise. Governments, though, ignored it. That model remains as a useful document. However, at this moment it would be appropriate to take the first major step by developing a bilateral treaty between the United States and Russia to reduce their strategic arsenals to 200 to 400 warheads on each side. This is the approximate level of other nuclear weapon states, which would need to be brought into a broader treaty for the final elimination of nuclear weapons.

A Model Strategic Weapons Elimination Treaty (SWEET) should have these features:

- A schedule for de-alerting, deactivation, and dismantlement as rapidly as practicable. Neither side should be at a disadvantage at any stage of reductions.
- Provisions for transparency and verification.
- Of reasonable length, such as 10 to 20 pages with cross-reference to other treaties as appropriate and appendices for detailed schedules if necessary.
- Drafted through an open process that involves U.S. and Russian experts and input from persons living elsewhere. Citizen diplomacy could occur during the drafting process to keep U.S. and Russian government officials informed and gain their feedback.

Citizen education and coalition building would take place during the drafting process in order to set the stage for citizens to demand that the governments accept, ratify, and implement the model treaty. As a beginning, the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, a U.S. coalition, could ask some experts to draft a model treaty and then reach out to faith groups in other countries and to civil sector organizations in the U.S. and abroad to start building support for the model treaty.

Proposed by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice
September 19, 2002

Status: U

Return-Path: <dkimball@armscontrol.org>

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

by osgood.mail.atl.earthlink.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17Sqc26aG3Nl3pt0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 20 Sep 2002 11:59:45 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from clw13.armscontrol.org ([66.7.2.230])

by otp.elinkisp.com (8.10.0/8.10.0) with ESMTTP id g8KFxaN29856
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 20 Sep 2002 11:59:37 -0400

Message-Id: <5.1.0.14.0.20020920115357.01d9d8d0@127.0.0.1>

X-Sender: dkimball/mail.elinkisp.com@127.0.0.1

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1

Date: Fri, 20 Sep 2002 11:58:49 -0400

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

From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@armscontrol.org>

Subject: Re: A model deep cuts treaty

In-Reply-To: <006801c26026\$94a72180\$a95cf7a5@default>

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

Howard:

My initial reaction is that because John Burroughs and others have already developed draft nuclear weapons convention, this exercise would be repetitive. Secondly, efforts to rally public support for the elimination of nuclear weapons will depend on our ability to communicate the nature and extent of the threat and to make it clear that prevention, rather than preemption is the better approach.

DK

At 05:50 PM 9/19/02 -0400, you wrote:

>Dear Daryl,

>

>I have further developed my idea for a model treaty on truly deep cuts in
>U.S. and Russian strategic arsenals. This is spelled out in the attachment.

>

>The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, could take
>the initiative by inviting experts to draft such a treaty. Under the
>theory that you can't beat something with nothing, a model treaty of this
>sort could be a useful rallying point for the faith community in the U.S.
>and counterparts in Canada and Europe. It could also be a rallying point
>for a broader coalition with civil sector organizations. The drafting
>process could involve contacts in Russia and maybe some citizen diplomacy
>through contacts with U.S. and Russian officials. If we do this right, we
>could fulfill President Eisenhower's warning that some day citizens will
>insist that their governments give them the peace they crave, in this case,
>nuclear disarmament.

>

>I have written John Burroughs about this idea and will explore with him
>whether he and his colleagues would be willing to help. It would also be
>desirable to involve arms control experts in Washington.

>
>At the moment the faith community is concentrating on opposition to war
>against Iraq. This won't go on forever. Perhaps by the first of next year
>or springtime we will be able give more attention to broader nuclear
>disarmament again. Drafting a model treaty could help prepare for that
>opportunity.

>
>Let's talk about this.

>
>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.

>

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Arms Control Association
1726 M Street, NW, Suite 201
Washington, DC 20036
(ph) 202-463-8270 x107 (fax) 202-463-8273
website <<http://www.armscontrol.org>>
email <dkimball@armscontrol.org>

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Christel Poelman" <cjpoelman@yahoo.com>
References: <20020919205327.27391.qmail@web13008.mail.yahoo.com>
Subject: Senate contacts
Date: Fri, 20 Sep 2002 13:55:00 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="-----_NextPart_000_001B_01C260AD.4FB70B80"
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_001B_01C260AD.4FB70B80
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Christel,

I would like to make contact with the foreign policy aides of my two =
senators, Sarbanes and Mikulski. I may come in Monday morning. Do you =
have their names? If not, you could probably get a list from David Culp =
at FCNL or John Isaacs at the Council for a Livable World. Others may =
want this resources.

Shalom,
Howard

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <redgar@nccusa.org>,
<bgirtonm@uccusa.org>,
<cjpoelman@yahoo.com>
Subject: Catholic statement on Iraq
Date: Fri, 20 Sep 2002 13:57:13 -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

Bob and Brenda,

If you haven't seen it, please look at the statement by Bishop Gregory, president of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, opposing military action against Iraq. It is found at <http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/bush902.htm>. It would be a good addition to the NCC web site.

