

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 30 Sep 1997 12:50:50 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Working Group Convenor for Weapons Usable Radioactive Materials  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org

Dear Friends,

I recently posted an enrollment form for our "1000 NGOs Campaign by the PrepCom" which listed our Working Group convenors and left a blank space for the Fissile Materials Working Group. I was just reminded by Martin Kalinowski that he volunteered to be the Convenor for the Abolition 2000 Working Group on Fissile Materials which we will now call Weapons Usable Radioactive Materials in order to include tritium, which is not fissionable but IS fusionable and a weapons-usable radioactive material. If you want to participate with this group, contact Martin below:

Martin Kalinowski, IANUS, c/o Institut fuer Kernphysik  
Schlossgartenstr. 9, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany  
Tel.: +49-6151-163016 FAX: +49-6151-166039  
Internet, private: KALINOWSKI@HRZPUB.TH-DARMSTADT.DE  
Internet, group: IANUS@HRZPUB.TH-DARMSTADT.DE  
<http://www.th-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/welcome.htm> and [.../inesap.htm](http://www.th-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/welcomesap.htm)

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

X-Authentication-Warning: igc2.igc.apc.org: majordomo set sender to owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org using -f

Date: Tue, 30 Sep 1997 13:31:36 -0700 (PDT)

From: NGO Committee on Disarmament <disarmtimes@igc.apc.org>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: land mine abolition

To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

To abolitionists of nuclear weapons,

You all would be well advised to take a look at the treaty just agreed at Oslo, boldly banning anti-personnel land mines. May we someday be able to present to the world a similar treaty banning nukes, signed by so many important countries!

The text of the Oslo treaty can be viewed on the website of the NGO Committee on Disarmament, at <http://www.peacenet.org/disarm/>

Peacefully,  
Roger Smith

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: nfla.news@conf.gn.apc.org  
Date: Wed, 1 Oct 1997 10:14:06 GMT  
From: nfnzsc@gn.apc.org (Stewart Kemp)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: UK Poll Shows Huge Support for Ab2000 aims  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: nfnzsc@gn.apc.org (Unverified)

ACTION: Please take the following to your local press, journal and media outlets

---

Strict Press Embargo to 00.01am (British Summer Time), Thursday, 2 October 1997

## POLL SHOWS UK GOVERNMENT SAFE TO SEIZE INITIATIVE ON NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

MANCHESTER, UK: A new survey (1) released on Thursday shows an overwhelming 87% of the British public want the Government to negotiate a global treaty to prohibit and eliminate nuclear weapons. Further, a large majority (59% against 37%) now say it would be best for Britain's security if we do not have nuclear weapons. An even larger majority (63% against 36%) disagree with spending 1,500 million pounds per year of public money to maintain a nuclear deterrent. Finally, a clear majority (54% against 42%) would support immediate steps to withdraw Trident nuclear warheads from deployment at sea and place them in storage.

The findings of the poll commissioned from the Gallup Organisation by the UK Nuclear Free Local Authorities (2), as part of their work with Abolition 2000-UK (3), are released ahead of Thursday's Labour Party Conference defence debate on the future of Trident.

The poll results come as the Government continues to consider through its Defence Review how, in the Foreign Secretary's words (4), to "...seize the opportunity provided by the end of the Cold War to push forward the arms control agenda."

Responding to the Gallup findings, Nuclear Free Local Authorities' Chair, Leeds City Councillor, Martin Hemingway said: "This research shows the Government can be confident of public support if it acts to break the log jam in international nuclear disarmament negotiations. Taking Trident off alert and placing its nuclear weapons in storage would send a clear signal to the international community that Britain is serious about achieving the abolition of nuclear weapons in the next Century."

Frank Blackaby, President of Abolition 2000-UK, said: "Wherever this poll has been conducted, it shows that over 80% of the public want negotiations to start, to rid the world of these terrible weapons. There are World conventions banning chemical weapons and biological weapons: Britain has ratified them both. We now need a Nuclear Weapons Convention to be negotiated by the year 2000. The British Government should take the lead to bring this about."

The Gallup results reinforce findings of a similar US survey commissioned by Abolition 2000 in March 1997. This showed 87% of Americans would support their Government if it opened negotiations on a treaty to eliminate nuclear weapons (5). This latest UK survey also confirms a growing trend in public opinion here against nuclear weapons. In the last poll, also by Gallup in the Autumn of 1995, 51% did not want nuclear weapons for Britain's security while 39% did.

END

Further information: Stewart Kemp, NFLAs: (mobile) + 44 468 743996  
Frances Connelly, Abolition 2000-UK: + 44 171 354 9911

## Notes

1. The Gallup survey was conducted between 5-10 September 1997 and tested the opinion of a representative sample (by age, social class and geographic location) of 1008 people to five questions about UK nuclear weapons policy and practice. The research was commissioned by the UK Steering Committee for Nuclear Free Local Authorities to find out current attitudes of local citizens. 5 questions were asked and these are set out below together with the aggregated responses:

\* What do you think will be the most serious and threatening international problem, which will have consequences for your community in the future?

|                                 |     |
|---------------------------------|-----|
| Conflicts based on nationalism: | 8%  |
| Immigration and Refugees:       | 7%  |
| Environmental Crises:           | 24% |
| Disease (eg. AIDs):             | 9%  |
| Nuclear Weapons:                | 14% |
| Over Population:                | 13% |
| Energy Crises:                  | 6%  |
| Terrorism:                      | 14% |
| None of the Above:              | 2%  |
| Don't Know:                     | 2%  |

\* Do you think it will be best for the security of your community if Britain does or does not have nuclear weapons?

|                                |     |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| Does have nuclear weapons:     | 36% |
| Does not have nuclear weapons: | 59% |
| Don't Know:                    | 4%  |
| Refused:                       | 1%  |

\* To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement:  
Spending £1.5 billion pounds each year to maintain Britain's nuclear weapons is a necessary use of public resources?

|                 |     |
|-----------------|-----|
| Strongly Agree: | 12% |
| Somewhat Agree: | 24% |

|                    |     |
|--------------------|-----|
| Somewhat Disagree: | 22% |
| Strongly Disagree: | 41% |
| Don't Know:        | 1%  |

\* You may be aware that a Royal Navy Trident submarine is currently on patrol at immediate readiness to launch nuclear tipped missiles. With the end of the Cold War, to what extent do you agree or disagree that Trident's nuclear warheads should be placed in storage?

|                    |     |
|--------------------|-----|
| Strongly Agree:    | 27% |
| Somewhat Agree:    | 27% |
| Somewhat Disagree: | 20% |
| Strongly Disagree: | 22% |
| Don't Know:        | 3%  |

\* Britain has signed global treaties to prohibit and eliminate chemical and biological weapons. Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree that Britain should help to negotiate a global treaty to prohibit and eliminate nuclear weapons?

|                    |     |
|--------------------|-----|
| Strongly Agree:    | 73% |
| Somewhat Agree:    | 14% |
| Somewhat Disagree: | 5%  |
| Strongly Disagree: | 6%  |
| Don't Know:        | 2%  |

2. 118 local authorities across England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland exercise their powers to work together in practical ways to promote a nuclear free future.

3. Abolition 2000 UK is supported by leading UK non governmental organisations which work together to promote peace and a nuclear free future. Abolition 2000 UK is part of the international Abolition 2000 movement, supported by over 700 non governmental organisations world-wide, which aims to secure by the year 2000 an international agreement binding all the nuclear weapon states to a timetable for nuclear disarmament in the 21st Century.

4. Rt Hon Robin Cook MP, Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, to a joint MoD/FCO Defence Review Seminar, 11 July 1997

5. In a nation-wide poll of 1006 Americans, conducted by Lake Sosin Snell & Associates in March 1997, 84% said they would feel safer in a world without nuclear weapons; 87% wanted their Government to negotiate an agreement to eliminate nuclear weapons; and 77% thought too many tax dollars were spent on nuclear weapons.

\*\*\*\*\*

Nuclear Free Local Authorities Tel: + 44 (0) 161 831 9108  
 Town Hall Fax: + 44 (0) 161 835 3645  
 Manchester M60 2LA UK Email: [nfznc@gn.apc.org](mailto:nfznc@gn.apc.org)  
 Web Site: <http://www.gn.apc.org/nfznc/>

\*\*\*\*\*



Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>

Date: Wed, 01 Oct 1997 16:54:23 -0400

From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>

Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility

To: NABbasic@AOL.COM, dkimball@clw.org, jsmith@clw.org, cdavis@clw.org,  
disarmament@igc.org, bridget@fcnl.org, kathy@fcnl.org, mupj@igc.org,  
meldredge@igc.org, paprog@igc.org, btiller@psr.org, ledwidge@psr.org,  
dculp@nrdc.org, vision@igc.org, wandwill@clark.net,  
tcollina@ucsusa.org, 73744.3675@compuserve.com, davidhart@igc.org

Subject: Draft sign-on letter on SSM

First Draft ----- sign-on letter on SSM

COMMENTS ON THE TEXT DUE TO BOB TILLER BY 12:00 NOON ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER  
7TH ----- 202-898-0150 ext 220, <btiller@psr.org>

Dear Senator/Representative:

We are writing to express our deep concern about the Department of Energy's Stockpile Stewardship and Management program for our nation's nuclear weapons complex. This costly program, funded at \$4.5 billion for FY 98, covers a wide range of activities and facilities dealing with nuclear weapons research, including: the subcritical tests at the Nevada Test Site, the National Ignition Facility at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California, and the DARHT facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico.

The Stockpile Stewardship and Management program ought to be sharply reduced in scope and purpose. Please consider the following points:

This enormous program is not necessary for maintaining the safety and reliability of our nuclear arsenal. The Department of Energy itself has said that it does not expect significant deterioration of existing nuclear weapons, so what is the purpose of the Stockpile Stewardship program? Is the real purpose the design and development of new weapons, rather than the maintenance of our current weapons stockpile? DOE should undertake a curatorship approach of much smaller dimensions, supporting the goal of nuclear non-proliferation.

Although the components of this program are generally permitted by the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, signed last year by President Clinton, they are certainly not within the spirit of that treaty. The whole program sends a signal to other nations — signatories and non-signatories to the treaty alike — that we are not really serious about ending nuclear testing. Furthermore, some respected analysts contend that much of the program, for example, the explosions of the National Ignition Facility, will violate the letter of the treaty as well.

This is an extremely expensive program, projected to cost \$60 billion over the next thirteen years, possibly more. We do not need to spend such vast amounts on nuclear weapons stockpiles and research at a time

when we are reducing, not expanding, the number of such weapons deployed. Astonishingly, with this Stockpile Stewardship program the United States will now spend more each year, in constant dollars, on nuclear weapons than it did at the height of the Cold War.

The leaders of our three national laboratories agreed to express public support for the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in exchange for a well-funded Stockpile Stewardship program. This agreement to safeguard nuclear scientists' jobs is completely inappropriate.

We urge you to examine this costly, unnecessary and dangerous program very carefully, and then step forward to help cut it back to a more appropriate level. Please find the legislative opportunities next year to shrink this program through the annual budget-authorization-appropriations process.

Thank you for considering these views. We would appreciate an opportunity to talk with you in greater depth about these ideas.

Sincerely,

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Sat, 11 Oct 1997 20:12:50 -0700 (PDT)  
From: flick@igc.apc.org (flick)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: South Africa  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: flick@pop.igc.apc.org

Dear Abolitionists,

I posted Alice's rave about South Africa's role on nukes to a couple of people asking them to respond in the hope that I could formulate my ideas about her position and just generally know more about the issues.

Sharon Riggle has responded with this rave and I invite more discussion.

Sharon also said in her email to me " [NOTE: I have recently talked with the South Africans and they said that would be willing to address the group in person to dispel rumors (Goosen's idea, not mine). I think we should take them up on it at the PrepCom next year!]" and I agree with her

love flick

#### RESPONSE TO THE "BACKGROUND PAPER FOR A SOUTH AFRICAN STRATEGY" BY ALICE SLATER

I would start by saying that I wholeheartedly agree with several of the statements made in Alice Slater's analysis: 1) we should push for a world without the scourge of nuclear weapons, 2) there are a growing number of citizens around the world taking an active interest in this issue, 3) we need to use the poll that GRACE produced re the majority of citizens opposing nuclear weapons, and 4) that the South Africans do indeed have an important role to play in the future of nuclear disarmament.

I found the background paper a bit confusing, as it seemed that facts and opinion were intermingled and I was unclear as to which was meant to be which. I would like to propose the following version that I believe to be factual, as well as give my opinions for future actions.

First a bit of history. For several months prior to the NPT Review and Extension Conference in 1995, countries around the world were discussing the possibilities for extending the treaty. The NAM was no exception, and talked both openly and privately about their positions. Most countries were undecided until almost the last minute. But it was no secret that there were several NAM countries that were not "toeing the line" on a unified NAM position for the extension conference (e.g. Nigeria). There was virtually no realistic possibility that there would be a coherent, united position taken at the Bandung NAM Ministers Conference. Therefore, laying the blame on one single country, in this case South Africa, when several others held varying positions, is erroneous and misleading.

It is true that South Africa was one of the first NAM countries to go public with their decision to vote for indefinite extension. As soon as that decision was taken, they started looking at what concessions they could demand in return. They subsequently conceived of the strengthened review process architecture and the substantive Principles and Objectives document, both of which were adopted by all states parties along with the extension decision.

The list of Principles and Objectives in effect broadened the review debates. They were the basis for the "cluster" meetings (i.e. the substance of the session) in the 1997 PrepCom. Although in my opinion they should be much more strongly dealt with in future during the PrepComs and Review Conferences, they are nonetheless an indisputable improvement on the old system.

For the new, strengthened review process that we now enjoy we can thank the delegation from South Africa as well. It was their idea to not only extend the time allotted to PrepComs, but to also broaden the scope to include discussions on substantive matters found in and relating to the treaty, transforming it from the merely procedural exercise it had been in the past. Without this foresight, we would not have the expanded forum today to voice our issues and to impact the discussions on a yearly basis.

To understand what happened at this year's NAM ministers meeting, one has to look to the events in the Conference on Disarmament (CD) in Geneva. The proposal at the end of 1996 from the NAM countries in the CD (the G-21) was their Programme of Action for future work in that forum. This proposal was coordinated by India and supported by the majority of the G-21, but included linkages between different action items, i.e. in order to talk about nuclear disarmament, the CD would have to simultaneously take up the question of fissile material cutoff as well as other issues. Both Chile and South Africa thought that the "all-or-nothing" approach was a bad idea and refused to join the group in supporting this measure. The timebound framework concept which would govern any talks on nuclear disarmament has also been contentious, and is not favored by South Africa, but neither is it supported by many other "angels" of the disarmament community. These areas of difficulty for the NAM were well known long before the NAM meeting in Delhi in April, and it was no surprise that South Africa was unable to agree to these issues being included in the NAM position. So the question should be put as to whether one agrees with their position or not, and not whether or not they were "spoilers" at the last minute.

As regards the proposal on negative security assurances, I do not agree that it is "paltry" as Alice Slater mentions in her paper. It has two aspects: the substance and the procedure. It is necessary to take into account the structure under which it would occur, i.e. intersessional meetings of the states parties. This is actually a revolutionary way to deal with non-proliferation-related issues. The strengthened review process allows for "subsidiary bodies" to be established by PrepComs as needed, and this concept of intersessionals pushes that envelope. Secondly, it is an issue that just might have a

chance of succeeding! Think about the possibilities of what other issues might occupy that place were NSAs successfully dealt with in that body. It might be a way to incrementally move toward our ultimate goals for disarmament.

May I also insert one or two words here about the almost complete lack of constructive ideas coming from the NAM delegations at the 1997 PrepCom. I have the utmost sympathy for the situation many of them were in: no directions from the capital, dealing with abstract concepts instead of established precedent, general uncertainty as to what was expected both from them and from the conference. But signaling out one country who was actually trying to put forward concrete ideas, as well as actively supporting those of other like-minded delegations, is shooting ourselves in the foot. To my mind it was much more damaging not to have enough input from many NAM delegations at a time that was ripe for change. The Western Group was being surprisingly flexible (contrary to my predictions, I might add), and good ideas from more than just 3 or 4 countries would have dramatically altered the outcome.

If we do have a "spoiler" in the system, to quote the paper, it would be the Cold War relic of political groupings. How realistic is it to expect that over 100 countries with infinitely diverse social, economic and political systems can reach agreement on every issue? If you look solely at the nominations accorded each group, one of the only practical functions it serves, the Western group only has 28 members, the stagnant Eastern group has less than that, while the NAM is forced to choose from well over 100 qualified candidates. The coordination on issues alone is a killer, much less finding consensus. Why not adopt the model of the Chemical Weapons Convention and base the groupings on truly regional, not political, grounds? In the long run the NAM countries would benefit from such a shift.

Although my opinion on the role of South Africa in the NPT realm is obviously contrary to that of Ms. Slater's, I do think that it is a good idea to use contacts in South Africa, and other countries for that matter, to pressure the governments to keep moving forward on the nuclear disarmament question. Continued pressure is a crucial element in getting the nuclear weapon states to finally feel the need to disarm.

Until that time, I think a constructive approach would be to talk to your contacts in the NAM and urge them to coordinate well in advance this time. Not only as a group, but individually the states have an important role to play. Look at the example of Malaysia, who is trying to get the ball rolling on a Nuclear Weapons Convention. If individual states come to the PrepCom next year well-informed, with concrete proposals in hand and ready to act, we could potentially have a landmark conference.

The time is definitely right and the political will and attention is there. The new review process has begun, with much remaining undefined. We can help set strong precedents with our lobbying and pressure. We all need to

keep pushing for that ultimate goal ... at every small step along the way.

submitted 11 October 1997

Sharon Riggle

Centre for European Security and Disarmament

Brussels.

To: dgracie@afsc.org, crramey@igc.org  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Reply from Dwain Epps  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

I would like to share with you a reply from Dwain Epps of World Council of Churches regarding a forum for religious leaders at the time of the NPT PrepCom meeting. I have forward this to David Atwood at the Quaker Office in Geneva.

Howard Hallman

Return-Path: <dce@wcc-coe.org Date: Thu, 09 Oct 1997 16:11:09 +0100 From: Dwain EPPS <dce@wcc-coe.org To: mupj@igc.apc.org Cc: sal@wcc-coe.org Subject: Request for advice -Reply Dear Howard, My sincere apologies for having delayed so long in replying to your good message with respect to the NPT PrepCom meeting in April 1998. I hope it is needless to say that the WCC stands strongly with those in your network in opposition to the continuing poison of nuclear arms in our midst, and the need to abolish them absolutely. Depending on the nature of the event you have in mind, we could certainly consider ways we could offer space and limited support here in the Ecumenical Center. I fear, though, that with our drastically reduced staff now, and especially in light of intensive preparations for the forthcoming WCC Assembly in Harare, we have had to lay aside all other commitments for 1998. Thus promise to be able to do more than this. But if there were people who could organize, and depending a bit on what is organized, of course, we would welcome such an initiative. This is not much, I know. But I trust you will understand the dilemma. Let me know what you think. If this is enough to allow you to move networks in the direction you suggest, then let us keep in touch and see what we might do here locally in Geneva to help. With best regards, Dwain C. Epps Coordinator International Affairs (CCIA) WCC

Return-Path: <102464.1110@compuserve.com>  
Date: Mon, 13 Oct 1997 08:50:38 -0400  
From: Dietrich Fischer <102464.1110@compuserve.com>  
Subject: CTBT ratification  
Sender: Dietrich Fischer <102464.1110@compuserve.com>  
To: abolition-caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: Bob Kinsey <bkinsey@peacemission.org>,  
"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline

Dear friends, I entirely agree with Howard W. Hallman and Bob Kinsey that Abolition 2000 should support the CTBT, while at the same time seeking to end the Stockpile Stewardship program and, of course, complete abolition. If we were to oppose CTBT ratification in the US Senate because it contains some provisions we don't like, we would split the forces who support nuclear disarmament and hand a victory to the opponents. Let's keep our movement broad and strong, not splintering into small factions that fight each other over questions of doctrinal purity, or we risk being ignored.