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: "Culp, David" <david@fcnl.org>
Subject: Senate contacts
Date: Fri, 20 Sep 2002 13:59:50 -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

David,

Do you have the names of the foreign policy aides of my senators, Sarbane and Mikulski? I want to talk with them about Iraq.

Thanks,
Howard

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

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

Status: U

Return-Path: <david@fcnl.org>

Received: from local.fcnl.org ([65.207.12.2])

by nils.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17SsiA3uv3Nl3pm0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 20 Sep 2002 14:14:40 -0400 (EDT)

Received: by local.fcnl.org with Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

id <TF0WB739>; Fri, 20 Sep 2002 14:12:09 -0400

Message-ID: <E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF6736171@local.fcnl.org>

From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>

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

Subject: RE: Senate contacts

Date: Fri, 20 Sep 2002 14:12:09 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: text/plain

I have:

Sarbanes is Joanne Berry.

Mikulski is Frederic Baron

David

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

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

Sent: Friday, September 20, 2002 2:00 pm

To: Culp, David

Subject: Senate contacts

David,

Do you have the names of the foreign policy aides of my senators, Sarbane
and Mikulski? I want to talk with them about Iraq.

Thanks,

Howard

Howard W. Hallman is Chair of

Methodists United for Peace with Justice

1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036

Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org

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

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: <bgirtonm@nccusa.org>
Subject: Catholic statement on Iraq
Date: Fri, 20 Sep 2002 14:06:43 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4807.1700
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4807.1700

Brenda,

If you haven't seen it, please look at the statement by Bishop Gregory, president of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, opposing military action against Iraq. It is found at <http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/bush902.htm>. It would be a good addition to the NCC web site.

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: <redgar@nccusa.org>

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

by walker.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17SsEygL43N13s70
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 20 Sep 2002 14:37:22 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from BobEdgar ([64.212.94.149])

by bruno.nccusa.org (Pro-8.9.2/Pro-8.9.2) with SMTP id NAA09202
for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 20 Sep 2002 13:27:33 -0400 (EDT)

Reply-To: <redgar@nccusa.org>

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

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

Subject: RE: Catholic statement on Iraq

Date: Fri, 20 Sep 2002 13:36:06 -0500

Message-ID: <008201c260d4\$9557aec0\$955ed440@nccusa.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 CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4522.1200

Importance: Normal

In-Reply-To: <003d01c260cf\$aabb65e0\$de59f7a5@default>

Thanks, Howard. I did share it with our heads of communion and ecumenical officers. Best wishes. I hope to see you next week. Peace, Bob

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

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

Sent: Friday, September 20, 2002 12:57 PM

To: redgar@nccusa.org; bgirtonm@uccusa.org; cjpoelman@yahoo.com

Subject: Catholic statement on Iraq

Bob and Brenda,

If you haven't seen it, please look at the statement by Bishop Gregory, president of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, opposing military action against Iraq. It is found at <http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/bush902.htm>. It would be a good addition to the NCC web site.

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: <owner-gbcs-pwj@UMCGROUPEMAIL.ORG>

Received: from umcgroupemail.org ([64.221.242.81])

by nils.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTTP id 17SttG6dd3Nl3pm0

for <mupj@igc.org>; Fri, 20 Sep 2002 15:30:11 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from UMCom2C02 (10.1.2.12) by umcgroupemail.org (LSMTTP for Windows NT v1.1b) with SMTP id <0.0002E3EC@umcgroupemail.org>; Fri, 20 Sep 2002 14:27:47 -0500

Received: from UMCGROUPEMAIL.ORG by UMCGROUPEMAIL.ORG (LISTSERV-TCP/IP release 1.8d) with spool id 2723 for GBGS-PWJ@UMCGROUPEMAIL.ORG; Fri, 20 Sep 2002 14:25:46 -0500

Received: from Church1.UMC-GBCS.ORG (66.95.90.3) by umcgroupemail.org (LSMTTP for Windows NT v1.1b) with SMTP id <0.0002E3B1@umcgroupemail.org>; Fri, 20 Sep 2002 14:25:46 -0500

content-class: urn:content-classes:message

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----_=_NextPart_001_01C260DB.82B7B6C0"

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft Exchange V6.0.6249.0

X-MS-Has-Attach: yes

X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:

Thread-Topic: Actions to stop war in Iraq

Thread-Index: AcJg21nB6PIBPuPuQiq4WNk49w/91wAABidw

Message-ID: <D58A7AD53C7E224EBA04A42D033330916B70B@Church1.UMC-GBCS.ORG>

Date: Fri, 20 Sep 2002 15:25:42 -0400

Reply-To: GBGS PWJ <GBGS-PWJ@UMCGROUPEMAIL.ORG>

Sender: GBGS PWJ <GBGS-PWJ@UMCGROUPEMAIL.ORG>

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

Subject: [GBGS-PWJ] FW: Actions to stop war in Iraq

To: GBGS-PWJ@UMCGROUPEMAIL.ORG

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_=_NextPart_001_01C260DB.82B7B6C0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

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

From: Janet Horman=20

Sent: Friday, September 20, 2002 3:25 PM

To: 'GBGS-PWJ@GROUPEMAIL.ORG'

Subject: Actions to stop war in Iraq

=20

Dear Friends:

Thanks to Adrienne for sending out alert re:lobby day on September 30th = to stop war on Iraq. Please see NCC website for more on activities in DC = Sept. 23-27(religious leaders lobbying day and press event) and October = 11 citizen's hearing(org. by GBGS and NCC committee).

<http://www.nccusa.org/>

Please try to organize some visit or event at your district/local office =
for your Senator or Rep while they are home beginning the 15th of =
October.

Also, if you have not done so yet, please send out action alert on Iraq =
through our UMPOWER at the GBCS website.(www.umc-gbcs.org).

Also, we are looking for a Senate office to host the October 11 =
citizen's hearing. We will have four UMC Bishops at our Washington =
office that day in conjunction with the GBCS Bd. meeting. Please call =
your Senate office and ask him/her to consider sponsoring a citizen's =
hearing for religious, civic, labor, etc. leader's to express opposition =
to war. You might ask for the staffer who handles Iraq. Please leave =
your name as a contact(since you are a constituent), and then tell the =
staffer that you will have me call them with details.

Thanks,=20

Janet Horman=20

To Unsubscribe from this Group:

If you wish to remove yourself from this Group, please go to UMCom.org, login to your account, click on the My Resources link and select Leave from the list(s) from which you wish to unsubscribe. If you have problems, or any further questions, email us at: websupport@umcom.org.

Powered by United Methodist Communications <http://www.UMCom.org>

Status: U

Return-Path: <owner-gbcs-pwj@UMCGROUPEMAIL.ORG>

Received: from umcgroupemail.org ([64.221.242.81])

by bissell.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17SKtX7b73N13rE0

for <mupj@igc.org>; Sat, 21 Sep 2002 09:39:37 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from UMCom2C02 (10.1.2.12) by umcgroupemail.org (LSMTP for Windows NT v1.1b) with SMTP id <0.0002E90B@umcgroupemail.org>; Sat, 21 Sep 2002 8:39:36 -0500

Received: from UMCGROUPEMAIL.ORG by UMCGROUPEMAIL.ORG (LISTSERV-TCP/IP release 1.8d) with spool id 4331 for GBGS-PWJ@UMCGROUPEMAIL.ORG; Sat, 21 Sep 2002 08:37:35 -0500

Received: from falcon.mail.pas.earthlink.net (207.217.120.74) by umcgroupemail.org (LSMTP for Windows NT v1.1b) with SMTP id <0.0002E90A@umcgroupemail.org>; Sat, 21 Sep 2002 8:37:34 -0500

Received: from sdn-ap-017watacop0094.dialsprint.net ([63.191.232.94]) by falcon.mail.pas.earthlink.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #1) id 17skRw-0003ME-00 for GBGS-PWJ@umcgroupemail.org; Sat, 21 Sep 2002 06:37:33 -0700

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

Mime-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="MS_Mac_OE_3115435289_4630258_MIME_Part"

Message-ID: <B9B1C519.384C%kentkathyb@earthlink.net>

Date: Sat, 21 Sep 2002 06:41:29 -0700

Reply-To: GBGS PWJ <GBGS-PWJ@UMCGROUPEMAIL.ORG>

Sender: GBGS PWJ <GBGS-PWJ@UMCGROUPEMAIL.ORG>

From: Kent/Kathy Barton <kentkathyb@EARTHLINK.NET>

Subject: [GBGS-PWJ] Text of Lee resolution on Iraq

To: GBGS-PWJ@UMCGROUPEMAIL.ORG

> 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_3115435289_4630258_MIME_Part

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

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

FYI

Kathy Campbell-Barton

Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the importance of the United States working through the United Nations to assure Iraq's compliance with United Nations Security Council... (Introduced in House)

HCON 473 IH

107th CONGRESS

2d Session

H. CON. RES. 473

Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the importance of the United States working through the United Nations to assure Iraq's compliance

with United Nations Security Council resolutions and advance peace and security in the Persian Gulf region.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
SEPTEMBER 19, 2002

Ms. LEE (for herself, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. WATSON of California, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. STARK, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FILNER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. CONYERS) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on International Relations

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the importance of the United States working through the United Nations to assure Iraq's compliance with United Nations Security Council resolutions and advance peace and security in the Persian Gulf region.