Dietrich Fischer

>From wrl Mon Oct 13 07:57:44 1997  
>Return-Path: <wrl@igc.apc.org>  
>X-Sender: wrl@pop.igc.apc.org  
>Date: Mon, 13 Oct 1997 10:53:02 -0400  
>To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
>From: War Resisters League <wrl@igc.apc.org>  
>Subject: Re: Sign-on letter to President Clinton  
>Sender: wrl@igc.org  
>X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc3.igc.apc.org id HAA07705

Dear Howard,

Please add my name: Christopher Ney, Disarmament Coordinator and Fundraisers, War Resisters League, New York NY

Thanks for your work,

Chris

At 01:53 PM 10/8/97 -0700, you wrote:

>Dear Friends:

>

>I invite you to sign the following letter to President Clinton, asking that  
>the United States take a positive approach to proposals for multi-lateral  
>negotiations for nuclear disarmament when they arise at the UN General  
>Assembly, the Conference on Disarmament, and the NPT Preparatory Committee.

>

>The letter contains ideas I gained from discussion with Alyn Ware of the  
>Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy. A first draft was reviewed by Alice  
>Slater of GRACE and members of the Nuclear Weapons Working Group of the  
>Monday Lobby in Washington, D.C. Several initial signers are indicated.

>

>If you wish to sign, please let me know and indicate the name and title of  
>the signer and name of your organization. Deadline for signing is  
>Wednesday, October 15, 1997.

>

>If you have any questions, you can call me at 301 896-0013 or reach me by  
>e-mail at mupj@igc.apc.org.

>

>With best regards,

>

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

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

>The Honorable William J. Clinton  
>The White House  
>Washington, DC 20500

>

>Dear Mr. President:

>  
>On a number of occasions you have expressed a desire to see the total  
>elimination of nuclear weapons on Earth. In your second inaugural address  
>you offered a vision of a land of new promise where "our children will sleep  
>free from the threat of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons." This  
>vision has wide public support, indicated in a poll conducted last spring by  
>Celinda Lake of Lake Sosin Snell Associates that revealed 84 percent of  
>American voters would feel safer knowing that no country had nuclear weapons.

>  
>Already there are global conventions for the elimination of chemical and  
>biological weapons. In the Celinda Lake survey 87 percent of the  
>respondents agreed that the United States should negotiate a similar  
>agreement to eliminate nuclear weapons. In the next eight months three  
>international bodies will be meeting and will have opportunities to take  
>significant steps toward accomplishing this goal. We hope that under your  
>leadership the United States will play a constructive role in these  
gatherings.

>  
>The first occasion is the 52nd Session of the United Nations General  
>Assembly, now meeting in New York. It is our understanding that the General  
>Assembly will consider a resolution similar to the one proposed by Malaysia  
>and adopted last December that (1) notes the unanimous conclusion of the  
>International Court of Justice that "there exists an obligation to pursue in  
>good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear  
>disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international  
>control" and (2) "calls upon all states to fulfill that obligation  
>immediately by commencing negotiations of a nuclear weapons convention  
>prohibiting the development, production, testing, deploying, stockpiling,  
>transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their  
>elimination." We ask that the United States drop its opposition to such a  
>resolution and strongly endorse it.

>  
>The second occasion will be the reconvening of the UN Conference on  
>Disarmament in Geneva in January 1998. Previously some participants have  
>proposed that the Conference establish an ad hoc committee to commence  
>multi-lateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Likely this proposal  
>will come up again. We favor this approach. Therefore, we ask that the  
>United States support creation of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament  
>within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament.

>  
> (over)  
>The third occasion will be meeting of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)  
>Preparatory Committee in Geneva in April 1998. In preparation for this  
>meeting we recommend that the United States take several good faith actions  
>that begin to respond to the obligations under Article VI of the NPT.  
>Specifically we urge that the United States begin to carry out "immediate  
>steps" recommended by the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear  
>Weapons:

>  
>· Take nuclear weapons off alert  
>· Remove warheads from delivery vehicles  
>· End deployment of non-strategic nuclear weapons  
>· Achieve agreement with other nuclear weapon states for reciprocal no  
first use



Return-Path: <atwood@pop.unicc.org>  
Date: Mon, 13 Oct 1997 17:01:15 +0100  
X-Sender: atwood@pop.unicc.org  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
From: atwood@pop.unicc.org (David Atwood)  
Subject: Re:  
Cc: edibal@iprolink.ch, ipb@gn.apc.org

Dear Howard Hallman:

Thank you for your various messages to me. Apologies for not responding earlier.

Now that I have joined the Abolition server, I have begun to gather the information on the plans for the NPT PrepCom next May. The Special NGO Committee for Disarmament itself will be involved in assisting the organization of activities here in Geneva during the PrepCom.

Let me sent you some preliminary thoughts on your idea. I think that a strong religious voice concerning the need to abolish nuclear weapons is vital. How best to focus that voice on decision-makers is always difficult to determine. In principle, the idea of having a gathering of world religious leaders in Geneva is an attractive idea. I believe that the impact of such a gathering would be greater at the time of the PrepComm than at the start of the CD session in January. Attention will be more focused at that time.

What exactly would these world religious leaders do while here? How best to use their presence? I think that something early in the first week would be likely to attract more delegate participation than on Sunday afternoon, when delegations will only be arriving in Geneva. An event near the UN during the luncheon period (13.00 - 15.00) might be a chance to stage a public event to which delegates were invited.

I am sorry to hear that the WCC doesn't feel it can take part to any real extent, although the offer of space at the Ecumenical Center, not far from the Palais des Nations, is an important one. If you were to demonstrate that you were able to attract some major religious figures to Geneva for this, I suspect it would be hard for the WCC and for Konrad Reiser not to see it as important to get involved in. I guess they just can't handle the organizing.

I suppose an important question to be answered would be what kind of message would you wish these leaders to give. The NPT PrepComm is a key process and there will be important things to urge states to do there. But a general nuclear disarmament message risks being politely heard and then dismissed as rather irrelevant to the business at hand. So, I have a little trouble matching up a gathering of such an august group and the normal conduct of business of these PrepComms, however much it has been possible to turn them in to sessions of substance.

We are quite limited here in Geneva in our ability to offer organizational assistance for such an effort. To go forward with such an idea, what is

your estimate of what would be required in terms of cost and organization? What would you require locally to make this happen? A critical element would be to get a measure of what would be required in terms of inviting such world religious leaders and putting together the programme and of making the local arrangements? Putting on something here in Geneva could be effective in this regard provided this basic organizational capacity can be arranged.

Another consideration, more modest but also less organizationally demanding and costly, would be to organize some kind of multi-faith service at some time during the PrepComm. Daniel Ibanez-Gomez of the Peace Council (he lives in Wisconsin) has done this effectively in Geneva, Brussels, and Oslo for the International Campaign to Ban Landmines. He is planning to organize such a service in Ottawa at the time of the Treaty signing in December. This adds a good dimension to the NGO presences around such events and does attract some delegate participation.

I have to say that our local NGO capacity is extremely limited. We shall be enhancing that capacity for the PrepComm. But for an event such as you are suggesting to be do-able, I believe that you will need to feel confident that you are able to pull together the requisite organizational capacity to do the advance work as well as the local arrangements, although surely in this ecumenical setting there may be some willing to get behind this.

I would be happy to talk with you about this further. Basically, I think the idea has possibilities and could be quite an effective element. I am sending my response to you also to Colin Archer at the International Peace Bureau and to Edith Ballantyne at the Womens International League for Peace and Freedom, as they may also have comments to make to you.

With every good wish.

David Atwood

>Dear David Atwood:

>

>I am writing to you at the suggestion of David Gracie of the AFSC. He and I  
>along with Clayton Ramey of the FOR (in the US) are co-conveners of the  
>Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, which is part of the  
>Abolition 2000 Network.

>

>As you may know, Abolition 2000 intends to bring together a number of NGOs  
>in Geneva at the next meeting of the NPT Preparatory Committee, scheduled  
>for April 28 to May 8, 1998. They will conduct a series of forums and make  
>contact with delegates in order to influence the outcome of the meeting.

>

>This may also be an opportunity bring together world religious leaders to  
>make the moral case for abolition of nuclear weapons. We would like your  
>advice and assistance on this matter.

>

>Several weeks ago I wrote to Dwayne Epps at the World Council of Churches,  
>asking him if top leadership of WCC might be involved. I had a brief

>telephone conversation with him, but I caught him in the midst of the  
>Central Committee meeting. He said he'd get back in touch with me, but I  
>haven't heard from him.  
>  
>My friends in the Catholic Church believe that the Pontifical Commission on  
>Justice and Peace is examining the matter of nuclear weapons anew. They  
>further note that the Pope is an abolitionist according to statements he has  
>made.  
>  
>The Dalai Lama has made strong statements favoring nuclear disarmament.  
>Leaders of other faiths have done likewise.  
>  
>Do you think it would be possible to put together some kind of gathering in  
>which these world leaders or their representatives would participate? For  
>example, one suggestion is to have a forum at 4:00 p.m. on Sunday, April 27,  
>the day before the NPT PrepCom meeting commences, and follow the forum with  
>a reception for delegates. No doubt there are other possibilities.  
>  
>  
>It is conceivable that a similar event could be organized toward the end of  
>January 1998 when the Conference on Disarmament reconvenes.  
>  
>We are open to various possibilities and therefore will benefit greatly from  
>whatever counsel you can offer.  
>  
>To reply you can reach me via e-mail at [mupj@igc.apc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.apc.org) or by phone in the  
>U.S. at 301 896-0013.  
>  
>With best regards,  
>  
>Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
>Methodists United for Peace with Justice.  
>  
>  
>

---

David C. Atwood  
Associate Representative  
Disarmament and Peace Programme  
Quaker United Nations Office  
13, avenue du Mervelet  
1209 Geneva  
Switzerland  
Tel: +41-22-748 4802 or switchboard 748 4800)  
FAX: +41-22-748 4819)  
E-mail: [atwood@pop.unicc.org](mailto:atwood@pop.unicc.org)

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 13 Oct 1997 12:38:07 -0400  
From: ike <ike@swva.net>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: NYT: Perilous Pause on Nuclear Cuts  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

October 13, 1997, NYT editorial  
A Perilous Pause on Nuclear Cuts

Nearly a decade after the end of the cold war, some 30,000 nuclear warheads are still available for use around the world, each with devastating destructive power. Future generations may someday look back at the failure to reduce that total more rapidly as the greatest blunder of the 1990's.

More than 10,000 warheads remain in Russia, where nuclear security has eroded and underpaid scientists and security guards may be tempted to smuggle weapons for profit to countries like Iran or Libya or to criminal gangs or terrorists. That Moscow no longer has its missiles aimed at the United States is deceptively reassuring. Targets can be changed in minutes. Given the dangers, President Clinton should urgently re-energize negotiations on drastic further reductions in warheads, building on the substantial achievements of his two Republican predecessors. The treaties Presidents Reagan and Bush signed with Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin, even though the last of them has yet to be ratified by the Russian Parliament, have cut nuclear arsenals nearly in half.

But since 1993 the drive has gone out of nuclear weapons reduction. The three modest agreements reached by Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin in Helsinki last winter only underscore the loss of negotiating momentum. The two sides agreed to relax the restrictions of a 1972 treaty limiting defensive missiles and to delay the deadlines for dismantling Russian nuclear warheads set in the 1992 Bush-Yeltsin treaty. They also set modest goals for a new round of reductions in negotiations not scheduled to begin anytime soon.

What is needed is not the bending of old treaties but immediate efforts to negotiate new and deeper cuts. Mr. Clinton and Congress insist on waiting until Russia ratifies the 1992 treaty before beginning negotiations on the next steps. In contrast, almost immediately after the signing of the first arms reduction treaty, Mr. Bush and Mr. Yeltsin got to work on the second one.

Washington should begin negotiations on a third treaty now, aiming for limits as low as 1,000 warheads on each side, not the 2,000 agreed at Helsinki. Commitments to sharp additional cuts could speed Russian ratification of the 1992 treaty by sparing Moscow the cost of building new single-warhead missiles to conform to the 1992 limits.

Meanwhile, Washington should seek agreement to move most of both sides' warheads off alert. Stansfield Turner, a former Director of Central

Intelligence, suggests that each side physically separate a large proportion of its nuclear warheads from the missiles that would deliver them and post observers at each other's storage sites. That would lessen the risks of accidental launch, and, in a crisis, give diplomats time to work.

In Russia, where conventional forces are weak and anxiety is rising about NATO's planned eastward expansion, politicians once again talk of nuclear weapons as a vital line of defense and the last vestige of Russia's global power. In America, both Congress and the Administration talk of preparing to rebuild nuclear arsenals if Russia's Parliament fails to ratify the 1992 treaty. The peaceful dividends that have come with the end of the cold war may look meager in the years ahead if the danger of nuclear disaster is not more effectively contained.

1997 Copyright New York Times

<http://www.nytimes.com/yr/mo/day/editorial/13mon1.html>

To: dgracie@afsc.org, crramey@igc.org  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Re: David Atwood's response  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

I would like to confer with both of you about David Atwood's response, which follows.

>Return-Path: <atwood@pop.unicc.org>  
>Date: Mon, 13 Oct 1997 17:01:15 +0100  
>X-Sender: atwood@pop.unicc.org  
>To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
>From: atwood@pop.unicc.org (David Atwood)  
>Subject: Re:  
>Cc: edibal@iprolink.ch, ipb@gn.apc.org  
>  
>Dear Howard Hallman:  
>  
>Thank you for your various messages to me. Apologies for not responding  
>earlier.  
>  
>Now that I have joined the Abolition server, I have begun to gather the  
>information on the plans for the NPT PrepCom next May. The Special NGO  
>Committee for Disarmament itself will be involved in assisting the  
>organization of activities here in Geneva during the PrepCom.  
>  
>Let me sent you some preliminary thoughts on your idea. I think that a  
>strong religious voice concerning the need to abolish nuclear weapons is  
>vital. How best to focus that voice on decision-makers is always difficult  
>to determine. In principle, the idea of having a gathering of world  
>religious leaders in Geneva is an attractive idea. I believe that the  
>impact of such a gathering would be greater at the time of the PrepComm than  
>at the start of the CD session in January. Attention will be more focused  
>at that time.  
>  
>What exactly would these world religious leaders do while here? How best to  
>use their presence? I think that something early in the first week would be  
>likely to attract more delegate participation than on Sunday afternoon, when  
>delegations will only be arriving in Geneva. An event near the UN during  
>the luncheon period (13.00 - 15.00) might be a chance to stage a public  
>event to which delegates were invited.  
>  
>I am sorry to hear that the WCC doesn't feel it can take part to any real  
>extent, although the offer of space at the Ecumenical Center, not far from  
>the Palais des Nations, is an important one. If you were to demonstrate  
>that you were able to attract some major religious figures to Geneva for  
>this, I suspect it would be hard for the WCC and for Konrad Reiser not to  
>see it as important to get involved in. I guess they just can't handle the  
>organizing.  
>  
>I suppose an important question to be answered would be what kind of message  
>would you wish these leaders to give. The NPT PrepComm is a key process and

>there will be important things to urge states to do there. But a general  
>nuclear disarmament message risks being politely heard and then dismissed as  
>rather irrelevant to the business at hand. So, I have a little trouble  
>matching up a gathering of such an august group and the normal conduct of  
>business of these PrepComms, however much it has been possible to turn them  
>in to sessions of substance.

>  
>We are quite limited here in Geneva in our ability to offer organizational  
>assistance for such an effort. To go forward with such an idea, what is  
>your estimate of what would be required in terms of cost and organization?  
>What would you require locally to make this happen? A critical element  
>would be to get a measure of what would be required in terms of inviting  
>such world religious leaders and putting together the programme and of  
>making the local arrangements? Putting on something here in Geneva could be  
>effective in this regard provided this basic organizational capacity can be  
>arranged.

>  
>Another consideration, more modest but also less organizationally demanding  
>and costly, would be to organize some kind of multi-faith service at some  
>time during the PrepComm. Daniel Ibanez-Gomez of the Peace Council (he  
>lives in Wisconsin) has done this effectively in Geneva, Brussels, and Oslo  
>for the International Campaign to Ban Landmines. He is planning to organize  
>such a service in Ottawa at the time of the Treaty signing in December.  
>This adds a good dimension to the NGO presences around such events and does  
>attract some delegate participation.

>  
>I have to say that our local NGO capacity is extremely limited. We shall be  
>enhancing that capacity for the PrepComm. But for an event such as you are  
>suggesting to be do-able, I believe that you will need to feel confident  
>that you are able to pull together the requisite organizational capacity to  
>do the advance work as well as the local arrangements, although surely in  
>this ecumenical setting there may be some willing to get behind this.

>  
>I would be happy to talk with you about this further. Basically, I think  
>the idea has possibilities and could be quite an effective element. I am  
>sending my response to you also to Colin Archer at the International Peace  
>Bureau and to Edith Ballantyne at the Womens International League for Peace  
>and Freedom, as they may also have comments to make to you.

>  
>With every good wish.

>  
>David Atwood

>  
>  
>  
>  
>>  
>\_\_\_\_\_

>David C. Atwood  
>Associate Representative  
>Disarmament and Peace Programme  
>Quaker United Nations Office  
>13, avenue du Mervelet  
>1209 Geneva  
>Switzerland

>Tel: +41-22-748 4802 or switchboard 748 4800)

>FAX: +41-22-748 4819)

>E-mail: [atwood@pop.unicc.org](mailto:atwood@pop.unicc.org)

>

>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 13 Oct 1997 20:38:06 +0100 (BST)  
From: npc@gn.apc.org (National Peace Council UK)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Abolition 2000 UK  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: npc@gn.apc.org

NEWS FROM ABOLITION 2000 UK. We were launched in 1996 in London and have the support of 150 UK groups. Representatives of about 20 of these groups meet every 2 months in London. I am the part time co-ordinator - my predecessor was Danny Thomson, now at the Chernobly Children's project in Ireland.

We have been trying to influence the UK government by enlisting the support of the "Great and the Good" ie influential and respected people. We have asked permission for them to give their names in a letter to Robin Cook, and in a newspaper ad. The response was good, we mailed nearly 1,000 letters and have received 170 positive responses. In addition Musicians against Nuclear Arms (MANA) obtained the signatures of 20 well-known musicians.

Together with other peace NGOs we have met with Tony Lloyd, Minister of State in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office - and it looks as if there will be further similar meetings. We are also planning a meeting on Abolition in a committee room in the House of Commons (UK parliament).

We have publicised the British Gallup poll on nuclear weapons, but so far without much success. But these results will be usable for some time to come.