Whereas on April 6, 1991, during the Persian Gulf War, Iraq accepted the provisions of United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 (April 3, 1991) bringing a formal cease-fire into effect;

Whereas, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 687, Iraq unconditionally accepted the destruction, removal, or rendering harmless of `all chemical and biological weapons and all stocks of agents and all related subsystems and components and all research, development, support and manufacturing facilities related thereto', and `all ballistic missiles with a range greater than one hundred and fifty kilometers, and related major parts and repair and production facilities';

Whereas, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 687, Iraq unconditionally agreed not to acquire or develop any nuclear weapons, nuclear-weapons-usable material, nuclear-related subsystems or components, or nuclear-related research, development, support, or manufacturing facilities;

Whereas Security Council Resolution 687 calls for the creation of a United Nations special commission to `carry out immediate on-site inspection of Iraq's biological, chemical, and missile capabilities' and to assist and cooperate with the International Atomic Energy Agency in carrying out the `destruction, removal or rendering harmless' of all nuclear-related items and in developing a plan for the ongoing monitoring and verification of Iraq's compliance;

Whereas United Nations weapons inspectors (UNSCOM) between 1991 and 1998

successfully uncovered and destroyed large stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons and production facilities, nuclear weapons research and development facilities, and Scud missiles, despite the fact that the Government of Iraq sought to obstruct their work in numerous ways;

Whereas in 1998, UNSCOM weapons inspectors were withdrawn from Iraq and have not returned since;

Whereas Iraq is not in compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 687, United Nations Security Council Resolution 1154, and additional United Nations resolutions on inspections, and this noncompliance violates international law and Iraq's ceasefire obligations and potentially endangers United States and regional security interests;

Whereas the true extent of Iraq's continued development of weapons of mass destruction and the threat posed by such development to the United States and allies in the region are unknown and cannot be known without inspections;

Whereas the United Nations was established for the purpose of preventing war and resolving disputes between nations through peaceful means, including 'by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional arrangements, or other peaceful means';

Whereas the United Nations remains seized of this matter;

Whereas the President has called upon the United Nations to take responsibility to assure that Iraq fulfills its obligations to the United Nations under existing United Nations Security Council resolutions;

Whereas war with Iraq would place the lives of tens of thousands of people at risk, including members of the United States armed forces, Iraqi civilian non-combatants, and civilian populations in neighboring countries;

Whereas unilateral United States military action against Iraq may undermine cooperative international efforts to reduce international terrorism and to bring to justice those responsible for the attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas unilateral United States military action against Iraq may also undermine United States diplomatic relations with countries throughout the Arab and Muslim world and with many other allies;

Whereas a preemptive unilateral United States first strike could both set a dangerous international precedent and significantly weaken the United Nations as an institution; and

Whereas the short-term and long-term costs of unilateral United States military action against Iraq and subsequent occupation may be significant in terms of United States casualties, the cost to the United States treasury, and harm to United States diplomatic relations with other countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the United States should work through the United Nations to seek to resolve the

matter of ensuring that Iraq is not developing weapons of mass destruction, through mechanisms such as the resumption of weapons inspections, negotiation, enquiry, mediation, regional arrangements, and other peaceful means.

Status: U

Return-Path: <DickUll@aol.com>

Received: from imo-r07.mx.aol.com ([152.163.225.103])

by strange.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17SKGH4yN3N13oW0
for <mupj@igc.org>; Sat, 21 Sep 2002 09:52:47 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from DickUll@aol.com

by imo-r07.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v34.10.) id p.138.14a8de5a (3988);
Sat, 21 Sep 2002 09:51:58 -0400 (EDT)

From: DickUll@aol.com

Message-ID: <138.14a8de5a.2abdd37e@aol.com>

Date: Sat, 21 Sep 2002 09:51:58 EDT

Subject: Fwd: FW: SCOTT RITTER

To: ghgray@bcpl.net, richard.horwitt@ssa.gov, ahusain@isb.org, SuMaJor@aol.com,
MAKATLACK@aol.com, krumm@vntsc.dot.gov

CC: mupj@igc.org, fherman@harsinai-md.org, mary.kambic@jhu.edu,
kkcpapc@ionet.net, JIamar@maryknoll.org

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="part1_138.14a8de5a.2abdd37e_boundary"

X-Mailer: AOL 7.0 for Windows US sub 10637

--part1_138.14a8de5a.2abdd37e_boundary

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="part1_138.14a8de5a.2abdd37e_alt_boundary"

--part1_138.14a8de5a.2abdd37e_alt_boundary

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

In a message dated 9/19/2002 12:06:28 PM Eastern Daylight Time,
GGillespie@afsc.org writes:

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

> From: Dick Ullrich [mailto:pfmjpi@mail.missionhelpers.org]

>

>

> Now that the public debate about war with Iraq is engaged, it is
> appropriate

> to hear another voice. Scott Ritter was a Marine Intelligence Officer for
> UNSCOM in Iraq for seven years. Scott has the literally hands-on-experience
> with weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, and a totally different
> perspective than the Bush administration about war with Iraq.