We have produced a useful leaflet on Abolition which I will mail out on request.

We are starting to prepare for the NPT PrepCom. Janet Bloomfield and possibly others from Abolition 2000 UK will attend.

Frances Connelly  
Abolition 2000 UK  
88 Islington High Street  
London N1 8EG  
Tel 0171 354 9911 Fax 0171 354 0033.

National Peace Council UK (npc@gn.apc.org)

>From aslater Mon Oct 13 15:49:53 1997  
Return-Path: <aslater@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Mon, 13 Oct 1997 15:49:48 -0700 (PDT)  
X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org  
To: Dietrich Fischer <102464.1110@compuserve.com>,  
abolition-caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: CTBT ratification  
Cc: Bob Kinsey <bkinsey@peacemission.org>,  
"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: aslater@igc.org

Dear Dietrich,

There is no issue among any abolitionists about whether we should support the ratification of the CTBT. Many of us have worked for it for all our adult lives. The issue is, will we silently support the ratification of the CTBT without bringing to public attention the terrible price that Clinton is willing to pay for it? \$60billion worth of stockpile stewardship over the next 13 years which includes underground sub-critical tests, stadium sized facilities such as the NIF and supercomputing initiatives which will enable the weaponeers to continue to design new nukes. They have already designed one new weapon, the B61 earth penetrator and are working on a new warhead for the Trident-- all without full scale "critical" nuclear testing. We need to make the deal known and not silently go along with ratification of a CTB encumbered by the Faustian bargain Clinton made with the labs and the Pentagon. We need to get Senators to speak out in favor of a "clean CTB", without the \$60 billion stockpile stewardship package. Otherwise, the public will be lulled into complacency that nuclear development is over upon ratification of the CTB and will be unaware of the bargain Clinton made and the continued activity in the labs. We need a real public debate on nuclear policy and abolitionists should be requesting it of their Congressional representatives. Regards,

At 08:50 AM 10/13/97 -0400, Dietrich Fischer wrote:

>Dear friends, I entirely agree with Howard W. Hallman and Bob  
>Kinsey that Abolition 2000 should support the CTBT, while at  
>the same time seeking to end the Stockpile Stewardship program  
>and, of course, complete abolition. If we were to oppose CTBT  
>ratification in the US Senate because it contains some  
>provisions we don't like, we would split the forces who support  
>nuclear disarmament and hand a victory to the opponents. Let's  
>keep our movement broad and strong, not splintering into small  
>factions that fight each other over questions of doctrinal  
>purity, or we risk being ignored.

>Dietrich Fischer

>

>

>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 13 Oct 1997 15:49:44 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: South Africa  
To: flick@igc.apc.org (flick), abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org

I welcome Sharon's analysis, and more particularly her suggestion that we all urge NAM and other countries as well to take a unified position before the prepcom. As the Abolition Network, we should be asking that they come to the prepCom with a proposal that an intersessional working group be established to begin working on the nuclear weapons convention so that it can be negotiated by the year 2000. In fact, the resolution drafted by Doug Roche at the recent IPB meeting in Moscow deserves restating here:

Following is text of the resolution on Nuclear Weapons Abolition drafted by former Canadian Ambassador Doug Roche and adopted unanimously at the Triennial Assembly of the International Peace Bureau, Moscow, September 27, 1997. Note: The resolution was first presented to, and adopted at, a Working Group session of the IPB Conference organized by the Civic Peace Association, "Global Security, National Interests: The Role of Civil Society," Moscow, September 25-27, 1997.

\* \* \* \* \*

BEARING in mind the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice, the report of the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, the Statement by the International Group of Former Generals and Admirals, and the UNGA 51/45 Resolution calling for negotiations to begin in 1997 dealing with the elimination of nuclear weapons;

RECOGNIZING the danger to the continued viability of the Non-Proliferation Treaty by the refusal of some Nuclear Weapons States to make an unequivocal commitment to enter negotiations leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons;

IMPLORING the Russian Federation to ratify START II, thus removing any impediment to beginning negotiations for START III, which should provide drastic reductions in U.S. and Russian strategic stockpiles;

URGING the United Kingdom, France and China to join a multilateral process with the U.S. and the Russian Federation to give assurance to the world that all NWS are unequivocally committed to reductions on a step-by-step basis to zero nuclear weapons;

THEREFORE, the International Peace Bureau:

URGES a coalition of like-minded Non-Nuclear Weapon States in all regions of the world be formed to jointly press the NWS to accept their responsibility to world humanity to make an unequivocal commitment now to enter into negotiations on a program to eliminate all nuclear weapons;

SUGGESTS that this resolution be drawn to the attention of the middle-power governments that have a special relationship and access to the United States, which itself is in a unique leadership role in the world;

RECOMMENDS that all IPB affiliates urge their governments to support the forthcoming resolution at UNGA 52, which repeats the call for negotiations leading to the conclusion of a Nuclear Weapons Convention;

COMMITTS the IPB to use its good offices to obtain the active support of members and supporters around the world to press this resolution on their national governments, and to make this resolution known to other international disarmament organizations.

Doug Roche

As a final note,

I just can't get too enthused about negative security assurances--I don't think it moves our disarmament agenda forward and it could be pointed to by the nuke powers as a great accomplishment, like the CTBT, which will do nothing to stop the nuclear juggernaut from continuing to expand and threaten life on the planet.

Regards,

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: nukenet@envirolink.org, ssmmpn+@igc.org, cpaine@nrdc.org  
Date: Mon, 13 Oct 1997 16:59:10 -0700 (PDT)  
From: marylia@igc.apc.org (Marylia Kelley)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: For Treaty and Vision  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
X-Sender: marylia@pop.igc.apc.org (Unverified)

For Treaty and Vision  
by Marylia Kelley  
from Tri-Valley CAREs' October newsletter, Citizen's Watch

One year after he signed it, President Clinton sent the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) to the Senate for ratification on September 22. Troubling is the letter he sent with the CTBT, for it undermines the comprehensive intent of the Treaty, touts the overblown "Stockpile Stewardship" program and emphasizes a change in the way the U.S. certifies the "safety" and "reliability" of its arsenal-to give the Livermore and Los Alamos Labs nearly unlimited authority and thus a stranglehold on the nation's checkbook.

Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC) greeted the CTBT's arrival in his Foreign Relations Committee with a yawn. It will not come up for a vote this year, he said, and maybe not next year either.

For the peace movement, this presents a situation of challenge and opportunity. Our task must be one of articulating the vision embodied in the CTBT-moving toward nuclear disarmament and constraining the DOE to a program of "curatorship" for the U.S. arsenal, whereby it is kept under safe conditions but adding new designs and military capabilities are foresworn. Our consistent message, put on the table with decision-makers and espoused in our communities, must be, "CTBT yes, Stockpile Stewardship no."

Underscoring the need for consistent action by peace advocates, Administration officials and Senator Pete Dominici (R-NM) announced recently that the price tag for so-called Stockpile Stewardship had risen again. Instead of the \$40 billion worth of new nuclear weapons technologies over 10 years promised to the labs in 1995, taxpayers would now be expected to ante up \$60 billion over 13 years.

At \$4.5 billion a year and likely to soar higher still, these obscene expenditures are to satisfy the desires of the weaponeers, not to caretake the arsenal. Economists in early 1996 estimated the cost of a bare-bones maintenance program for U.S. weapons at about \$100 million per year.

Marylia Kelley  
Tri-Valley CAREs \* 5720 East Ave. #116 \* Livermore, CA 94550  
Ph: (510) 443-7148 \* Fx: (510) 443-0177

Return-Path: <ipb@gn.apc.org>  
Date: Mon, 13 Oct 1997 21:39:38 -0100  
From: International Peace Bureau <ipb@gn.apc.org>  
Subject: RE: inter-religious action at NPT  
To: "David Atwood" <atwood@pop.unicc.org>,  
"mupj@igc.apc.org" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Cc: "edibal@iprolink.ch" <edibal@iprolink.ch>,  
"ipb@gn.apc.org" <ipb@gn.apc.org>  
Encoding: 182 TEXT

I support David's comments. One idea might be for the group to send an inter-faith delegation to visit all nuclear weapons states and threshold states in Geneva - try to get meetings at the highest possible level and urge very firmly that they consider accepting the opening of multilateral talks on nuclear disarmament. UK and France might be especially susceptible to this given their new leftish governments.

Colin Archer, IPB

-----  
From: David Atwood[SMTP:atwood@pop.unicc.org]  
Sent: lundi, 13. octobre 1997 17:01  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Cc: edibal@iprolink.ch; ipb@gn.apc.org  
Subject: Re:

Dear Howard Hallman:

Thank you for your various messages to me. Apologies for not responding earlier.

Now that I have joined the Abolition server, I have begun to gather the information on the plans for the NPT PrepCom next May. The Special NGO Committee for Disarmament itself will be involved in assisting the organization of activities here in Geneva during the PrepCom.

Let me sent you some preliminary thoughts on your idea. I think that a strong religious voice concerning the need to abolish nuclear weapons is vital. How best to focus that voice on decision-makers is always difficult to determine. In principle, the idea of having a gathering of world religious leaders in Geneva is an attractive idea. I believe that the impact of such a gathering would be greater at the time of the PrepComm than at the start of the CD session in January. Attention will be more focused at that time.

What exactly would these world religious leaders do while here? How best to use their presence? I think that something early in the first week would be likely to attract more delegate participation than on Sunday afternoon, when delegations will only be arriving in Geneva. An event near the UN during the luncheon period (13.00 - 15.00) might be a chance to stage a public event to which delegates were invited.

I am sorry to hear that the WCC doesn't feel it can take part to any real extent, although the offer of space at the Ecumenical Center, not far from the Palais des Nations, is an important one. If you were to demonstrate that you were able to attract some major religious figures to Geneva for this, I suspect it would be hard for the WCC and for Konrad Reiser not to see it as important to get involved in. I guess they just can't handle the organizing.

I suppose an important question to be answered would be what kind of message would you wish these leaders to give. The NPT PrepComm is a key process and there will be important things to urge states to do there. But a general nuclear disarmament message risks being politely heard and then dismissed as rather irrelevant to the business at hand. So, I have a little trouble matching up a gathering of such an august group and the normal conduct of business of these PrepComms, however much it has been possible to turn them in to sessions of substance.

We are quite limited here in Geneva in our ability to offer organizational assistance for such an effort. To go forward with such an idea, what is your estimate of what would be required in terms of cost and organization? What would you require locally to make this happen? A critical element would be to get a measure of what would be required in terms of inviting such world religious leaders and putting together the programme and of making the local arrangements? Putting on something here in Geneva could be effective in this regard provided this basic organizational capacity can be arranged.

Another consideration, more modest but also less organizationally demanding and costly, would be to organize some kind of multi-faith service at some time during the PrepComm. Daniel Ibanez-Gomez of the Peace Council (he lives in Wisconsin) has done this effectively in Geneva, Brussels, and Oslo for the International Campaign to Ban Landmines. He is planning to organize such a service in Ottawa at the time of the Treaty signing in December. This adds a good dimension to the NGO presences around such events and does attract some delegate participation.

I have to say that our local NGO capacity is extremely limited. We shall be enhancing that capacity for the PrepComm. But for an event such as you are suggesting to be do-able, I believe that you will need to feel confident that you are able to pull together the requisite organizational capacity to do the advance work as well as the local arrangements, although surely in this ecumenical setting there may be some willing to get behind this.

I would be happy to talk with you about this further. Basically, I think the idea has possibilities and could be quite an effective element. I am sending my response to you also to Colin Archer at the International Peace Bureau and to Edith Ballantyne at the Womens International League for Peace and Freedom, as they may also have comments to make to you.

With every good wish.

David Atwood

>Dear David Atwood:

>

>I am writing to you at the suggestion of David Gracie of the AFSC. He and I

>along with Clayton Ramey of the FOR (in the US) are co-conveners of the  
>Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, which is part of the  
>Abolition 2000 Network.

>

>As you may know, Abolition 2000 intends to bring together a number of NGOs  
>in Geneva at the next meeting of the NPT Preparatory Committee, scheduled  
>for April 28 to May 8, 1998. They will conduct a series of forums and  
make

>contact with delegates in order to influence the outcome of the meeting.

>

>This may also be an opportunity bring together world religious leaders to  
>make the moral case for abolition of nuclear weapons. We would like your  
>advice and assistance on this matter.

>

>Several weeks ago I wrote to Dwayne Epps at the World Council of Churches,  
>asking him if top leadership of WCC might be involved. I had a brief  
>telephone conversation with him, but I caught him in the midst of the  
>Central Committee meeting. He said he'd get back in touch with me, but I  
>haven't heard from him.

>

>My friends in the Catholic Church believe that the Pontifical Commission  
on  
>Justice and Peace is examining the matter of nuclear weapons anew. They  
>further note that the Pope is an abolitionist according to statements he  
has  
>made.

>

>The Dalai Lama has made strong statements favoring nuclear disarmament.  
>Leaders of other faiths have done likewise.

>

>Do you think it would be possible to put together some kind of gathering  
in  
>which these world leaders or their representatives would participate? For  
>example, one suggestion is to have a forum at 4:00 p.m. on Sunday, April  
27,  
>the day before the NPT PrepCom meeting commences, and follow the forum  
with  
>a reception for delegates. No doubt there are other possibilities.

>

>

>It is conceivable that a similar event could be organized toward the end  
of  
>January 1998 when the Conference on Disarmament reconvenes.

>  
>We are open to various possibilities and therefore will benefit greatly  
from  
>whatever counsel you can offer.  
>  
>To reply you can reach me via e-mail at [mupj@igc.apc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.apc.org) or by phone in  
the  
>U.S. at 301 896-0013.  
>  
>With best regards,  
>  
>Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
>Methodists United for Peace with Justice.  
>  
>  
>

---

David C. Atwood  
Associate Representative  
Disarmament and Peace Programme  
Quaker United Nations Office  
13, avenue du Mervelet  
1209 Geneva  
Switzerland  
Tel: +41-22-748 4802 or switchboard 748 4800)  
FAX: +41-22-748 4819)  
E-mail: [atwood@pop.unicc.org](mailto:atwood@pop.unicc.org)

Return-Path: <galen@om.com.au>  
Date: Tue, 14 Oct 1997 22:31:51 +1000  
From: Galen White <galen@om.com.au>  
Organization: GTF Software  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter to President Clinton  
References: <2.2.16.19971008165015.48e7754a@pop.igc.org>

Dear Howard,

Please sign on the following groups:

=====

Kerri Frances, Secretary, Big Scrub Environment Centre, 2 Darsham Ave, Lismore, NSW, 2480, Aust  
Ellen Davison, Secretary, North Coast Uranium Action Group, Ross Rd, The Channon, NSW, 2480, Aust  
Galen White, Senior Analyst, GTF Software, PO Box 1003, Mullumbimby, NSW, 2482, Aust

Please sign on the following individuals:

=====

Barbara Worthington, 1032 Dunoon Rd, Modanville, NSW, 2480, Aust  
Merle Hemensley, 1 Esyth Lane, Lismore, NSW, 2480, Aust  
Bobbi Allan, 346 The Channon Rd via Lismore, NSW, 2480, Aust  
Robyn Whyte, 1050 Terania Creek Rd, The Channon, NSW, 2480, Aust  
Isabele Whyte, 1050 Terania Creek Rd, The Channon, NSW, 2480, Aust  
Haus Peter Schnelbogl, PO Box 1223, Lismore, NSW, 2480, Aust  
Sally Castle, 82 James St, Dunoon, NSW, 2480, Aust  
Elly Clough, Ross Rd, The Channon, NSW, 2480, Aust  
Evelyn Meyer, Lot 5, Repentance Creek Rd, Rosebank, NSW, 2480, Aust

mupj@igc.apc.org wrote:

> Dear Friends:

>  
> I invite you to sign the following letter to President Clinton, asking that  
> the United States take a positive approach to proposals for multi-lateral  
> negotiations for nuclear disarmament when they arise at the UN General  
> Assembly, the Conference on Disarmament, and the NPT Preparatory Committee.  
>  
> The letter contains ideas I gained from discussion with Alyn Ware of the  
> Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy. A first draft was reviewed by Alice  
> Slater of GRACE and members of the Nuclear Weapons Working Group of the  
> Monday Lobby in Washington, D.C. Several initial signers are indicated.  
>  
> If you wish to sign, please let me know and indicate the name and title of  
> the signer and name of your organization. Deadline for signing is  
> Wednesday, October 15, 1997.  
>  
> If you have any questions, you can call me at 301 896-0013 or reach me by  
> e-mail at mupj@igc.apc.org.  
>

> With best regards,  
>  
> Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice

> \*\*\*\*\*

> The Honorable William J. Clinton  
> The White House  
> Washington, DC 20500

> Dear Mr. President:

> On a number of occasions you have expressed a desire to see the total  
> elimination of nuclear weapons on Earth. In your second inaugural address  
> you offered a vision of a land of new promise where "our children will sleep  
> free from the threat of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons." This  
> vision has wide public support, indicated in a poll conducted last spring by  
> Celinda Lake of Lake Sosin Snell Associates that revealed 84 percent of  
> American voters would feel safer knowing that no country had nuclear weapons.

> Already there are global conventions for the elimination of chemical and  
> biological weapons. In the Celinda Lake survey 87 percent of the  
> respondents agreed that the United States should negotiate a similar  
> agreement to eliminate nuclear weapons. In the next eight months three  
> international bodies will be meeting and will have opportunities to take  
> significant steps toward accomplishing this goal. We hope that under your  
> leadership the United States will play a constructive role in these gatherings.

> The first occasion is the 52nd Session of the United Nations General  
> Assembly, now meeting in New York. It is our understanding that the General  
> Assembly will consider a resolution similar to the one proposed by Malaysia  
> and adopted last December that (1) notes the unanimous conclusion of the  
> International Court of Justice that "there exists an obligation to pursue in  
> good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear  
> disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international  
> control" and (2) "calls upon all states to fulfill that obligation  
> immediately by commencing negotiations of a nuclear weapons convention  
> prohibiting the development, production, testing, deploying, stockpiling,  
> transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their  
> elimination." We ask that the United States drop its opposition to such a  
> resolution and strongly endorse it.

> The second occasion will be the reconvening of the UN Conference on  
> Disarmament in Geneva in January 1998. Previously some participants have  
> proposed that the Conference establish an ad hoc committee to commence  
> multi-lateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Likely this proposal  
> will come up again. We favor this approach. Therefore, we ask that the  
> United States support creation of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament  
> within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament.