>

> Scott Ritter gave a presentation in Baltimore on August 22 at the Stony Run
> Friends Meeting on this subject. The video of that session includes a 30
> minute presentation by Scott Ritter, a panel of local citizens, and
> question/answers from many of the 200 attendees.

>

> The entire tape is two hours, and costs \$25.00. It was produced by Mission
> Helper Productions, Inc. in Towson.

>

- > It is a timely topic and one that is vital to our democracy.
- >
- > For your copy, call Maryland Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities at
- > 410-323-7200 ext. 36, or mail your check of \$25.00 [payable to WILPF] to:
- >
- > Maryland Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities
- > % American Friends Service Committee (AFSC)
- > 4806 York Road
- > Baltimore, MD 21212
- >

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Dietrich Fischer" <102464.1110@compuserve.com>
References: <200210041349_MC3-1-141C-37A2@compuserve.com>
Subject: remove
Date: Fri, 4 Oct 2002 16:48:52 -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

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

From: "Dietrich Fischer" <102464.1110@compuserve.com>
To: "Dietrich Fischer" <fischer@transcend.org>
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2002 1:45 PM
Subject: Nov. 23-24 workshop with Johan Galtung and Hamid Mowlana

> [Note: I am sending you such announcements of peace courses about
> 3-5 times per year. If you wish to be removed from this list,
> please reply with "REMOVE" in the subject line. Please also
> include all your "aliases"--other email addresses you check from
> time to time or from which email is forwarded to you. Thank you.]

>

> Announcement:

>

> PEACEFUL TRANSFORMATION OF COMPLEX CONFLICTS:

> The TRANSCEND Approach

>

> A Workshop with Johan Galtung, Professor of Peace Studies and
> Director, TRANSCEND: A Peace and Development Network, and
> Hamid Mowlana, Professor of International Relations at the School
> of International Service, The American University

>

> DATES: Saturday, November 23, 2002, 10:30 am - 10:00 pm

> Sunday, November 24, 12:15 - 4:00 pm

>

> PLACE: Manassas, Virginia (half an hour West of Washington, DC;

> directions will be sent to those who have registered)

>

> This workshop is recommended for anyone interested in helping
> parties in a conflict transform them nonviolently, at the personal,
> group and international level. It should be of interest to
> practitioners, diplomats, professionals working with NGOs and
> international organizations, journalists, psychologists, family
> therapists, social workers, as well as teachers and students from
> a wide range of disciplines.

>

> WORKSHOP OVERVIEW:

- >
- > This workshop will provide participants with an introduction to the
- > TRANSCEND method of conflict transformation by peaceful means,
- > based on 40 years of research and practice. Conflicts can rarely
- > be "resolved" in the sense that they completely disappear, but they
- > can be transformed from being fought with violent means to being
- > conducted by peaceful means. In that sense, conflicts can have a
- > constructive function in helping bring about desirable change.
- >
- > The workshop format will be highly interactive, with a combination
- > of lectures, facilitated discussions and exercises in small groups.
- > Participants are invited to contribute case studies from their own
- > experience.

> OBJECTIVES OF THE WORKSHOP:

- >
- > * Participants will learn to analyze conflicts and design
- > methods of intervention that help reduce violence.
- >
- > * Methods of mapping conflict formations are to be discussed.
- >
- > * Introduction to diagnosis (sources of a conflict),
- > prognosis (likely trends without intervention) and
- > therapy (proposed interventions to reduce violence).
- >
- > * Principles of dialogue and negotiation as methods of conflict
- > transformation; the psychology of the dialogue process.
- >
- > * Distinction between direct, structural and cultural violence.
- >
- > * Sensitivity to cultural differences in conflict transformation.
- >
- > * Development of empathy with the parties involved, and
- > creativity to discover mutually acceptable outcomes.
- >
- > * Conflict work as a profession; a code of ethics.
- >
- > * Ending the vicious cycle of terrorism and state terrorism. The
- > US seeks free trade and military protection. The Islamic
- > fundamentalists' long-term goal seems to be respect for
- > religious sensitivities. Could trade with basic needs priority,
- > including religious sensitivities, achieve both simultaneously?
- >
- > TRANSCEND is a peace and development network of 200 invited
- > scholars-practitioners in 60 countries doing action/training/
- > research/dissemination within 20 programs, based on 40 years of
- > experience. Reports on programs and some manuals can be freely
- > downloaded from www.transcend.org
- >
- > JOHAN GALTUNG, founder and director of TRANSCEND, a distinguished
- > professor of Peace Studies, is widely known as the founder of the
- > academic discipline of peace research. Galtung has served as
- > Professor of peace studies at the Universities of Hawaii, George

> Mason, Witten/Herdecke (Germany), Tromsø (Norway), American,
> Granada (Spain), Ritsumeikan (Japan), Sichuan (China) and the
> European Peace University (Austria). He established the world's
> first Peace Research Institute in Oslo in 1959 and the Journal of
> Peace Research in 1964. He has published over 1500 articles and
> 106 books, including Gandhi's Political Ethics (1955), nine volumes
> of Essays in Peace Research and Methodology (Ejlers, Copenhagen,
> 1974-88), The True Worlds (1980), There Are Alternatives: Four
> Roads to Peace and Security (1984), Human Rights in Another Key
> (1994), Peace By Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development
> and Civilization (Sage, 1996) and Searching for Peace: the Road to
> TRANSCEND (Pluto Press, London, 2002). He is a consultant to
> several UN agencies and a constantly traveling lecturer. He holds
> numerous honorary degrees and awards, among them the Right
> Livelihood Award (the "Alternative Nobel Prize"). He has played an
> active role in helping mediate in over 50 major conflicts around
> the world over the past four decades.

>
> HAMID MOWLANA is Professor of International Relations and the
> founding director of the International Communication Program at
> American University, Washington, D.C. He has served as visiting
> professor in Europe, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America and
> is the recipient of numerous awards. He has worked for UNESCO and
> written extensively on international communication, cultural and
> psychological aspects of international relations, and socio-
> economic development. He is the author of numerous works, among
> them Global Information and World Communication: New Frontiers in
> International Relations; Global Communication in Transition: The
> End of Diversity?; Mass Media in the Middle East: A Comprehensive
> Handbook; he has also contributed to numerous books and
> anthologies, including International Encyclopedia of Communication
> and The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern Islamic World.

>
> REGISTRATION FEE: \$200 (\$80 for students)
> This includes:
> - admission to workshops on Saturday and Sunday
> - Conflict Transformation by Peaceful Means (the TRANSCEND Method),
> A Manual Prepared for the United Nations Disaster Management
> Training Program (192 pages) by Johan Galtung
> - certificate for completing the program
> - coffee, refreshments and meals on Saturday

>
> FOR MORE INFORMATION, contact Prof. Dietrich Fischer, Pace
> University <fischer@transcend.org>, Tel 609-799-8319
> (MONDAY, THURSDAY AND FRIDAY BETWEEN 8 AM AND 4 PM ONLY, PLEASE!)

>
>
>
> TO REGISTER, please send the following information by email, in the
> body of a message, not as attachment, to fischer@transcend.org, by
> November 17, 2002:

>
> Name:

>

- > Occupation:
- >
- > Organization:
- >
- > Address:
- >
- > Tel:
- >
- > Fax (optional):
- >
- > Email:
- >
- > Why you wish to take part in this workshop and how you expect the
- > training program will benefit your work (about 100-200 words).
- >

> _____

- >
- > Those who register will receive detailed directions. Please bring
- > the registration fee to the door, in cash, or a check made out to
- > TRANSCEND. We regret that we can't process credit cards. Thank you!
- >
- > JOHAN GALTUNG'S 9 VOLUMES OF COLLECTED ESSAYS IN PEACE RESEARCH AND
- > METHODOLOGY (almost 4000 pages) will be on sale for \$200 per set.
- > If you cannot attend but wish to order them by mail, please send a
- > \$200 check to Dietrich Fischer, 114 Conover Road, Princeton
- > Junction, NJ 08550, USA. This includes postage by surface mail.
- >
- > The second edition of "Searching for Peace: the Road to TRANSCEND"
- > by Johan Galtung, Carl G. Jacobsen and Kai Frithjof Brand-Jacobsen
- > (Pluto Press, May 2002), which includes an analysis of 45 conflicts
- > from around the world, can be ordered on-line at www.transcend.org
- >
- > On-line courses offered by the TRANSCEND Peace University start in
- > January 2003 and will soon be announced at www.transcend.org
- >

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
To: "Kayser, Marie" marie_kayser@yahoo.com
Subject: Iraq additions
Date: Sat, 21 Sep 2002 09:23:28 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="-----=_NextPart_000_0017_01C26150.8C0F8320"
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 some changes and additions to Disarming Iraq. I'm sending them as an attachment so that you can see the bold face and underlining that I want.

Thanks,
Howard

Changes and additions on Disarming Iraq, #1

Go to How to Get to Zero

Scroll down to Disarming Iraq in index

Go to Disarming Iraq in text section

In sub-index provide linkage between Statements of Religious Organizations & Articles and Reports to where they are presented below.