> (over)

> The third occasion will be meeting of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)  
> Preparatory Committee in Geneva in April 1998. In preparation for this

- > meeting we recommend that the United States take several good faith actions
- > that begin to respond to the obligations under Article VI of the NPT.
- > Specifically we urge that the United States begin to carry out "immediate
- > steps" recommended by the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear
- > Weapons:
- >
- > · Take nuclear weapons off alert
- > · Remove warheads from delivery vehicles
- > · End deployment of non-strategic nuclear weapons
- > · Achieve agreement with other nuclear weapon states for reciprocal no first use
- >
- > At the meeting of the NPT PrepCom we ask that the United States support
- > efforts to establish a working group to begin negotiations on a nuclear
- > weapons convention. Such a group could work out a division of
- > responsibility with the ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament of the
- > Conference on Disarmament, for there are many tasks to perform in moving
- > toward the goal of nuclear abolition.
- >
- > None of these multi-lateral efforts would preclude the United States and
- > Russia from working out a START III agreement that would substantially
- > reduce the world's two largest nuclear arsenals. Indeed, such bilateral
- > reductions can set the stage for total elimination by all parties under a
- > nuclear weapons convention.
- >
- > Mr. President, as you lead the United States on this journey, we promise to
- > help build public support for such bold measures. As previously indicated,
- > the American people are already inclined in this direction and will welcome
- > your leadership to work out arrangements for global elimination of nuclear
- > weapons within a timebound framework.
- >
- > Sincerely yours,
- >
- > [Initial signers:]
- >
- > Caleb S. Rositer, Director, Demilitarization for Democracy
- > Edward (Ned) W. Stowe, Legislative Secretary, Friends Committee for
- > National Legislation
- > Alice Slater, President, Global Resource Action Center for the Environment
- > Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice
- > Kathy Thorton, National Coordinator, NETWORK: A National Catholic Social
- > Justice Lobby
- > Gordon S. Clark, Executive Director, Peace Action
- > David Hart, Executive Director, Veterans for Peace
- > Susan Share, Executive Director, Women's Action for New Directions

-----  
 Galen White  
 GTF Software  
 Web Applications, Databases and GIS  
 ph: +61 2 66882386 galen@om.com.au

GTF Software is a member of the Abolition 2000 Network  
 A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

<http://www.wagingpeace.org/orgapledge.html>

Return-Path: <bkinsey@peacemission.org>  
From: "Bob Kinsey" <bkinsey@peacemission.org>  
To: "Alice Slater" <aslater@igc.apc.org>,  
"Dietrich Fischer" <102464.1110@compuserve.com>,  
"abolition-caucus" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: CTBT ratification  
Date: Tue, 14 Oct 1997 12:18:45 -0600  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

A great phrase "A Clean CTBT" -- Another idea--how dare the Dr. Strangeloves appropriate the Christian concept of Stewardship for their nefarious plans to extend earth and human destroying devices? Their choice of terms reveals their duplicity. Proper Stewardship of the stockpile would be to find the quickest way to eliminate it.

-----  
> From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>  
> To: Dietrich Fischer <102464.1110@compuserve.com>; abolition-caucus  
<abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
> Cc: Bob Kinsey <bkinsey@peacemission.org>; Howard W. Hallman  
<mupj@igc.apc.org>  
> Subject: Re: CTBT ratification  
> Date: Monday, October 13, 1997 4:49 PM  
>  
> Dear Dietrich,  
> There is no issue among any abolitionists about whether we should support  
> the ratification of the CTBT. Many of us have worked for it for all our  
> adult lives. The issue is, will we silently support the ratification of  
> the  
> CTBT without bringing to public attention the terrible price that Clinton  
> is  
> willing to pay for it? \$60billion worth of stockpile stewardship over the  
> next 13 years which includes underground sub-critical tests, stadium  
> sized  
> facilities such as the NIF and supercomputing initiatives which will  
> enable  
> the weaponeers to continue to design new nukes. They have already  
> designed  
> one new weapon, the B61 earth penetrator and are working on a new warhead  
> for the Trident-- all without full scale "critical" nuclear testing. We  
> need to make the deal known and not silently go along with ratification  
> of a  
> CTB encumbered by the Faustian bargain Clinton made with the labs and the  
> Pentagon. We need to get Senators to speak out in favor of a "clean  
> CTB",  
> without the \$60 billion stockpile stewardship package. Otherwise, the  
> public will be lulled into complacency that nuclear development is over  
> upon  
> ratification of the CTB and will be unaware of the bargain Clinton made  
> and  
> the continued activity in the labs. We need a real public debate on  
> nuclear  
> policy and abolitionists should be requesting it of their Congressional



Return-Path: <prop1@prop1.org>  
X-Sender: prop1@prop1.org (Unverified)  
Date: Tue, 14 Oct 1997 14:54:05 -0400  
To: (Recipient list suppressed)  
From: Peace through Reason <prop1@prop1.org>  
Subject: Re: CTBT ratification  
Cc: 102464.1110@compuserve.com

At 08:50 AM 10/13/97 -0400, Dietrich Fischer wrote:

>I entirely agree with Howard W. Hallman and Bob  
>Kinsey that Abolition 2000 should support the CTBT, while at  
>the same time seeking to end the Stockpile Stewardship program  
>and, of course, complete abolition. If we were to oppose CTBT  
>ratification in the US Senate because it contains some  
>provisions we don't like, we would split the forces who support  
>nuclear disarmament and hand a victory to the opponents. Let's  
>keep our movement broad and strong, not splintering into small  
>factions that fight each other over questions of doctrinal  
>purity, or we risk being ignored.

>  
>  
>  
>

To: "Bob Kinsey" <bkinsey@peacemission.org>  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Re: CTBT ratification  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Bob,

I believe you misunderstood Alice's memo. It was she who spoke of a "Clean CTB" without being soiled by stockpile stewardship.

Howard Hallman

At 12:18 PM 10/14/97 -0600, you wrote:

>A great phrase "A Clean CTBT" -- Another idea--how dare the Dr.  
>Strangeloves appropriate the Christian concept of Stewardship for their  
>nefarious plans to extend earth and human destroying devices?  
>Their choice of terms reveals their duplicity. Proper Stewardship of the  
>stockpile would be to find the quickest way to eliminate it.

>-----

>> From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>  
>> To: Dietrich Fischer <102464.1110@compuserve.com>; abolition-caucus  
>><abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
>> Cc: Bob Kinsey <bkinsey@peacemission.org>; Howard W. Hallman  
>><mupj@igc.apc.org>  
>> Subject: Re: CTBT ratification  
>> Date: Monday, October 13, 1997 4:49 PM

>>

>> Dear Dietrich,

>> There is no issue among any abolitionists about whether we should support  
>> the ratification of the CTBT. Many of us have worked for it for all our  
>> adult lives. The issue is, will we silently support the ratification of  
>the

>> CTBT without bringing to public attention the terrible price that Clinton  
>is

>> willing to pay for it? \$60billion worth of stockpile stewardship over the  
>> next 13 years which includes underground sub-critical tests, stadium  
>sized

>> facilities such as the NIF and supercomputing initiatives which will  
>enable

>> the weaponeers to continue to design new nukes. They have already  
>designed

>> one new weapon, the B61 earth penetrator and are working on a new warhead  
>> for the Trident-- all without full scale "critical" nuclear testing. We  
>> need to make the deal known and not silently go along with ratification  
>of a

>> CTB encumbered by the Faustian bargain Clinton made with the labs and the  
>> Pentagon. We need to get Senators to speak out in favor of a "clean  
>CTB",

>> without the \$60 billion stockpile stewardship package. Otherwise, the  
>> public will be lulled into complacency that nuclear development is over  
>upon

>> ratification of the CTB and will be unaware of the bargain Clinton made  
>and  
>> the continued activity in the labs. We need a real public debate on  
>nuclear  
>> policy and abolitionists should be requesting it of their Congressional  
>> representatives. Regards,

>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>

>> At 08:50 AM 10/13/97 -0400, Dietrich Fischer wrote:  
>> >Dear friends, I entirely agree with Howard W. Hallman and Bob  
>> >Kinsey that Abolition 2000 should support the CTBT, while at  
>> >the same time seeking to end the Stockpile Stewardship program  
>> >and, of course, complete abolition. If we were to oppose CTBT  
>> >ratification in the US Senate because it contains some  
>> >provisions we don't like, we would split the forces who support  
>> >nuclear disarmament and hand a victory to the opponents. Let's  
>> >keep our movement broad and strong, not splintering into small  
>> >factions that fight each other over questions of doctrinal  
>> >purity, or we risk being ignored.  
>> >Dietrich Fischer

>> >  
>> >  
>> >  
>>  
>  
>

Return-Path: <DavidMcR@aol.com>

From: DavidMcR@aol.com

Date: Wed, 15 Oct 1997 08:52:35 -0400 (EDT)

To: aslater@igc.apc.org, 102464.1110@compuserve.com, abolition-caucus@igc.org

cc: bkinsey@peacemission.org, mupj@igc.apc.org, WRL@igc.apc.org

Subject: Re: CTBT ratification

May I strongly join in supporting Alice Slater's post in friendly response to Dietrich. This is almost certainly also the position of War Resisters League but we rarely take official positions, sticking to actions and campaigns.

Peace,  
David McReynolds

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 15 Oct 1997 16:20:18 -0400 (EDT)  
From: LANLaction@aol.com  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: RE:KINSEY/SLATER ON SS&M  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

FROM: PEGGY PRINCE, LANLaction@aol.com  
Oct. 14, 1997  
Dear Abolition Sisters and Brothers;

I've been keeping up as best I can with the discussion on the CTBT as it relates to SS&M in the Abolition Caucus. Most notably the correspondence between Alice Slater and Bob Kinsey. Now, I'm not a policy expert (far from it) nor am I adept at Washington political dynamics, so I apologize in advance for my lack of sophistication. That having been said however, I do have a few thoughts on this issue and beg your indulgence to hear me out.

I'm not going to give you a stirring tale of my background living near Los Alamos National Lab, or take up your valuable time explaining my connection with A2000, I'll just launch in. You'll notice that I don't mention Alice Slater's analysis of CTB and SS&M; that's because I couldn't agree more.

SOME OF MY COMMENTS ARE BASED ON THE E-MAIL BELOW:

Subj: Re: CTBT Ratification and Stockpile Stewardship  
Date: 8, Oct 1997 2:28 PM MST  
From: bkinsey@peacemission.org  
X-From: bkinsey@peacemission.org (Bob Kinsey)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org, abolition-caucus@igc.org

BOB WRITES:

There is no way at this time to make subtle distinctions between these two issues. The general public is for a CTBT. At this time they aren't prepared to get the problem of Stockpile Stewardship quick or get behind an effort eliminate it.

---

I'm sure that Bob didn't mean to sound condescending but I hear that. I believe that the public not only can understand the dynamics of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty with no teeth, but that they have an intuitive realization that there's something fishy going on in the Senate with CTBT.

The general public wants nuclear weapons to go away, yes, but if we underestimate their intelligence it's us, not the policy wonks, that will receive the brunt of their wrath when no enforceable CTBT emerges at the other end, or the other U.N. member states refuse to ratify.

BOB WRITES:

If we get the CTBT we can move toward challenging the SS program as hypocrisy in the face of what they thought they were getting with the CTBT.

---

I think Bob's being too canny by half. The hypocrisy he mentions will be seen as our own, and stupidity too. The public is not like a pit bull you aim at a target and say "Sick'em." Isn't it better to challenge Stockpile Stewardship head-on and directly linking it to a toothless CTBT? 'Moving toward challenging' SS&M will be too little too late.

BOB WRITES:

CTBT will get an international inspection system in place and commit the US to cooperative anti testing activity. Cooperative is the operative word. We have to establish some sort of commitment to gaining national security via international cooperation. Every inch in that direction, even if accompanied by large bits of hypocrisy is progress.

---

I can't even begin to express how much I DON'T agree with this statement!

The United States 'national security' has never been an issue, only every other country's security in a world where the U.S. is the largest weapons dealer. Bob mentions the government hypocrisy in the previous out-take and then mentions our hypocrisy here. Have we, as Pogo says, "met the enemy and he is us?" When he says 'cooperative' it sounds very much like surrender or obfuscation depending what side you're on. Hypocrisy is, in my opinion, never progress. It is merely selling one's soul for a momentary and fleeting perception of victory.

In a very clever way, I believe Bob's being myopic, and his obviously bright mind could be leading him down the slippery slope. Now, I don't know him and have to sort of make some judgments from his tone, so I'm sorry if my assessment offends.

A CTBT with Stockpile Stewardship as its shadow brother won't fool anyone, certainly not the other U.N. member nations we expect to ratify. We must not give in to the temptation to wink at one another and say that the King has lovely new clothes; we'll only be fooling ourselves. As Corbin Harney, Western Shoshone spiritual leader said, "Let me tell you about treaties..."

In closing, I would like to suggest that Bob read, once again, the American Friends Service Committee letter by David Gracie. I was very taken by his comments which are more eloquently said than I ever could produce. Those comments follow:

\* We should not become closet abolitionists in order to persuade senators to ratify, which is what I am afraid several peace organizations are in danger of doing, by consciously suppressing their critique of Stockpile Stewardship in their lobbying efforts for ratification.

\* So how should we work now for a CTBT, with integrity? I think the only way to do it is by adding to every expression of support for this treaty a demand that the labs be defunded, the Nevada test site closed, all weapons taken off alert, and the other steps followed that lead the way to abolition. (The steps have been clearly outlined in detail by the Canberra Commission and in brief form in the Abolition 2000 statement.).

\* Arms control treaties may be very important steps towards our larger goals of peace and justice, but each treaty and each campaign must be carefully

examined in the context of the structures of power to which we in AFSC try to speak truth. We have to be careful that we do not sell pieces of ourselves for words on paper.

\* I believe we should be promoters of the codes of conduct on conventional arms transfers and of the nuclear weapons convention, with a CTBT as a necessary step on the way to that goal. But in our advocacy we should not speak less than the truth nor promote illusions about power.

Thank you for your time and attention to this reply to some of Bob Kinsey's arguments. I look forward to further debate and education.

To: ograbc@aol.com, jmatlack@erols.com, cwu\_washington.parti@ecument.org, barbara\_green@pcusa.org, dgracie@afsc.org, tom.hart@ecunet.org, cramey@igc.org, mknolldc@igc.org, lwyolton@prodigy.com, dave@paxchristiusa.org  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Report of October 15 meeting  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

#### Highlights of Meeting on CTBT Grassroots Campaign, October 15, 1997

The CTBT is now before the Senate. Several committees will have hearings this fall with more hearings after the first of the year. NATO expansion will come up before the CTBT, which may not reach the Senate floor until late spring or early summer. For more information on hearings, contact David Culp at 202 898-0150 or dculp@nrdc.org.

Kathy Crandall of the Disarmament Clearinghouse has set up an e-mail list/serve to keep activists in Washington and around the country informed about the CTBT ratification campaign. If she hasn't contacted you and you want on this list serve, contact her at 202 898-0150, x. 232 or disarmament@igc.org.

Kathy also has an Activist Packet, which she will make available to you, and through you to grassroots leaders in the CTBT campaign.

Plans are proceeding for the Denver CTBT Activist Summit, scheduled for November 15. Please encourage your main contacts in Utah, Arizona, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Nebraska, and Kansas to attend. If you need more flyers, contact Bridget Moix at 202 547-6000 or bridget@fcnl.org. A similar workshop for Pittsburgh has been scheduled for Saturday, January 17, 1998.

Most of the meeting was spent going through the list of 24 states, sent to you with the meeting agenda, to identify who has contacts. If you have names of your activists in various states who can be part of state coalition work, please send this information to Kathy Crandall, who will channel the names to the Washington contacts for the various states.

The next meeting on the CTBT Grassroots Campaign will take place on Wednesday, December 3 from 12:30 to 2:00 p.m. in the Methodist Building, Conf. Room 3. Bring your lunch if you wish.

With best regards,

Howard Hallman  
301 896-0013

To: disarmament  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Contacts  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Kathy:

Here are names of some contacts in the Northwest who will work on the CTBT campaign:

Rev. Richard K. Heacock, Jr.      Alaska Impact  
3012 Riverview Drive  
Fairbanks, AK 99709-4735  
907 474-0700

Rev. Robert E. Hughes      United Methodist Peace with Justice Coordinator  
2707 68th Avenue, SE  
Mercer Island, WA 98040  
206 232-0598 (h)  
206 533-4465 (o)

Kathy Campbell-Barton      United Methodist Peace with Justice Coordinator  
1230 Highland NE  
Salem, OR 97303  
Ph. 503 399-1584 (h)  
Fax: 503 581-3974

Dan Mondragon      Catholic Justice and Peace Coordinator  
Archdiocese of Denver  
1300 S. Stell Street  
Denver, CO 80210  
Ph. 303 715-3220  
Fax: 303 715-2042

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: j bloomfield@gn.apc.org, jrussow@coastnet.com, mhutton@melb.alexia.net.au,  
rwilcock@web.net, smirnowb@ix.netcom.com  
Date: Thu, 16 Oct 1997 08:11:51 GMT  
From: Janet Bloomfield <j bloomfield@gn.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: Destroying Cassini?  
To: a-days@agoranet.be, aalsmin-l@ube.ubalt.edu, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org,  
EURO-LEX@LISTSERV.GMD.DE, FBOYLE@law.uiuc.edu,  
humanrights-l@lawlib.wuacc.edu, kanakamaoliallies-l@hawaii.edu,  
listserv@law.wuacc.edu, NUKENET@envirolink.org

Dear Friends,  
now that Cassini has finally been launched, without accident thank  
God, I think it is time to consider how we focus the concern,  
awareness and energy generated by the campaign into achieving  
the prime purpose of Abolition 2000 - a nuclear weapons  
convention. The campaign against Cassini was a great effort  
and I am sure some people will want to continue to work against  
it and any other space mission fueled by plutonium but the  
fundamental problem we have right now is plutonium in nuclear  
weapons, nuclear power plants, reprocessors and in the  
environment on earth. The lesson for me of the landmines  
campaign, which has still some way to go, is that you have to  
focus on a clear goal and tell the human story of why  
you want what you do. And then build alliances as widely  
as possible.

A nuclear weapons convention would completely undermine the  
nuclear ideology that propelled Cassini into the heavens.

Lets get back to our core business - after all its not very  
long until the year 2000.

Yours in peace,  
Janet Bloomfield.

To: cwu\_washington.parti@ecunet.org  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Report on October 15 meeting  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

>Highlights of Meeting on CTBT Grassroots Campaign, October 15, 1997

>

>The CTBT is now before the Senate. Several committees will have hearings  
>this fall with more hearings after the first of the year. NATO expansion  
>will come up before the CTBT, which may not reach the Senate floor until  
>late spring or early summer. For more information on hearings, contact  
>David Culp at 202 898-0150 or dculp@nrdc.org.

>

>Kathy Crandall of the Disarmament Clearinghouse has set up an e-mail  
>list/serve to keep activists in Washington and around the country informed  
>about the CTBT ratification campaign. If she hasn't contacted you and you  
>want on this list serve, contact her at 202 898-0150, x. 232 or  
>disarmament@igc.org.

>

>Kathy also has an Activist Packet, which she will make available to you, and  
>through you to grassroots leaders in the CTBT campaign.

>

>Plans are proceeding for the Denver CTBT Activist Summit, scheduled for  
>November 15. Please encourage your main contacts in Utah, Arizona, Wyoming,  
>Colorado, New Mexico, Nebraska, and Kansas to attend. If you need more  
>flyers, contact Bridget Moix at 202 547-6000 or bridget@fcnl.org. A similar  
>workshop for Pittsburgh has been scheduled for Saturday, January 17, 1998.

>

>Most of the meeting was spent going through the list of 24 states, sent to  
>you with the meeting agenda, to identify who has contacts. If you have  
>names of your activists in various states who can be part of state coalition  
>work, please send this information to Kathy Crandall, who will channel the  
>names to the Washington contacts for the various states.

>

>The next meeting on the CTBT Grassroots Campaign will take place on  
>Wednesday, December 3 from 12:30 to 2:00 p.m. in the Methodist Building,  
>Conf. Room 3. Bring your lunch if you wish.

>

>With best regards,

>

>Howard Hallman  
>301 896-0013

>

>

To: flick  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Getting religious to NPT PrepCom  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Felicity:

The desire of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition to bring world religious leaders to the NPT PrepCom meeting in Geneva is beginning to take shape. Thus, I want to share with you what our tentative thinking is and to ask your advice and assistance.

Our most ambitious objective is to bring together top world religious leaders at some kind of gathering early in the PrepCom meeting, such as on Monday, April 27, 1998. This could include representatives of the World Council of Churches, the Vatican, the Dalai Lama, equivalent leaders from other faiths, and perhaps Nobel peace prize winners Archbishop Tutu and Elie Wiesel. They would state the necessity for elimination of nuclear weapons from a faith perspective and would urge delegates to get on with the task, such as by setting up an intersessional working group to begin preparing for and negotiating a nuclear weapons convention. They might also urge the nuclear weapons states to implement the intermediate steps outlined by the Canberra Commission.

I have made some initial inquiries via e-mail. Dwain Epps at the World Council of Churches is supportive of the idea, doesn't have time to do much work on it, but would consider ways to offer space and limited support in the Ecumenical Center. David Atwood at the Quaker office is supportive and suggests having an event near the UN during the luncheon period and invite the delegates. He suggests that a less-demanding alternative would be to have a multi-faith service some time during the PrepCom. Colin Archer suggests that in addition to an event we get religious leaders to lobby delegates. Alice Slater wonders whether 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. on the first Monday would be a better time for an event that would draw in delegates.

I'm reaching out to find ways to involve the Catholic Church and then to other faiths. Preliminary soundings lead me to conclude that we can succeed to drawing in world religious leaders. But I'm a congenital optimist.

I'm also a pragmatist and know that such an event has some demanding logistics. It would depend upon a lot of help from people in Geneva, such as working out arrangements for space and food service, if required. It will have expenses, especially if food is provided. Therefore, we need a reality check from you and others who know Geneva and also the way the PrepCom proceeds. Accordingly, your advice will be greatly appreciated.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
301 896-0013

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 2 Oct 1997 01:04:24 -1000  
From: Richard Salvador <salvador@hawaii.edu>  
Reply-To: Richard Salvador <salvador@hawaii.edu>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: South Pacific Forum  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
X-Sender: salvador@uhunix5

To the Abolition 2000 Network members:

Aloha from Hawai'i,

I returned to Honolulu, Hawai'i yesterday after nearly three weeks observing the South Pacific Forum and attending the Parallel NGO Forum which were held on the island of Rarotonga in the Cook Islands. I have included below paragraphs 29 to 38 of the South Pacific Forum Communique' which have relevance to the nuclear abolition movement worldwide. If you are interested in viewing the entire Communique', it is been published in its entirety in the Pacific Islands Report at the following URL:

<http://pidp.ewc.hawaii.edu/PIReport/September%201997/09-22-16.html>

As far as the NGO Parallel Forum which I attended, we produced our own NGO Forum Communique' which went beyond the positions taken by the Pacific Island Governments. For your information, the Abolition 2000 was well represented there as I endeavored to share as much material and information as I could. Gabriel Tetiarahi of the Hiti Tau organization (Tahiti) was there as well. As a president of the Pacific Islands Association of NGOs (PIANGO), his time on lobbying for nuclear issues was quite limited so it became incumbent on myself to carry the torch on Abolition 2000's behalf.

The South Pacific Forum has always been a close meeting of Pacific leaders, coming together oftentimes formally to adopt a number of initiatives already worked on by the respective Pacific ministries of foreign affairs. As a result of an exclusivity, the Cook Islands Government forced the NGO Forum to cancel its parallel forum to after the official SPF after the leaders have left. So unfortunately the NGOs came to Rarotonga after the government delegates have left. But thanks to Kilali Alailima, I went to Rarotonga even before the South Pacific Forum even began. I wish to thank personally David Krieger and the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation who provided some essential funding for my food expenses. Once there, I found I could not gain entry to the meetings of the Forum as they were held on the other side of the island away from the main town of Avarua where I stayed.

I found the island still suffering from the impact of a recent government bankruptcy so most of my lobbying activities were prohibited by transportation costs. But almost by a miracle, a friend who was returning home on the same flight invited me to a church on the first Sunday I was there. As it turned out, the Bishop of this church was the driver for the Palau Government's delegation, so he invited me to a Sunday luncheon with

the government delegations. There I began to meet all the presidents and prime ministers; I promptly made appointments. But because the Rarotongan Hotel where most of the meetings were held was off-limits, I stood by the roadsides catching the leaders as they were driven to the beaches, the churches, or to the nightclubs. I think they all got sick of me. But in the end, I was able to pass on a copy of the Nuclear Weapons Convention and the Abolition 2000 informational sheets to each Pacific leader. Thanks to Pamella Meidell, Felicity Hill, Michael Jones, the Greenpeace people, Western States Legal Foundation, etc, etc. I had the right materials and information). Also thanks to my lobbying experiences around the United Nations this past April, I put them to very good use.

The Cook islands Association of NGOs (CIANGO) which hosted us was very poor and had only one old computer and a loaned copy machine from UNDP which was bloody slow. These we used for all the participants of the NGO Parallel Forum, if you can believe it. I spent an entire day and a whole night until morning xeroxing the Nuclear Weapons Convention and the AB2000 Information Packet for each Pacific Island Government. I was impressed greatly by the dedication of so many to do the best they can with so little resources. In spite of the impacts of structural adjustments and the suffering these adjustments have caused, CIANGO members (MOSTLY ALL WOMEN) cooked for us, provided us with so much food, and volunteered as secretaries and organizers. Everything is very expensive and so resource-wise, the NGOs managed with so very little. There was an impressive sense of caring for the Pacific environment from the nuclear testings of colonial powers. But above all, a strong Pan-Pacific regionalism was so much evident as the NGO's met. We need you our colleagues in the North to stand up to the madness and arrogance of the nuclear age, to the TNCs/MNCs whose global reaches are impacting on vulnerable Pacific communities with as much force as the previous age of colonialisms.

For the next week after I arrived and readied my lobbying materials, I literally stood on the street corners handing them out to the leaders and delegates who took breaks from their meetings, or meeting them in churches where the Government of the Cook Islands took them on Sundays. (The island is very religious and prayers and sermons are given by a priest both at the church and all government functions.) One night at around 11pm while taking a break at the wharf where Greenpeace's Rainbow Warrior was docked, a Vanuatu Government delegate stopped to take a bite, only to find me lobbying him and telling him about the Nuclear Weapons Convention. I had been frustrated from an almost unfruitful day of dodging the police and security guards at the Forum meeting venue. This must have been the well-deserved price of patience and hard work. The delegate took time to listen and raise good questions. It also turned out his friend was a friend of mine.

In the end, I spoke with the Presidents of both the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) and RMI's foreign affairs Minister Philip Muller. The latter assured me they did not have a problem introducing the N.W. Convention to the UNGA and would in fact do it. Well, we'll have to wait and see if it gets done.

If each of you has any questions, I would be glad to answer your question.



non-proliferation regime, the cornerstone of which is the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. They welcomed the fact that, with total Treaty membership having grown to 186 countries, the goal of Treaty universality was drawing closer and noted the constructive start in New York during the First PrepCom in April 1997, of the strengthened Treaty review process.

31. Leaders endorsed the general approach that the region's focus in the PrepComs in the lead up to the 2000 NPT Review Conference be on nuclear weapon free zones and cooperation between nuclear weapon free zones in the Southern Hemisphere in particular, and the transport of radioactive materials through the region. The Forum agreed to work in close consultation with other states and organisations with a common position.

#### Radioactive Waste Shipments and Accident Liability

32. The Forum agreed that shipments of plutonium and radioactive wastes through the region posed a continuing concern and agreed to adopt a consistent position on the issue, taking into account the risks of an accident occurring and the consequences of such an accident. It reiterated the expectation that such shipments should be carried out in a manner which addressed all possible contingencies and the concerns of relevant countries. The Forum expected that shipments would be made only if the cargo is of demonstrably minimal risk, ships are of the highest standard and shipping states agree to promote the safety of the material and provide compensation for any industries harmed as a result of changes in the market value of the region's fisheries and tourism products in the event of an accident.

33. In this regard, the Forum noted the efforts of Japan, France and the United Kingdom in providing information about the recent shipment of high level wastes and expressed the hope that this would be continued.

34. The Forum noted the adoption of the Convention on Supplementary Compensation for Nuclear Damage, and in particular, its provisions for a dedicated transboundary fund for the victims of transboundary damage and giving coastal states jurisdiction over actions concerning nuclear damage in their Exclusive Economic Zones.

#### Contamination in the Republic of Marshall Islands

35. The Forum recognised the special circumstances pertaining to the continued presence of radioactive contaminants in the Republic of Marshall Islands, and reaffirmed the existence of a special responsibility by the United States towards the people of the Marshall Islands who have been, and are continuing to be, adversely affected as a direct result of nuclear weapons tests conducted by the United States of America during its administration of the islands under the UN Trusteeship mandate.

36. The Forum again called on the United States to live up to its full obligations on the provision of adequate and fair compensation and the commitment to its responsibility for the safe resettlement of displaced populations, including the full and final restoration to economic productivity of all affected areas.

## Nuclear Waste Storage

37. The Forum reiterated its concerns that despite the long standing regional opposition to the use of the Pacific as a dumping ground for others' wastes, and the adoption of the Waigani Convention, the proposals for creating storage sites for nuclear waste on Palmyra and Wake Islands are still being discussed by private concerns. The Forum, however, was encouraged by the reaffirmed opposition to the proposal by the US administration.

## Johnston Atoll Chemical Agent Disposal System

38. The Forum drew attention to the regions continuing concerns about the Johnston Atoll Chemical Agent Destruction System, reiterating that the facility should be permanently closed when the current programme of chemical weapons and agent destruction was completed.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

X-Authentication-Warning: igc2.igc.apc.org: majordomo set sender to owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org using -f

Date: Thu, 2 Oct 1997 08:02:54 -0700 (PDT)

From: NGO Committee on Disarmament <disarmtimes@igc.apc.org>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: UN DISARMAMENT WEEK

To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

Dear abolitionists,

Following is the current agenda for the Disarmament

Week symposium taking place October 20-23

at U.N. headquarters, co-sponsored by the NGO

Committee on Disarmament. Sorry to be posting

this information so late; the events start at

5:30pm on October 20 with a talk by Bruce Kent

of Pax Christi UK. All other events are inside the

U.N. building; for those without passes, we need to

relay your names to U.N. Security very soon, so

please contact the NGO Committee by October 10.

Phone 212.687.5340; Fax 212.687.1643;

e-mail disarmtimes@igc.apc.org

Peacefully,

Roger Smith

\*\*\*\*\*

#### THE FUTURE OF DISARMAMENT

OCTOBER 21-23, U.N. Library Auditorium

Panel discussions in the UN sponsored by the NGO Committee on Disarmament, the UN Centre for Disarmament Affairs and UNDP

TUES., OCT. 21, 10am-1pm: HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND DISARMAMENT: How can the devastation caused by small arms be lessened and resources for development be increased?

RICHARD JOLLY, Special Adviser, UNDP

LORA LUMPE, Federation of American Scientists, and others

3-6pm: BANNING ANTI-PERSONNEL LAND MINES: THE OTTAWA PROCESS AND BEYOND

BOB LAWSON, Canadian delegation

JOHAN LOVALD, Norwegian delegation

AMBASSADOR JOHN CAMPBELL, Australian delegation to the CD

STEVE GOOSE, Human Rights Watch, and others

U.S. officials invited

WED., OCT. 22: 10am - 1pm: CONVENTIONAL DISARMAMENT: Deliberations of the UN Expert Panels on Small Arms and on the UN Arms Register

AMBASSADOR MITSURO DONOWAKI, Japan, Chairman, Small Arms Expert Panel

GRACIELA DE LOZANA, Colombian member, invited

AMB. RAFAEL GROSSI, Argentina, Chairman of the UN Arms Register Panel, invited

DONALD SINCLAIR, Canadian member  
JOSE FELICIO, Brazilian member  
GIOVANNI SNIDEL, US member  
NATALIE GOLDRING, BASIC  
ED LAURANCE, Monterey Institute of International Studies

1pm: OPENING OF PHOTO EXHIBITION: THE UN AND  
NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

3-6pm: NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT: RECOMMENDATIONS  
AND PROPOSALS

Recommendations of US National Academy of Sciences Study on  
The Future of US Nuclear Policy, presented by JOHN  
STEINBRUNNER, Vice Chair of the Committee, and  
RICHARD GARWIN

Additional remarks by

JOSEPH ROTBLAT, Pugwash Conferences on Science and  
World Affairs; Nobel Peace Laureate 1995

THURS., OCT. 23, 10am - 1pm: THE EVOLVING ROLE OF  
THE UN AND DISARMAMENT

PRVOSLAV DAVINIC, Director, UN Centre for Disarmament  
Affairs

RICHARD BUTLER, Executive Chairman, UNSCOM (UN  
Special Commission on Iraq)

JOSE BUSTANI, Director General, OPCW (Org. for the  
Prohibition of Chemical Weapons)

RANDALL FORSBERG, Institute for Defense and Disarmament  
Studies

3-6pm: THE CTBT AND BEYOND

WOLFGANG HOFFMANN, Exec. Sec., CTBTO,  
(Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Org.)

TOM GRAHAM, President, LAWS; formerly USACDA

CHRIS PAINE, Natural Resources Defense Council

If you would like to attend and have no UN pass, please contact the  
NGO Committee on Disarmament by Oct. 10 at 777 UN Plaza, 3B,  
New York, NY 10017; (212) 687-5340; fax: (212) 687-1643;  
e-mail [disarmtimes@igc.apc.org](mailto:disarmtimes@igc.apc.org)

Return-Path: <cfpa@cyberenet.net>  
Date: Wed, 15 Oct 1997 17:29:13 -0400  
From: Coalition for Peace Action <cfpa@cyberenet.net>  
Reply-To: cfpa@cyberenet.net  
Organization: Coalition for Peace Action  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter to President Clinton  
References: <2.2.16.19971008165015.48e7754a@pop.igc.org>

Howard, sign us on to the letter.

--

Rev. Robert Moore, Executive Director, Coalition for Peace Action  
40 Witherspoon Street, Princeton, NJ 08542  
(609) 924-5022 voice, (609) 924-3052 fax  
cfpa@cyberenet.net

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
Date: Thu, 16 Oct 1997 09:52:33 -0700  
From: Michael Veiluva <veiluvawslf@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: RE:KINSEY/SLATER ON SS&M  
To: LANLaction@aol.com  
X-Sender: veiluvawslf@pop.igc.apc.org (Unverified)

At 04:20 PM 10/15/97 -0400, you wrote:  
>FROM: PEGGY PRINCE, LANLaction@aol.com  
>Oct. 14, 1997  
>Dear Abolition Sisters and Brothers;  
>  
>I've been keeping up as best I can with the discussion on the CTBT as it  
>relates to SS&M in the Abolition Caucus. Most notably the correspondence  
>between Alice Slater and Bob Kinsey. Now, I'm not a policy expert (far from  
>it) nor am I adept at Washington political dynamics, so I apologize in  
>advance for my lack of sophistication...

Dear Peggy:

Whatever your disclaimers as to qualifications, yours was one of the more responsive and appropriate comments on the CTBT debate, which benefits from your injecting into the issue the essential question of personal integrity.

The debate has been shadowed into a sub-discussion on political timing, in which organizations closer to the halls of Congress than ours (we stare out at the Pacific Ocean) are basically saying - "we agree with you in principle, but now is not the time to criticise SS&M, you'll endanger Senate approval of CTBT. We've worked thirty years for this treaty, don't get in the way now."

The appropriate response, which you aptly framed, is, "If not now, when? If not us, who?" By engaging in the seductive "hypocrisy" of endorsing without reservation Senate approval of a CTBT with explicit conditions for SS&M (which becomes the law of the land) we gamble our integrity in some realpolitik roulette in which tobacco subsidies are traded for military contracts and a dam or two. If this President cant bring himself to endorse a land mine ban, do people really expect him to take on the national laboratories in some abstract debate after CTBT is approved? SS&M and CTBT are not simply tandem political issues that we can separate - the proposed measure up for approval explicitly binds them together.

The need is to disseminate the important information on SS&M, the development of fourth-generation technologies, the critical legal implications of ICF, the circumventing of the test ban, G-5 plans to design new weapons and the like. I am not interested in modulating the message or engaging in predictive behavior to attempt to forecast what some octegenarian ex-segregationalist will do in the Senate. There are thousands of lobbyists paid to do that.

This is the time for maximum exposure of the fundamental contradiction between SS&M and CTBT, and also the G-5's obligations under Article VI of the NPT. The debate needs to be expanded beyond technical discussions between physicists, to a genuine social policy debate in which we begin to break down the "culture of experts" and really discuss the merits of what applied weapons physics science and technology really mean to the future of civilization. Don't apologize for not being an "expert" - grab the mike! Do we have the right to speak for our children's future or not? I don't remember voting for the director of Los Alamos in the recent past. And when I pay the IRS, do I get a piece of the Beamlet laser deposited on my front lawn?

Sorry for the emotional content of this message - it's a bit like a jury argument than anything else. But what I get from what Corbin Harney and others is that our approach to these issues cannot be separated with our approach in a daily lives. As a 16-year lawyer, I understand how easy it is to be schizophrenic and hypocritical in advocating a case, and every time I do it, I kill off a part of the essential "self" that otherwise would look at the situation and say "why did you do that?" Some people pay me to do that, but I sure hve no inclination to do so here. How can we support CTBT and not condemn a \$40-60b military program that will preserve the nuclear arms industry into halfway through the next century, possibly enable the development of new, unverifiable weapons which defy legal control? E'nuf said.

Keep up the good work, and thanks -

Mike Veiluva, Counsel, WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Date: Thu, 16 Oct 1997 10:24:57 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Joseph Gerson <afscamb@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: John Deutch, recently retired Director of the CIA, on US  
Nuclear War Policy and the NPT  
To: RUSH@hnrc.tufts.edu  
X-Sender: afscamb@pop.igc.org

Oct. 16, 97

Dear David,

Thanks for making the contact with Chris. I've e-mailed him the press advisory and Dr. Rotblat's c.v. Thanks too for getting back to me on the polling. There have been no objections to the workshop so far.

Regarding Deutch, this note has to be quick because Monica broke her collar bone over the weekend, leaving me to have to carry more than I had anticipated. His statements were new and very disturbing, but I can't say that I was too surprised. As much as his arrogance and commitments make me reel in horror, I do have to appreciate his honesty. In a sense, he is saying that what you see is really what is there, and the rhetoric that surrounds the statements of politicians and diplomats is just that - rhetoric. What he said, I'm sorry to say, is quite consistent with my analysis in *The Deadly Connection* and *With Hiroshima Eyes*, and with Paul Walker's report of a discussion he had with a or the top official at ACDA during the NPT negotiations.