Under Religious Statements

1. **American Friends Service Committee** [not in italic]

2. **Catholic Church**

a. Move to second line with the citation -- **Holy See: Vatican Urges....** [same URL]

b. Add a new line

U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops: Letter to President Bush on Iraq, September 13, 2002
[<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/bush902.htm>]

3. Under **United Church of Christ** add a second item:

Statement of United Church of Christ leaders opposing U.S. war against Iraq, September 13, 2002 [<http://www.ucc.org/justice/iraq1.htm>]

3. What is now **United Kingdom Statement by Christian Leaders**

change to the following with new URL in new alphabetical location

British Christian Leaders' Statement

The Morality and Legality of a War against Iraq: A Christian Declaration, August 6, 2002

[<http://www.paxchristi.org.uk/documents1.htm#declaration>]

3. For the information now under World Council of Churches, change to a new heading and a different URL in a new alphabetical location

Canadian, British, and U.S. Christian Leaders' Statement

Stop the Rush to War, August 29, 2002 [<http://www.nccusa.org/news/02news82.html>]

4. Change the **World Council of Churches** entree to:

WCC cautions Iraq, US, UK, France, Russia and China on threatened military action, September 20, 2002 [<http://www.wfn.org/2002/09/msg00256.html>]

Add in alphabetical order:

Middle East Council of Churches

Statement on recent situation concerning Iraq, August 5, 2002

[<http://www.churchworldservice.org/news/MiddleEast/mecc-iraq-statement.html>]

NETWORK, A Catholic Social Justice Lobby

[NETWORK opposes the Administration's Draft Resolution](#) September 20, 2002

[<http://www.networklobby.org/page4.htm#position>]

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
To: "Kayser, Marie" marie_kayser@yahoo.com
Subject: Correction to Iraq additions
Date: Sat, 21 Sep 2002 09:29:34 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----
=_NextPart_000_000B_01C26151.6653AC00"
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,

After I sent you Iraq additions a few minutes ago, I realized that I hadn't saved my latest changes. Here is the correct version.

Howard

Changes and additions on Disarming Iraq, #1

Go to How to Get to Zero

Scroll down to Disarming Iraq in index

Go to Disarming Iraq in text section

In sub-index provide linkage between Statements of Religious Organizations & Articles and Reports to where they are presented below.

Under Religious Statements

1. **American Friends Service Committee** [not in italic]

2. **Catholic Church**

a. Move to second line with the citation

Holy See: Vatican Urges US to Seek UN Approval on Iraq [same URL}

b. Add a new line

U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops: Letter to President Bush on Iraq, September 13, 2002
[<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/bush902.htm>]

3. Under **United Church of Christ** add a second item:

Statement of United Church of Christ leaders opposing U.S. war against Iraq, September 13, 2002 [<http://www.ucc.org/justice/iraq1.htm>]

3. What is now **United Kingdom Statement by Christian Leaders**
change to the following with new URL in new alphabetical location

British Christian Leaders' Statement

The Morality and Legality of a War against Iraq: A Christian Declaration, August 6, 2002
[<http://www.paxchristi.org.uk/documents1.htm#declaration>]

3. For the information now under World Council of Churches, change to a new heading and a different URL in a new alphabetical location

Canadian, British, and U.S. Christian Leaders' Statement

[Stop the Rush to War](http://www.nccusa.org/news/02news82.html), August 29, 2002 [<http://www.nccusa.org/news/02news82.html>]

4. Change the **World Council of Churches** entree to:

WCC cautions Iraq, US, UK, France, Russia and China on threatened military action, September 20, 2002 [<http://www.wfn.org/2002/09/msg00256.html>]

Add in alphabetical order:

Middle East Council of Churches

Statement on recent situation concerning Iraq, August 5, 2002

[<http://www.churchworldservice.org/news/MiddleEast/mecc-iraq-statement.html>]

National Council of Churches

With Prayer and Faxing: Challenging the Rush to War with Iraq

[<http://www.nccusa.org/iraq/iraqlinks.html>]

NETWORK, A Catholic Social Justice Lobby

NETWORK opposes the Administration's Draft Resolution September 20, 2002

[<http://www.networklobby.org/page4.htm#position>]

September 21, 2002

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Marie Kayser" <marie_kayser@yahoo.com>
References: <20020923150743.65727.qmail@web13904.mail.yahoo.com>
Subject: Help ! Missing sections
Date: Mon, 23 Sep 2002 14:03:52 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
 boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0010_01C2630A.0C394DA0"
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_0010_01C2630A.0C394DA0
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Marie,

On How to Get to Zero everything is missing after the National Academy =
of Sciences section, which itself is incomplete. What happened?