Its implications? I think it gives us a deeper, clearer, and more frightening window into the nature of the US Nuclear State and confirmation about how the empire works. Yet, I don't think it should dishearten us. His arrogance rests on a particular structure of power within the US, a structure which has been challenged and changed in some ways when popular movements have changed the power equation within the US - e.g. when Kennedy was forced to introduce civil rights legislation, when members of Congress moved to cut funding for the Vietnam War because of their fears of not being reelected if they didn't, and a similar dynamic during the Freeze movement. I think it tells us that we need to be speaking about, and organizing, the kind of serious and long-term commitment and nonviolent activities and actions that will be needed to (in some ways) transform the US government. I think it also means working more consciously in collaboration with what exists of an international abolition movement, understanding that part of our responsibility is to help augment their pressure on the US to move to nuclear disarmament.

A last and very personal note, informed in part by my experiences as a peace educator and organizer in Arizona (land of Goldwater, Kleindeinst, Rhinequist, & O'Conner) during the Vietnam war. I think our responsibilities are more analagous to what people expected of democratic people within the Third Reich. (In my very few spare moments, I'm trying to track down something I believe I read many years ago that Hitler said about treaties

being scraps of paper, to be ripped up when they no longer suit the state's ambitions...)

Less than cheery!

Best,

Joseph Gerson

At 09:47 AM 10/16/97 -0500, RUSH@hnrc.tufts.edu wrote:

>This is important and discouraging news. How does it affect our approach

>at our upcoming conference on Nuclear Weapons Abolition?

>

>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 15 Oct 1997 22:24:33 -0600  
From: "Bob Kinsey" <bkinsey@peacemission.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: RE:KINSEY/SLATER ON SS&M  
To: <LANLaction@aol.com>, <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

I don't disagree with any of your analysis below. Maybe I'm selling the public short but the information available to them in Denver is minimal. The Denver Post and Rocky Mountain News, when given the information about the lack of position on the CTBT by their endorsed candidate would not publish this as an issue in the last Senatorial election. My read on public awareness is that most folks think most if not all nukes are off line, in a kind of cold storage and that stockpile stewardship means taking responsible care of the remnants of the cold war. Nobody around here seemed to care what the new Senator from Colorado would think about the CTBT. Nobody but activists around here seem to talk about nuclear weapons, waste storage and other related issues. My guess is that NIF is a word knights in Monty Python's Holy Grail movie say. Are we really, in five months, going to get full discussion and millions of cards and letters to mostly Republican Senators carefully outlining that people want a CTBT without SS. This is not to say we shouldn't try, but if all we get is CTBT while the Senate and house continue to fund SS then we will have to work to defund SS. I just think it would be foolish to work against CTBT ratification because the current Congress has agreed to also fund SS. The two are politically tied together but not legally. So lets get the CTBT legal and then elect a Congress that won't fund SS.

-----  
> From: LANLaction@aol.com  
> To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
> Subject: RE:KINSEY/SLATER ON SS&M  
> Date: Wednesday, October 15, 1997 2:20 PM  
>  
> FROM: PEGGY PRINCE, LANLaction@aol.com  
> Oct. 14, 1997  
> Dear Abolition Sisters and Brothers;  
>  
> I've been keeping up as best I can with the discussion on the CTBT as it  
> relates to SS&M in the Abolition Caucus. Most notably the correspondence  
> between Alice Slater and Bob Kinsey. Now, I'm not a policy expert (far  
> from  
> it) nor am I adept at Washington political dynamics, so I apologize in  
> advance for my lack of sophistication. That having been said however, I  
> do  
> have a few thoughts on this issue and beg your indulgence to hear me out.  
> I'm not going to give you a stirring tale of my background living near  
> Los  
> Alamos National Lab, or take up your valuable time explaining my  
> connection  
> with A2000, I'll just launch in. You'll notice that I don't mention  
> Alice

> Slater's analysis of CTB and SS&M; that's because I couldn't agree more.

>

> SOME OF MY COMMENTS ARE BASED ON THE E-MAIL BELOW:

>

> Subj: Re: CTBT Ratification and Stockpile Stewardship

> Date: 8, Oct 1997 2:28 PM MST

> From: bkinsey@peacemission.org

> X-From: bkinsey@peacemission.org (Bob Kinsey)

> Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

> To: mupj@igc.apc.org, abolition-caucus@igc.org

>

> BOB WRITES:

> There is no way at this time to make subtle distinctions between these  
two

> issues. The general public is for a CTBT. At this time they aren't  
prepared

> to get the problem of Stockpile Stewardship quick or get behind an effort  
> eliminate it.

> ---

>

> I'm sure that Bob didn't mean to sound condescending but I hear that. I

> believe that the public not only can understand the dynamics of a

> Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty with no teeth, but that they have an  
intuitive

> realization that there's something fishy going on in the Senate with  
CTBT.

> The general public wants nuclear weapons to go away, yes, but if we

> underestimate their intelligence it's us, not the policy wonks, that will

> receive the brunt of their wrath when no enforceable CTBT emerges at the

> other end, or the other U.N. member states refuse to ratify.

>

>

> BOB WRITES:

> If we get the CTBT we can move toward challenging the SS program as  
hypocrisy

> in the face of what they thought they were getting with the CTBT.

> ---

>

> I think Bob's being too canny by half. The hypocrisy he mentions will be

> seen as our own, and stupidity too. The public is not like a pit bull

you

> aim at a target and say "Sick'em." Isn't it better to challenge

Stockpile

> Stewardship head-on and directly linking it to a toothless CTBT? 'Moving

> toward challenging' SS&M will be too little too late.

>

>

> BOB WRITES:

> CTBT will get an international inspection system in place and commit the  
US

> to cooperative anti testing activity. Cooperative is the operative word.

We

> have to establish some sort of commitment to gaining national security

via

> international cooperation. Every inch in that direction, even if accompanied  
> by large bits of hypocrisy is progress.  
> ---  
>  
> I can't even begin to express how much I DON'T agree with this statement!  
> The United States 'national security' has never been an issue, only every  
> other country's security in a world where the U.S. is the largest weapons  
> dealer. Bob mentions the government hypocrisy in the previous out-take and  
> then mentions our hypocrisy here. Have we, as Pogo says, "met the enemy and  
> he is us?" When he says 'cooperative' it sounds very much like surrender or  
> obfuscation depending what side you're on. Hypocrisy is, in my opinion,  
> never progress. It is merely selling one's soul for a momentary and fleeting  
> perception of victory.  
>  
> In a very clever way, I believe Bob's being myopic, and his obviously bright  
> mind could be leading him down the slippery slope. Now, I don't know him and  
> have to sort of make some judgments from his tone, so I'm sorry if my  
> assessment offends.  
>  
> A CTBT with Stockpile Stewardship as its shadow brother won't fool anyone,  
> certainly not the other U.N. member nations we expect to ratify. We must not  
> give in to the temptation to wink at one another and say that the King has  
> lovely new clothes; we'll only be fooling ourselves. As Corbin Harney,  
> Western Shoshone spiritual leader said, "Let me tell you about treaties..."  
>  
>  
> In closing, I would like to suggest that Bob read, once again, the American  
> Friends Service Committee letter by David Gracie. I was very taken by his  
> comments which are more eloquently said than I ever could produce. Those  
> comments follow:  
>  
> \* We should not become closet abolitionists in order to persuade senators to  
> ratify, which is what I am afraid several peace organizations are in danger  
> of doing, by consciously suppressing their critique of Stockpile Stewardship  
> in their lobbying efforts for ratification.  
> \* So how should we work now for a CTBT, with integrity? I think the only

way  
> to do it is by adding to every expression of support for this treaty a demand  
> that the labs be defunded, the Nevada test site closed, all weapons taken off  
> alert, and the other steps followed that lead the way to abolition. (The  
> steps have been clearly outlined in detail by the Canberra Commission and in  
> brief form in the Abolition 2000 statement.).  
> \* Arms control treaties may be very important steps towards our larger goals  
> of peace and justice, but each treaty and each campaign must be carefully  
> examined in the context of the structures of power to which we in AFSC try to  
> speak truth. We have to be careful that we do not sell pieces of ourselves  
> for words on paper.  
> \* I believe we should be promoters of the codes of conduct on conventional  
> arms transfers and of the nuclear weapons convention, with a CTBT as a  
> necessary step on the way to that goal. But in our advocacy we should not  
> speak less than the truth nor promote illusions about power.  
>  
> Thank you for your time and attention to this reply to some of Bob Kinsey's  
> arguments. I look forward to further debate and education.  
>  
>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 16 Oct 1997 15:22:03 -0700  
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: State Survival Article  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

A more elaborate version of the following article can be found at:  
[http://www.wagingpeace.org/humanitarian\\_law\\_state\\_survival.html](http://www.wagingpeace.org/humanitarian_law_state_survival.html)

"THE VERY SURVIVAL OF A STATE"  
AND A STATE'S OBLIGATIONS UNDER  
INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW

by  
David Krieger\*

On July 8, 1996 the International Court of Justice (ICJ) handed down an advisory opinion on the following question posed by the United Nations General Assembly: "Is the threat or use of nuclear weapons in any circumstance permitted under international law?" In a critical portion of the Court's conclusion, it found "that the threat or use of nuclear weapons would generally be contrary to the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict, and in particular the principles and rules of humanitarian law". After this statement of general illegality, the Court continued by indicating an area in which it could not determine the status of international law, stating: "However, in view of the current state of international law, and of the elements of fact at its disposal, the Court cannot conclude definitively whether the threat or use of nuclear weapons would be lawful or unlawful in an extreme circumstance of self-defence, in which the very survival of a State would be at stake."

This conclusion, or rather lack thereof, was far from satisfactory. The President of the Court, Mohammed Bedjaoui, stated, "I cannot sufficiently emphasize the fact that the Court's inability to go beyond this statement of the situation can in no manner be interpreted to mean that it is leaving the door ajar to recognition of the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons." However, despite such protestations to the contrary, the Court did leave open a narrow area in which it allowed that it could not determine the law.

Thus, the Court flinched at a critical point of decision and played politics with the threat or use of nuclear weapons. Only three of the 14 judges -- Koroma, Shahabuddeen, and Weeramantry -- stated clearly that any threat or use of nuclear weapons would not be permitted under international law.

While the Court determined that any threat or use of nuclear weapons would need to conform to the rules of international humanitarian law, it then allowed for the possible legal use "in an extreme circumstance of self-defense, in which the very survival of a state would be at stake." The Court, therefore, set up an inconsistency, a possible contradiction. Did the Court mean that the rules of humanitarian law might be subject to legal violation in an "extreme circumstance" scenario? It also left open the questions of what constitutes "the very survival of a state," and who makes this decision.

The answer is that any threat or use of nuclear weapons must conform to the rules of international humanitarian law. The Court did not carve out an exception to the rules of humanitarian law for nuclear weapons. In fact, the Court specifically stated that it shares the view that "there can be no doubt as to the applicability of humanitarian law to nuclear weapons." Therefore, even in an "extreme circumstance" scenario, nuclear weapons could not be threatened or used in violation of international humanitarian law.

If there is no circumstance under which the threat or use of nuclear weapons would conform to the rules of

international humanitarian law, then the Court's "extreme circumstance" scenario is irrelevant. Even if the very survival of a state were at stake, a state could not use nuclear weapons unless such use did not cause harm to non-combatants, and did not cause excessive injury to combatants. Since nuclear weapons are generally targeted on cities and since their effects are known to cause excessive injury (including injury to the unborn), it follows that these weapons may not be used even when survival of a state is at stake.

With regard to who would determine when the survival of a state was at stake, this decision undoubtedly would be made by the leaders of the state itself. If such determination were made, leaders possessing nuclear weapons might also take it upon themselves to use these weapons without heed for the provisions of international humanitarian law. They might prefer risking violation of international law in order to secure the survival of their state. One unfortunate consequence of the Court's decision is that its "extreme circumstance" compromise may have opened the door to such reckless action by leaders of a state possessing nuclear weapons.

The only way that this door can now be successfully closed is to enforce the obligation set forth by the Court "to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control." The problem here is that the enforcement of this obligation is in the hands of the Security Council, and the five permanent members of the Security Council are the five declared nuclear weapons states.

In reality, the very survival of each of these states and the undeclared nuclear weapons states (Israel, India, and Pakistan), will remain at risk until all nuclear weapons are eliminated from the world. In all likelihood, the leaders of these states will only be convinced of the dangers inherent in the possession of nuclear weapons by their citizens. Thus, citizen action is critical in achieving this goal.

States are composed of territory, people, and government. Since states are a corporate form, they may also be thought of as being composed of property, people, and management. A state has the right to self-defence, under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, which states: "Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defence shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security."

Article 51 of the Charter is a clear statement of a State's right to self-defense under the conditions stated in the Article: a state must have been subjected to an armed attack; the state must have acted, individually or collectively, before the Security Council had acted; and the state must immediately report the actions taken in its self-defense to the Security Council.

In analyzing Article 51, Judge Koroma concluded that it "envisages the ability of a State lawfully to defend against armed attack." Judge Koroma stated: "The question therefore is not whether a State is entitled to exercise its right of self-defence in an extreme circumstance of self-defence in which the very survival of a State is at stake, but rather whether the use of nuclear weapons would be lawful or unlawful under any circumstance including an extreme circumstance in which its very survival was at stake -- or, in other words, whether it is possible to conceive of consequences of the use of such weapons which do not entail an infringement of international law applicable in armed conflict, particularly international humanitarian law." Judge Koroma found that "it is inconceivable that the use of nuclear weapons would not entail an infringement of, at the very least, the law applicable in armed conflict, particularly humanitarian law," and that therefore "the use of such weapons would be unlawful." Given his analysis, Koroma concluded that the Court's opinion regarding "extreme circumstances of self-defence" is "not legally sustainable."

Even the survival of a state does not provide a pretext for mass annihilation under international law. Threats to state survival cannot be met by "counter-genocide." Since nuclear weapons are "instruments of genocide," they cannot be used under any circumstances in which international humanitarian law would be violated. In addition, states are under a legal obligation to eliminate these weapons. Once this obligation is fulfilled, leaders will not be tempted to rely upon these "instruments of genocide" as a means to assure their survival, possibly at the risk of the survival of our species.

\* David Krieger is president of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

\*\*\*\*\*

A founding member of  
and global contact point for the  
Abolition 2000 Global Network for the  
Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

\*\*\*\*\*

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123  
Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794  
Phone (805) 965-3443 \* Fax (805) 568-0466  
E- mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org  
<http://www.wagingpeace.org>

\$\$\$\$\$\$\$ 7 LINES REFORMATTED BY POPPER AT [igc.apc.org](http://igc.apc.org) \$\$\$\$\$\$\$

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 16 Oct 1997 15:32:45 -0700  
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Arms Control and Disarmament  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, INESnet@fy.chalmers.se  
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

FROM ARMS CONTROL TO ABOLITION:  
GLOBAL ACTION FOR A NUCLEAR WEAPONS FREE WORLD  
by David Krieger\*

The article can be found at:  
[http://www.wagingpeace.org/arms\\_control\\_abolition.html](http://www.wagingpeace.org/arms_control_abolition.html)

CONTENTS:

Introduction  
START I, START II, and START III  
The Non-Proliferation Treaty Review and Extension Conference  
Abolition 2000 Global Network  
The World Court Project  
The Canberra Commission Report  
The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty  
The Statement by International Generals and Admirals  
A Nuclear Weapons Convention  
From Arms Control to Abolition

The article contains links, references, and a bibliography.

Should you like to have an e-mailed or surface mailed version, please contact the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation at  
<mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org>

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

\*\*\*\*\*

A founding member of  
and global contact point for the  
Abolition 2000 Global Network for the  
Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

\*\*\*\*\*

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123  
Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794  
Phone (805) 965-3443 \* Fax (805) 568-0466  
E- <mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org>  
<http://www.wagingpeace.org>

>From flick Thu Oct 16 22:42:39 1997  
Return-Path: <flick@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Thu, 16 Oct 1997 22:42:32 -0700 (PDT)  
X-Sender: flick@pop.igc.apc.org (Unverified)  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
From: flick@igc.apc.org (flick)  
Subject: Re: Getting religious to NPT PrepCom  
Sender: flick@igc.org

Howard,

Im really excited about your proposal and have a clear vision of this event in Geneva. Optimism is compulsory from now on in the Peace Movement I say - so much more gets accomplished with optimism so keep it up - I risk being accused of Pollyannaesque attributes but I don't care anymore!!

I think another important aspect in addition to the lobbying by religious leaders suggested ( a very good suggestion! The mayors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki made a good impact by making appointments over 2-3 days during the CTB and organising a schedule for the religious leaders would be important. )

How about also having a press conference of the religious leaders which could be a very powerful message stick to the world.

During the landmines campaign of April 96, they booked and used a church in the middle of town, a bus ride away from the UN. This space was available due to a request going into the World Council of Churches interfaith group - Im sure your friend would know the right forum to approach. Im sure the World Council of Churches would help out with finding the right venue. I like outdoor events myself but we can't rely on the weather in April, as close to the UN as possible would be good, but wherever is also fine.

Reality check - hmmm, everything in Geneva is horrendously expensive - what kind of food were you thinking of? If it was just nibble food for afterwards, the bread and cheese option is quite cheapish, with some fruit. You could have quite a few platters of that and fruit juice for a few hundred dollars, taking into consideration cups and napkins ( although I do protest loudly at the overuse of napkins herein the US all the time!).

Im so excited that people are thinking strategically in advance for this April - I know it will be an important opportunity to make change

in peace

felicity

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: jbloomfield@gn.apc.org  
Date: Fri, 17 Oct 1997 10:05:09 +0100 (BST)  
From: Janet Bloomfield <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Thoughts on the future of A2000  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

## SOME THOUGHTS ON THE FUTURE OF ABOLITION 2000.

Dear Abolition Friends,

this message to the Abolition Caucus has been prompted by a discussion that took place at the last meeting of the UK Abolition 2000 network at the end of September. We hope that you will read it in the spirit in which it is intended, that of constructive debate.

In less than three years it will be the year 2000.

The basic demand of the Abolition statement is that the states parties to the NPT should "Immediately initiate and conclude by the year 2000 negotiations on a nuclear weapons abolition convention that requires the phased elimination of all nuclear weapons within a timebound framework, with provisions for effective verification and enforcement."

Two questions arise from this: How do we make it happen by the end of the year 2000 and what do we do if it does not come about?

We have made great progress since April 1995: the Abolition statement has gained the support of over 700 organisations on 6 continents, the International Court of Justice has given its historic opinion, the Canberra Commission Report was published, the generals and admirals have spoken and opinion polls in the US and UK show large majorities in favour of A2000's central demand. I could go on....

But despite the growth of the movement and a widespread recognition that we have a great opportunity to make progress the chances of the world entering the next century with a nuclear weapons convention negotiated and signed are not great.

The implications of this analysis cannot be ducked by the Abolition network. We run the risk of entering the year 2001, not with a sense of achievement and hope, but demoralised and disempowered. This does not have to happen.

First we need to collectively apply our minds to developing a strategy (or strategies) that will maximise the chances of some form of agreement being entered into by the end of the year 2000 that commits the world to nuclear abolition. This may well not be a convention but the crucial thing is that the negotiations should have begun. What are the most likely allies, pressure points and fora that we need to focus on?

Second we have to honestly face the problem of what the Abolition statement and the very words Abolition 2000 imply. I propose that we consider now how we deal with such questions as "You have only got ...years/months, what are you doing about it?" and "Its now 2001, you have failed haven't you?". It is painful but it can't be ignored.