Howard

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
To: "Corinne Whitlatch" <cmep@cmep.org>
References: <20020923145301.5333.qmail@web13008.mail.yahoo.com>
<001601c2631b\$936c72a0\$9864a8c0@yourk71u5e0gcl>
Subject: Re: trouble with Iraq Web site material
Date: Mon, 23 Sep 2002 14:05:13 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0019_01C2630A.3C8B9A80"
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_0019_01C2630A.3C8B9A80
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Corinne,

I can't either. I'm having our webmaster look into it.

Howard

----- Original Message -----=20
From: Corinne Whitlatch=20
To: Christel Poelman=20
Cc: mupj@igc.org=20
Sent: Monday, September 23, 2002 12:09 PM
Subject: trouble with Iraq Web site material

Chirstel and Howard, I can get the website, but don't seem to be able =
to find the Iraq statements. Corinne=20

Reply-To: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" mupj@igc.org
To: gpowers@usccb.org
Subject: Lee Resolution
Date: Mon, 23 Sep 2002 14:33:05 -0400
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----
=_NextPart_000_0031_01C2630E.21D081C0"
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,

Attached is the resolution on Iraq introduced by Rep. Lee with 26 cosponsors. I'm trying to find out if there is any effort to get other cosponsors, especially through grassroots efforts. If there is, I'll let you know so that you can pass the word to your dioceses.

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.

107th CONGRESS
2d Session
H. CON. RES. 473

Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the importance of the United States working through the United Nations to assure Iraq's compliance with United Nations Security Council resolutions and advance peace and security in the Persian Gulf region.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
SEPTEMBER 19, 2002

Ms. LEE (for herself, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. WATSON of California, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. STARK, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FILNER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. CONYERS) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on International Relations

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the importance of the United States working through the United Nations to assure Iraq's compliance with United Nations Security Council resolutions and advance peace and security in the Persian Gulf region.

Whereas on April 6, 1991, during the Persian Gulf War, Iraq accepted the provisions of United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 (April 3, 1991) bringing a formal cease-fire into effect;

Whereas, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 687, Iraq unconditionally accepted the destruction, removal, or rendering harmless of all chemical and biological weapons and all stocks of agents and all related subsystems and components and all research, development, support and manufacturing facilities related

thereto', and `all ballistic missiles with a range greater than one hundred and fifty kilometers, and related major parts and repair and production facilities';

Whereas, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 687, Iraq unconditionally agreed not to acquire or develop any nuclear weapons, nuclear-weapons-usable material, nuclear-related subsystems or components, or nuclear-related research, development, support, or manufacturing facilities;

Whereas Security Council Resolution 687 calls for the creation of a United Nations special commission to `carry out immediate on-site inspection of Iraq's biological, chemical, and missile capabilities' and to assist and cooperate with the International Atomic Energy Agency in carrying out the destruction, removal or rendering harmless of all nuclear-related items and in developing a plan for the ongoing monitoring and verification of Iraq's compliance;

Whereas United Nations weapons inspectors (UNSCOM) between 1991 and 1998 successfully uncovered and destroyed large stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons and production facilities, nuclear weapons research and development facilities, and Scud missiles, despite the fact that the Government of Iraq sought to obstruct their work in numerous ways;

Whereas in 1998, UNSCOM weapons inspectors were withdrawn from Iraq and have not returned since;

Whereas Iraq is not in compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 687, United Nations Security Council Resolution 1154, and additional United Nations resolutions on inspections, and this noncompliance violates international law and Iraq's ceasefire obligations and potentially endangers United States and regional security interests;

Whereas the true extent of Iraq's continued development of weapons of mass destruction and the threat posed by such development to the United States and allies in the region are unknown and cannot be known without inspections;

Whereas the United Nations was established for the purpose of preventing war and resolving disputes between nations through peaceful means, including `by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional arrangements, or other peaceful means';

Whereas the United Nations remains seized of this matter;

Whereas the President has called upon the United Nations to take responsibility to assure that Iraq fulfills its obligations to the United Nations under existing United Nations Security Council resolutions;

Whereas war with Iraq would place the lives of tens of thousands of people at risk, including members of the United States armed forces, Iraqi civilian non-combatants, and civilian populations in neighboring countries;

Whereas unilateral United States military action against Iraq may undermine cooperative international efforts to reduce international terrorism and to bring to justice those responsible for the attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas unilateral United States military action against Iraq may also undermine United States diplomatic relations with countries throughout the Arab and Muslim world and with many other allies;

Whereas a preemptive unilateral United States first strike could both set a dangerous international precedent and significantly weaken the United Nations as an institution; and

Whereas the short-term and long-term costs of unilateral United States military action against Iraq and subsequent occupation may be significant in terms of United States casualties, the cost to the United States treasury, and harm to United States diplomatic relations with other countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the United States should work through the United Nations to seek to resolve the matter of ensuring that Iraq is not developing weapons of mass destruction, through mechanisms such as the resumption of weapons inspections, negotiation, enquiry, mediation, regional arrangements, and other peaceful means.