For instance, should we just move the year on to 2005? Probably not a good idea - because then might it just as well be timeless. It may be a better idea to do what Charter 88 (a UK organisation dedicated to democratic renewal and citizen's rights) did - they did not get their Charter by 1988, but they kept the name. The name could be kept: but in the basic demand the words "by the year 2000" could be dropped, so that it reads: "Immediately initiate and conclude negotiations on..." Then Abolition 2000 becomes a label - where the 2000 bit becomes part of its history. That is just one possible option?

This contribution is an honest attempt to start a crucial debate that cannot be avoided. We look forward to your response

Janet Bloomfield on behalf of Abolition 2000 UK.

\$\$\$\$\$\$ 2 LINES REFORMATTED BY POPPER AT igc.apc.org \$\$\$\$\$\$

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
CC: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
Date: Fri, 17 Oct 1997 10:07:09 -0400  
From: Coalition for Peace Action <cfpa@cyberenet.net>  
Organization: Coalition for Peace Action  
References: <199710170905.KAA25608@gn.apc.org>  
Reply-To: cfpa@cyberenet.net  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: Thoughts on the future of A2000  
To: Janet Bloomfield <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>

Janet,

Dr. Ted Taylor, a former U.S. nuclear weapons designer who is now at Princeton University and on our board, says he has been talking with some other experts. They are thinking a more achievable goal might be to initiate abolition negotiations by the year 2000--even that would be a major breakthrough. As to the longer term name, national Peace Action here in the U.S. simply calls it the Nuclear Abolition Campaign.

--

Rev. Robert Moore, Executive Director, Coalition for Peace Action  
40 Witherspoon Street, Princeton, NJ 08542  
(609) 924-5022 voice, (609) 924-3052 fax  
cfpa@cyberenet.net

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part  
Date: Thu, 16 Oct 1997 18:03:07 -0400  
From: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re[3]: KINSEY/SLATER ON SS&M  
To: <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>, "Bob Kinsey" <bkinsey@peacemission.org>

Earlier Bob Kinsey <bkinsey@peacmission.org> wrote:

"So lets get the CTBT legal and then elect a Congress that won't fund  
SS [Stockpile Stewardship]."

There's a lot of wisdom in that one sentence.

|                     |                        |  |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|
| David Culp          | E-mail: dculp@nrdc.org |  |
| Plutonium Challenge | Tel. +1 (202) 289-2388 |  |
| Washington, D.C.    | Fax +1 (202) 289-1060  |  |

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
Date: Fri, 17 Oct 1997 09:24:32 -0700  
From: Michael Veiluva <veiluvawslf@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: RE:KINSEY/SLATER ON SS&M  
To: "Bob Kinsey" <bkinsey@peacemission.org>  
X-Sender: veiluvawslf@pop.igc.apc.org (Unverified)

At 10:24 PM 10/15/97 -0600, you wrote:  
>I don't disagree with any of your analysis below.....

....I just think it would be foolish to work against CTBT  
>ratification because the current Congress has agreed to also fund SS. The  
>two are politically tied together but not legally. So lets get the CTBT  
>legal and then elect a Congress that won't fund SS."

>  
I wish the above statement was correct. But.....

Unfortunately, the Clinton administration, in submitting CTBT to the Senate, has tied SS&M to its ratification as a legal issue. SS&M is an express condition to US ratification. It's virtually a matter of contract - no SS&M, no CTBT. Going back afterwards once CTBT is ratified with all of the "safeguards" and complaining about SS&M will be somewhat difficult.

United States has declared that it will not ratify CTBT without specified safeguards, of which "science-based stockpile stewardship and management" and the preservation of the ability to resume tests if required are an explicit part:

"The safeguards that were established are as follows:

....."The conduct of a Science Based Stockpile Stewardship program to ensure a high level of confidence in the safety and reliability of nuclear weapons in the active stockpile, including the conduct of a broad range of effective and continuing experimental programs.

The maintenance of modern nuclear laboratory facilities and programs in theoretical and exploratory nuclear technology that will attract, retain, and ensure the continued application of our human scientific resources to those programs on which continued progress in nuclear technology depends.

The maintenance of the basic capability to resume nuclear test activities prohibited by the CTBT should the United States cease to be bound to adhere to this Treaty."

Moreover, the legislation accompanying CTBT requires annual certification that the stockpile is being maintained in a "reliable" condition. If it isn't, we can withdraw in the national interest:

....."If the President is advised, by the above procedure, that a high level of confidence in the safety or reliability of a nuclear weapon type critical to the Nation's nuclear deterrent could no longer be certified

without nuclear testing, or that nuclear testing is necessary to assure the adequacy of corrective measures, the President will be prepared to exercise our "supreme national interests" rights under the Treaty, in order to conduct such testing"

This discussion is happening because of this legal link - we did not think up the linkage ourselves. The above quotes are from the Transmittal letter from President Clinton to the Senate on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty September 23, 1997 which refers to the conditions for ratification, and <http://www.clark.net/pub/clw/coalition/whsafeg.htm> ("White House Fact Sheet on CTBT")

Much regards, Mike Veiluva WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Fri, 17 Oct 1997 11:22:33 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Brian Rawson <ippnwbos@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: forward from [Kate Dewes <katie@chch.planet.org.nz>]  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: ippnwbos@pop.igc.org

The following message was diverted to the caucus owner for technical reasons, and is now forwarded to the caucus. Such forwarding is not intended to imply endorsement or otherwise from the caucus owner. Please respond to the original sender.

>Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
>Date: Thu, 16 Oct 1997 13:57:13 -0700 (PDT)  
>From: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
>To: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
>Subject: BOUNCE abolition-caucus@igc.org: Non-member submission from [Kate Dewes <katie@chch.planet.org.nz>]  
>  
>>From ippnwbos@igc.org Thu Oct 16 13:56:38 1997  
>Received: from vesta.plain.co.nz (vesta.plain.co.nz [202.36.174.1])  
> by igc7.igc.org (8.8.7/8.8.7) with ESMTP id NAA27533  
> for <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>; Thu, 16 Oct 1997 13:56:00 -0700 (PDT)  
>Received: from katie.chch.planet.org.nz (ppp71079.chch.planet.org.nz [202.49.71.79])  
> by vesta.plain.co.nz (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id IAA25068  
> for <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>; Fri, 17 Oct 1997 08:54:47 +1200 (NZST)  
>Message-Id: <3.0.1.32.19971017095249.00690570@mail.chch.planet.org.nz>  
>X-Sender: katie@mail.chch.planet.org.nz  
>X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.1 (32)  
>Date: Fri, 17 Oct 1997 09:52:49 +1300  
>To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
>From: Kate Dewes <katie@chch.planet.org.nz>  
>Subject: Lee Butler Quotes from Geiringer Oration  
>Mime-Version: 1.0  
>Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="====\_876988369=="  
>  
>..====\_876988369==\_  
>Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
>  
>Dear Abolitionists,  
>  
>We've at last got General Lee Butler's clearance to promulgate the  
>following quotes from his Erich Geiringer Memorial Oration, given in  
>Wellington Aotearoa/New Zealand on 1 October. He has asked that the the  
>full text not be published, as he plans to give a version of it in the USA  
>early next year. There were no media reports on it: but he delivered it to  
>a 400-strong audience of the great and good(?), and he got a standing  
>ovation for it.  
>  
>That said, he made no mention of the legal angle. So we still have much to

>do to spread the word about that.

>

>Best wishes,

>

>Rob Green, UK Chair World Court Project

>-----\_876988369==\_

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

>Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

>

>QUOTES FROM GENERAL LEE BUTLER'S ERICH GEIRINGER ORATION: Wellington, New=

> Zealand - 1 October 1997

>

>Selected by Commander Robert Green, Royal Navy (Retired)

>

>1) (T)o borrow novelist Flanery O'Connor's restatement of a classic quote,=

> "you shall know the truth and the truth shall make you odd." =20

>

>2) My purpose in entering the debate was to help legitimize abolition as an=

> alternative worthy of serious and urgent consideration. My premise was=

> that my unique experience in the nuclear weapons arena might help kindle=

> greater antipathy for these horrific devices and the policies that justify=

> their retention by the nuclear weapon states. =20

>

>3) Converts are being won on many fronts to the propositions that these=

> issues matter, that nuclear arsenals can and should be sharply reduced,=

> that high alert postures are a pernicious anachronism, and that=

> proliferation of nuclear weapons is a clear and present danger. I am=

> persuaded that in every corner of the planet, the tide of public sentiment=

> is now running strongly in favor of diminishing the role of nuclear=

> weapons. Indeed, I am convinced that publics are well out in front of=

> their governments in shaking off the grip of the Cold War and reaching for=

> opportunities that emerge in its wake.

>

>4) Conversely, it is distressingly evident that for many people, nuclear=

> weapons retain an aura of utility, of primacy and of legitimacy that=

> justifies their existence well into the future, in some number, however=

> small. The persistence of this view lies at the core of the concern that=

> stirs my very soul. =20

>

>5) I live with the knowledge that this abiding faith in nuclear weapons was=

> inspired and is sustained by a catechism instilled over many decades by a=

> priesthood who speak with great assurance and authority.=20

>

>6) (T)hese enduring beliefs, and the fears that underlie them, perpetuate=

> Cold War policies and practices that make no strategic sense. They=

> continue to entail enormous costs and expose all mankind to unconscionable=

> dangers. I find that intolerable, and therefore I cannot stay silent. I=

> know too much of these matters, the frailties, the flaws, the failures of=

> policy and practice. =20

>

>7) I came to see it as a modern day holy war, a cosmic struggle between the=

> forces of light and darkness. The stakes were national survival, and the=

> weapons of choice were eminently suited to this scale of malevolence.

>

>8) (F)rom the earliest days of the nuclear era, the risks and consequences=  
> of nuclear war have never been properly understood. =20

>  
>9) (T)he stakes of nuclear war engage not just the survival of the=  
> antagonists, but the fate of mankind. =20

>  
>10) I have no other way to understand the willingness to condone nuclear=  
> weapons than to believe they are the natural accomplice of visceral enmity.=  
> They thrive in the divisive, emotion-charged climate born of alienation=  
> and isolation. The unbounded wantonness of their effects is a perfect=  
> companion to the urge to destroy completely. They play on our deepest=  
> fears and pander to our darkest instincts. They corrode our sense of=  
> humanity, numb our capacity for moral outrage, and make thinkable the=  
> unimaginable. What is anguishingly clear is that these fears and enmities=  
> are no respecter of political systems or values. They prey on democracies=  
> and totalitarian societies alike, shrinking the norms of civilized behavior=  
> and dimming the prospects for escaping the savagery so powerfully imprinted=  
> in our genetic code. That should give us great pause as we imagine the=  
> task of abolition in a world that gives daily witness to acts of=  
> unspeakable barbarism. So should it compound our resolve.

>  
>11) I was caught up in the holy war, inured to its costs and consequences,=  
> trusting in the assertions of the nuclear priesthood and the wisdom of my=  
> seniors. =20

>  
>On Deterrence

>  
>1) Bound up in this singular term, this familiar touchstone of security=  
> dating back to antiquity, was the intellectually comforting and deceptively=  
> simple justification for taking the most extreme risks and the expenditure=  
> of trillions of dollars. =20

>  
>2) We ignored, discounted or dismissed its flaws and cling still to the=  
> belief that it obtains in a world whose security architecture has been=  
> wholly transformed.=20

>  
>3) Now, with the evidence more clear, the risks more sharply defined and=  
> the costs more fully understood, I see deterrence in a very different=  
> light. Appropriated from the lexicon of conventional warfare, this simple=  
> prescription for adequate military preparedness became in the nuclear age a=  
> formula for unmitigated catastrophe. =20

>  
>4) (Deterrence) evolved from an increasingly convoluted morass of=  
> unwarranted assumptions, unprovable assertions and logical contradictions. =  
> By the end of the first decade of the Cold War, it had effectively served=  
> to suspend rational thinking about the ultimate aim of national security:=  
> to ensure the survival of the nation.=20

>  
>5) Deterrence in the Cold War setting was fatally flawed at the most=  
> fundamental level of human psychology in its projection of western reason=  
> through the crazed lens of a paranoid foe. =20

>  
>6) Little wonder that deterrence was the first victim of real world crises,=  
> leaving the antagonists to grope fearfully through a fog of mutual=

> misperception toward the brink of nuclear holocaust. =20  
>  
>7) While we clung to the notion that nuclear war could be deterred, Soviet=  
> leaders held fast the conviction that even a nuclear war must be won -- =  
> and took herculean measures toward that end. =20  
>  
>8) Deterrence was a dialogue of the blind with the deaf. In the final=  
> analysis, it was largely a bargain we in the West made with ourselves.  
>  
>9) Deterrence was flawed equally in that the consequences of its failure=  
> were intolerable. =20  
>  
>10) Deterrence carried a demon seed, born of an irresolvable contradiction,=  
> that spurred an insatiable arms race. =20  
>  
>11) (T)hrough every corridor, in every impassioned plea, in every fevered=  
> debate rang the rallying cry, deterrence, deterrence, deterrence.=20  
>  
>12) Emptied of any rational content, deterrence was reduced to a cheap=  
> carnival elixir, a rhetorical sleight of hand, deceptively packaged and=  
> oversold. =20  
>  
>13) Over time, planning was increasingly distanced and ultimately=  
> disconnected from any sense of scientific or military reality. In the end,=  
> the nuclear superpowers created astronomically expensive infrastructures,=  
> monolithic bureaucracies and complex processes that defied control or=  
> comprehension. Only now are the dimensions, costs and risks of these=  
> nuclear nether worlds coming to light. =20  
>  
>14) We cannot sit in silent acquiescence to the faded homilies of the=  
> nuclear priesthood. It is time to reassert the primacy of individual=  
> conscience, the voice of reason and the rightful interests of humanity. =20  
>

>ENDS

>-----\_876988369==\_

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

>-----\_876988369==\_--

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: jbloomfield@gn.apc.org  
Date: Fri, 17 Oct 1997 19:38:29 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Lachlan Forrow <lforrow@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: Thoughts on the future of A2000  
To: Janet Bloomfield <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: lforrow@pop.igc.org

Having participated in coining in 1994 within IPPNW the phrase "Abolition 2000" as the label for a global abolitionist campaign, I'd like to offer a few observations:

1. The chance of getting our full goal within 38 months (12/31/2000) is not lower than the chance, 38 months earlier, that the Berlin Wall would come down or that Nelson Mandela would peaceably become President of South Africa.
2. Nonetheless, it is still a long shot, especially given the cynical attitude embodied in John Deutch's recent remarks about Article VI.
3. Except for the "timebound framework and effective verification..." [key points, to be sure], the ICJ has ruled that we already have a signed global agreement committing the world to abolition in Article VI, so one can argue that what's left is timeframe and enforcement.
4. In just 30 months (since April 1995 in NYC), Abolition 2000 has gone from a phrase few had ever heard to a globally uniting, widely-known title. That's pretty amazing. (In fact, even in April 1995 we were still the "Abolition Caucus", not Abolition 2000.)
5. In practical terms, I would completely agree with Janet's suggestion about Charter 88, with the addition that I think this approach will work much, much better for Abolition 2000. Talking about Charter 88 in 1992 isn't as natural as talking about XYZ 2000 in the early 21st century.
6. We need to continue to build simple, recognizable grassroots vehicles for helping people identify with Abolition 2000. Sunflowers/seeds everywhere! 1000 co-sponsors by next year; 2000 by 2000. (By the way, the Abolition2000 Web page is gorgeous! Great work!!!)

--LF

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Sun, 19 Oct 1997 21:01:27 -0400 (EDT)  
From: DavidMcR@aol.com  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: Thoughts on the future of A2000  
To: cfpa@cyberenet.net, jbloomfield@gn.apc.org  
cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Our problem - and danger - is that we will progressively nibble away, as we are doing now with the CTBT. I do not for an instant question people's good intentions, but our job is not only nuclear abolition, it is total, comprehensive, complete disarmament of the nation states. Not by the year 3000 but soon.

No, we won't get abolition by the year 2000 but if we don't ask for it, we will continually be weakening our goals. In the same way that my problem with the CTBT is that this is really - as it now stands - a treaty which Clinton and the Pentagon will use to limit the spread of weapons without taking any action at cutting our own. Since the US is THE ONLY super power left, it is the one at which we need to take aim.

Our demand is surely that the US (and China and France and Israel and England, etc.) get rid of their nuclear arsenals, not simply put in place this 60 billion dollar stewardship program to continue testing for "security". Until we understand ourselves, and make it clear to others, that our definition of national security is disarmament, conventional as well as nuclear, but starting with nuclear, we will be easily bought off by the folks in power.

We know we can't get everything now, but we must be clear we want everything. And that must mean a disarmed United States. As the fidgets over the test ban go on it is diverting us from demanding (not asking politely, but demanding) that the US take the lead in moving toward nuclear disarmament.

Fraternally,  
David McReynolds

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, jbloomfield@gn.apc.org  
Date: Sun, 19 Oct 1997 22:06:27 EDT  
From: jopax@juno.com (John Owen)  
References: <199710170905.KAA25608@gn.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Amendments to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty  
To: Senator@Boxer.senate.gov  
X-Juno-Line-Breaks: 0-1,12-18

Dear Senator Boxer,

I would propose that you offer two amendments. First, to establish a timetable for global nuclear disarmament. The lack of a such a timetable or any commitment to nuclear disarmament, was the reason for India's objection, and causes us to lose one of the most important (to me) features of the existing non-proliferation treaty. The second amendment would be to delete the NIF and the "strategic security" component. The NIF continues testing by another name. It's most likely to cost trillions over the years, and who knows the extent of the deadly byproducts NIF will produce. I don't know if the nuclear abolitionists have enough votes to win, but i believe that the country is overdue for a debate on the future of nuclear weapons, throughout the world.

JOHN OWEN  
PO BOX 53521 LOS ANGELES, CA 90053  
213 223 2966  
jopax@juno.com  
MAY PEACE PREVAIL ON EARTH

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Sun, 19 Oct 1997 23:51:48 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Chiapski@aol.com  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: Thoughts on the future of A2000  
To: DavidMcR@aol.com, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Dear David,

You write, "Our problem - and danger - is that we will progressively nibble away, as we are doing now with the CTBT." I think such nibbling is not a problem at all, but a political necessity. The problem is how can we possibly get to our goal of complete and total disarmament, nuclear and otherwise. We must of course press for that very goal, but no one believes that goal is not feasible, in the short term. So it becomes necessary to nibble.

We are playing a game of position, like, say, chess or baseball. In order to win, we must work for proximal goals, putting ourselves in a position to achieve longer range goals. The CTBT is one short term goal. We shouldn't think its achievement will solve our problem, but it puts us closer to solving it. We cannot, I believe, pass up the opportunity presented by the CTBT. We must work for its ratification, understanding that the Stockpile Stewardship program and subcritical testing will be the concessions to the conservatives to secure ratification. This is not to say that we should ignore the SSMP as we push for a CTBT. In fact, the more opposition we can build against SSMP, the more pressure we put on Senators to vote yes on CTB, as a concession to us. In negotiations, we must push for everything we want but not be too disappointed when we only get part of it. Achieving the CTBT then becomes the starting point for the next push. With a CTB, we are in a better position to push for the dismantling of the weapons labs, than if we have no CTB. Later, with no weapons labs, we are in a better position to call for abolition of nuclear weapons. In my opinion, only such nibbling will allow us to reach out ultimate goals.

I agree with you that "We know we can't get everything now, but we must be clear we want everything." We must demand "the US take the lead in moving toward nuclear disarmament," but let's also make sure we seize a position when it becomes available. Let's not let the CTBT opportunity pass.

together in this long struggle,

Francis Chiappa  
Cleveland Peace Action  
2997 Hampshire Rd.  
Cleveland Hts., OH 44118 USA

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>  
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part  
Date: Mon, 20 Oct 1997 10:52:49 -0400  
From: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)  
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org  
Subject: CTBT Calendar  
To: "CTBT Organize" <ctbt-organize@igc.org>

## CTBT CALENDAR

Note: The Congressional schedules for 1998 are estimated from prior years' schedules. The actual calendar is usually issued in November or December.

- October 20 Senate reconvenes from fall recess
- October 21 Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, workshop on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, 2:30 p.m. (closed)
- October 27 Senate Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services, hearing on the safety and reliability of the nuclear stockpile, with DOE Secretary Federico Pena or DOE Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs Vic Reis, and former DOE Secretary James Schlesinger, 2 p.m., SD-342 Dirksen
- October 29 Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, hearings on DOE's stockpile stewardship program and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, with Defense Secretary Cohen, DOE Secretary Pena, DOE Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs Vic Reis, Defense Assistant Secretary for Atomic Energy Harold Smith, and Gen. Eugene Habiger, head of the U.S. Strategic Command, 2 p.m., SD-124 Dirksen
- November 7 Congressional adjournment target date
- November 15 Denver Regional CTBT Summit
- November Senate Armed Services Committee, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and Senate Select Intelligence Committee, possible hearings on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
- November Secretary of State Madeleine Albright visits India and Pakistan

## 1998

- January 5 Congress convenes (estimate)
- January 6-19 Congressional January recess (estimate)
- January 17 Pittsburgh Regional CTBT Summit
- January 20 Congress returns from recess (estimate)

January 21 President Clinton delivers the State of the Union speech to Congress (estimate)

January Seattle Regional CTBT Summit (proposed)

Jan. and Feb. Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, two days of hearings on DOE's stockpile stewardship program and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (one day open and one day closed)

February 2 President Clinton submits the annual federal budget to Congress

February 14-20 Senate Presidents Day recess (estimate)

February Senate floor action on NATO expansion (estimate)

February President Clinton visits India and Pakistan (estimate)

April 4-13 Congressional spring recess (estimate)

April 19-21 CTBT Lobby Days, Washington (proposed)

May 1-4 Physicians for Social Responsibility national meeting and lobby day, Crystal City Marriott, Arlington

May 23-31 Congressional Memorial Day recess (estimate)

Spring or Summer Senate floor action on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (estimate)

June 10 35th anniversary of President Kennedy's nuclear testing speech at American University

June 27-July 5 Congressional July 4th recess (estimate)

August 5 35th anniversary of the signing of the Limited Test Ban Treaty by the United States, Soviet Union and United Kingdom

Aug. 8- Sept. 7 Congressional August recess (estimate)

October 9 Congressional adjournment target date (estimate)

David Culp  
October 20, 1997

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 20 Oct 1997 14:29:21 -0400 (EDT)  
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)  
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org  
Subject: Coalition press breakfast; W. Post article on seismic event  
To: dkimball@clw.org  
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]

TO: Coalition members and friends  
FR: Daryl Kimball, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers  
RE: Coalition press activities on the CTBT; new information on seismic event

Earlier today, the Coalition convened a press breakfast in Washington to brief a group of 16 key defense, diplomatic, and national security reporters on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty on the eve of next week's Senate hearings on the Treaty. The breakfast brought together a panel which included Bob Bell of the NSC, Charles Curtis, former Deputy Sec. of Energy, Dr. Richard Garwin, and Dr. Lynn Sykes, a leading test ban seismological expert and author of new report in the FAS Public Interest Bulletin that makes a very strong case that the August 16 "seismic event" in Russia was an earthquake. As soon as we are able, we will distribute the statements, the Q&A, and news articles that may follow.

One of the early results is today's W. Post article which makes a strong case that the event was an earthquake. It is attached below. In response to several questions on the subject of the seismic event at this morning's breakfast, Bob Bell stated that from his perspective the technical evidence remains ambiguous as to the nature of the event.

I would also note that the W. Post article mentions, for the first time in a news story, the recommendation made in a May 1997 letter from ISIS and other Coalition groups that the greater transparency at the active test sites in connection with subcritical experiments and other activities would help address questions relating to test ban compliance -- like the August event.

We will forward these and other results of Coalition press and public education work in the days ahead. Thanks to our CTBT Working Group Chair Tom Collina of UCS, Jeremy Stone of FAS, and others for helping to make today's press event a successful one.

DK

\*\*\*\*\*

Monday, October 20, 1997  
The Washington Post

U.S. Officials Acted Hastily In Nuclear Test Accusation  
CIA Hesitates to Call Russian `Event' a Quake

By R. Jeffrey Smith  
Washington Post Staff Writer

A high-priority, classified alert issued by the CIA on Aug. 18 quickly caught the eye of senior U.S. policymakers. The bulletin came from the government's Nuclear Test Intelligence Committee, an interagency scientific group, and said that Russia probably had conducted a nuclear test two days earlier on an island near the Arctic Circle.

Officials at the National Security Council swung into action, convening an interagency meeting two days later and ordering a full-court press to collect an explanation from Moscow. The Russian ambassador was summoned to hear a strong complaint at the State Department, and the senior U.S. diplomat in Moscow issued a similar demarche at the Foreign Ministry there.

Although the government kept the report secret, the NSC prepared a statement to be read in case of a leak, which said, "We do have information that a seismic event with explosive characteristics occurred in the vicinity of the Russian nuclear test range" on the island of Novaya Zemlya. When the statement was eventually released on Aug. 27, it raised dark suspicions around the world that Moscow had challenged the nuclear test ban treaty.

There was only one problem: The CIA's report about the location of the "event" was wrong, according to various U.S. intelligence and defense officials, independent scientific experts, and the British, Norwegian and French governments. The event actually occurred roughly 80 miles at sea and, these officials and experts now say, was almost certainly an earthquake.

In the past two months, U.S. intelligence officials say, the CIA has scoured its overt and secret sources of intelligence near the test site and has found nothing to corroborate its initial report -- no sign of unusual radioactivity, no record of telltale underwater blast sounds, no indication of underwater drilling or extraordinary activity of any kind in the Kara Sea off Novaya Zemlya before, during or after the event.

The Russian government has called the charges unfounded and disappointing. But the administration has not yet publicly given Moscow a clean bill of health, a circumstance that some U.S. officials and independent scientists claim is partly due to a lingering distrust of Russia's military operations in the vicinity of the test site and partly to the reluctance of the CIA and senior policymakers to acknowledge that they made a diplomatic and scientific goof.

"I personally think it was an earthquake," said Harold P. Smith, assistant to the secretary of defense for nuclear, chemical and biological defense programs, in a telephone interview on Friday, adding that other scientists at the Pentagon share his belief that the initial CIA report was wrong. "We now know that they would have been well advised to wait" until they had more data and could reach an accurate conclusion, he said.

"Not only was there a mistake made, but there was no effort to retract it," said Paul Richards, a seismologist at Columbia University who consults for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and has written a forthcoming article for the scientific journal Nature that criticizes Washington's handling of the event.

What makes the initial CIA report especially surprising is that the event

was described from the outset as having occurred at sea by officials at an international monitoring center in Arlington, which was created to collect, analyze and distribute data from a worldwide network of nuclear test sensors -- the same network used by the CIA to provide its analysis in this case.

About an hour after the disturbance occurred, computers at the center -- drawing upon seismic signals from five sensors or arrays in Norway, Sweden, Finland and Russia -- had fixed the probable location at more than 60 miles from Novaya Zemlya and ruled out the possibility it had occurred at the test site. A second report, prepared by the center after more exhaustive analysis two days later, confirmed that conclusion.

An unclassified report on the center's analysis, including a statement that the event was most likely an earthquake, was slated to be presented last month by center director Robert North at a scientific meeting convened by the Defense Special Weapons Agency in Orlando. But at the last minute, the presentation was canceled, after officials elsewhere within the Defense Department objected to making the information public, according to the official who made the decision to withdraw the presentation, who asked that his name not be published.

"The sense I got was that there were some concerns [about the paper] and this thing had not been vetted," the official said, attributing the decision to a problem of timing rather than censorship, as some other officials have privately claimed.

Interviews with White House, Defense Department and intelligence community officials indicate that confusion over the origins of the Aug. 16 event stemmed largely from the fact that Russian technicians were busily engaged in suspicious-looking activities on Novaya Zemlya during the same period. Although no test had been conducted there since 1990 and Moscow had since promised to abide by a treaty banning all nuclear tests, which it had signed but not ratified, U.S. officials were wary.

If Moscow were to carry out such a blast, it not only would undermine the treaty but could have implications for the dormant U.S. nuclear testing program. Congressional legislation barring future U.S. blasts is conditioned in part on continuation of the Russian moratorium, making it possible for Washington to reconsider its position if Moscow is proven to have shifted course.

The CIA was aware before the event that the head of Russia's atomic energy ministry, Viktor Mikhailov, recently had visited the vast test site, and the agency had snapped satellite photographs showing test equipment being lowered into the ground, with telltale diagnostic cables leading away from the holes into nearby buildings.

As one intelligence analyst said, activities at the site on both Aug. 14 and Aug. 16 were "a dead ringer for [those in] test shots" by Moscow over the past 10 years. The Air Force Technical Applications Center (AFTAC), a little-known organization based in Florida that conducts classified studies of Russian nuclear blasts, was alarmed enough to order a plane equipped with radiation detectors to fly downwind from the site on the first of these two dates, but it found no trace of a nuclear explosion.

The first sign of a seismic "event" on Aug. 16 was recorded at a station operated by Russia's defense ministry at Norilsk. The station has already been designated as one of 320 nuclear monitoring sites that will form a global system meant to sort through roughly 20,000 seismic disturbances annually to determine if any were caused by a secret nuclear blast.

The signal from Norilsk was transmitted automatically by a direct link to the International Data Center, which the Pentagon created as a prototype for a more elaborate center to be completed in Vienna by 1999. Additional data were transmitted there within minutes from two monitoring sites in Norway, one in Finland and one in Sweden, and they fixed the time of the event at close to 5 a.m. at the site, a circumstance that matched the punctuality of past Russian nuclear tests.

When the Air Force group -- which learned about the event from the center -- passed the information to the CIA on Aug. 18, the agency's analysts were alarmed by the coincidences, including indications that some of the signals recorded by seismometers looked like those from past nuclear blasts there.

The CIA organized an emergency meeting of the Nuclear Test Intelligence Committee, consisting of roughly 10 specialists from different agencies, and took a new look at the data. They tossed out the signals from the sites in Russia and Sweden on the grounds that their sensors were not properly "calibrated," and determined that the location of the blast, while probably at sea, could have been at the test site.

In the initial alert message to policymakers, however, this analysis was garbled through an error that intelligence officials said Friday they could not explain. The "event" was described without any qualifiers as having definitely occurred at the test site, and the wrong location coordinates -- those from a past Russian nuclear test on the island -- were inadvertently listed in place of the most probable location at sea, according to intelligence officials.

"We were trying to be very, very careful," said one official, adding that it was nonetheless a "fast answer" based on partial data. One of the policymakers who received the report said it conveyed "very high confidence that it was explosive . . . and right at Novaya Zemlya."

Smith said it was his sense that the test site activities had made the intelligence community "leaning forward and spring-loaded" to reach this conclusion. Eugene Herrin, a professor at Southern Methodist University who for the past 15 years has chaired the military's principal seismological advisory panel, said he agreed that "somebody jumped the gun. Based on what I know [from both classified and open sources], it was not an ambiguous event. . . . It's an earthquake."

The committee's report also was challenged by Norwegian scientists, who told the Pentagon on Aug. 21 that "the event appears to be quite confidently located offshore," according to a copy obtained by The Washington Post. British government scientists reported to the Pentagon on Sept. 11 that the event "has a similar location and mechanism" as an earthquake that occurred in the Kara Sea 11 years ago.

But the nuclear intelligence committee, which the CIA chairs, did not formally begin backpedaling until two weeks after the event, causing one official to describe it as "the last to join the crowd." A new, classified report by the committee in early September, incorporating additional data, declared that the test site activities and the seismic event were not linked and affirmed that the event occurred at sea.

According to several officials, the CIA has no evidence it was "an explosive event," but remains reluctant to call it an earthquake because of a paucity of data on previous earthquakes in that area. "We like our judgment to be based on positive evidence," one intelligence official explained.

Some officials are also interested in exploring the possibility that the shock waves were caused by a sudden compression of the hull of one of the outmoded nuclear submarines that Russia has dumped into the Kara Sea; an alternative concern that one of the submarine reactors might have become "critical" and exploded has now largely been dismissed. The intelligence official said the CIA's scientists will try to obtain better data more rapidly when the next such "event" occurs.

But the CIA's conclusion that there is no evidence of an explosion evidently has not yet reached the NSC. The director for defense programs there, Robert Bell, said Friday that based on what he has been told so far, the event should still be considered ambiguous, with neither an explosion nor an earthquake ruled out.

"We are still trying to talk with the Russians, [but] our assessment from the technical side . . . [is] it was more likely than not explosive in nature," Bell said.

"We think this makes the case for the Comprehensive Test Ban," which provides for consultations and on-site inspections to resolve suspicion, said a White House official.

Moscow has informed Washington that its activities at the test site were scientific experiments related to its nuclear weapons program that did not involve nuclear fission. The Energy Department conducted similar experiments in Nevada last summer, after the administration spurned a suggestion from arms control groups that it allow international observers to monitor the work and allay any foreign suspicions about it. A senior Pentagon official called the idea "not necessary, . . . not cost-effective, and not prudent" in a letter to one of the groups.

---

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers  
at Council for a Livable World Education Fund  
110 Maryland Ave. NE #201  
Washington DC 20002  
p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142  
website: [www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/](http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/)

---

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
Date: Mon, 20 Oct 1997 13:51:20 -0700  
From: Michael Veiluva <veiluvawslf@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: Re[3]: KINSEY/SLATER ON SS&M  
To: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)  
X-Sender: veiluvawslf@pop.igc.apc.org

At 11:34 AM 10/20/97 -0400, you wrote:

>  
>"This statement is very wrong.  
>  
>When the U.S. Senate ratifies a treaty, it passes a "resolution of  
>ratification." It is only a resolution. It does not go to the House of  
>Representatives. It is not signed by the President. It is not a law."

Treaties ratified by the US and approved by the Senate become the "law of the land" under the Constitution. Safeguards and conditions apposed by the Senate become part of the interpretive source material and are binding on how the executive agencies approach their tasks of interpreting the treaty. Describing the safeguards as "merely political" lacks significance under international law. It is, unfortunately, an American trait we have to view treaties as something less than ordinary "legislation".

Just as legislative history and the recitals to bills are important in statutory interpretation, few lawyers would argue that the "Safeguards" adopted by the Senate are not an integral part in interpreting the manner in which the United States views how it is bound by CTBT.

The "law-political" distinction is a disingenuous one. It is dangerously naive to suggest that DOE will not rely heavily upon the Safeguards in submitting future budget requests - adding international treaty imperatives to the usual national security arguments.

You wrote:

>Overturning treaty safeguards is not difficult--if you have the votes.  
>I have done it.  
>  
>The Senate resolution on the Limited Test Ban Treaty (1963) included a  
>series of safeguards. One of them, "Safeguard C," required the U.S. to  
>maintain the ability to resume atmospheric testing. The U.S. had been  
>using Johnston Atoll in the Pacific Ocean to maintain a test site for  
>Safeguard C compliance  
>  
>>On June 24, 1993, Rep. Pat Danner (D-Missouri) offered a floor  
>amendment to the annual energy and water appropriations bill to delete  
>all funding for the Safeguard C program. It was accepted. It later  
>became law. There is no Safeguard C program today.  
>

Congress always has the power to ignore or repudiate treaties - just ask the Native Americans. The books are full of dusty, ignored treaties that have gone nowhere - which I'm not sure is the point you are trying to make.

My point is that treaties and Senate "safeguards" imposed on treaty obligations have far greater force than nothing at all, and mute acceptance of such safeguards will inhibit future debate on repudiating them. Moreover, I anticipate that the same people who are advising organizations such as ours not to bring up SS&M at this time will be equally forceful in tell us to "cool it" later or risk withdrawal from CTBT by the US.

The Limited Test Ban example is not comforting since a 30 year gap exists between the Treaty and repudiation of Safeguard C (resumption of atmospheric testing). By 1993, there was no significant credible lobby arguing for the resumption of atmospheric tests, including the labs. In 30 years' time from today, there is no telling what SS&M will produce, and testing technologies (such as ICF) may develop to such a sophisticated level that the resumption of underground tests may similarly be viewed as an anachronism and wholly unnecessary to the design of new weapons...

Regards,

Michael Veiluva, Counsel, WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION  
At 11:34 AM  
10/20/97 -0400, you wrote:

>  
>"This statement is very wrong.  
>  
>When the U.S. Senate ratifies a treaty, it passes a "resolution of  
>ratification." It is only a resolution. It does not go to the House of  
>Representatives. It is not signed by the President. It is not a law."

Treaties ratified by the US and approved by the Senate become the "law of the land" under the Constitution. Safeguards and conditions imposed by the Senate become part of the interpretive source material and are binding on how the executive agencies approach their tasks of interpreting the treaty. Describing the safeguards as "merely political" lacks significance under international law. It is, unfortunately, an American trait we have to view treaties as something less than ordinary "legislation".

Just as legislative history and the recitals to bills are important in statutory interpretation, few lawyers would argue that the "Safeguards" adopted by the Senate are not an integral part in interpreting the manner in which the United States views how it is bound by CTBT.

The "law-political" distinction is a disingenuous one. It is dangerously naive to suggest that DOE will not rely heavily upon the Safeguards in submitting future budget requests - adding international treaty imperatives to the usual national security arguments.

You wrote:

>Overturning treaty safeguards is not difficult--if you have the votes.  
>I have done it.  
>  
>The Senate resolution on the Limited Test Ban Treaty (1963) included a  
>series of safeguards. One of them, "Safeguard C," required the U.S. to  
>maintain the ability to resume atmospheric testing. The U.S. had been  
>using Johnston Atoll in the Pacific Ocean to maintain a test site for  
>Safeguard C compliance  
>  
>>On June 24, 1993, Rep. Pat Danner (D-Missouri) offered a floor  
>amendment to the annual energy and water appropriations bill to delete  
>all funding for the Safeguard C program. It was accepted. It later  
>became law. There is no Safeguard C program today.  
>

Congress always has the power to ignore or repudiate treaties - just ask the Native Americans. The books are full of dusty, ignored treaties that have gone nowhere - which I'm not sure is the point you are trying to make. If treaties are so ephemeral, why is CTBT so critical?

My point is that treaties and Senate "safeguards" imposed on treaty obligations have far greater force than nothing at all, and mute acceptance of such safeguards will inhibit future debate on repudiating them. Moreover, I anticipate that the same people who are advising organizations such as ours not to bring up SS&M at this time will be equally forceful in tell us to "cool it" later or risk withdrawal from CTBT by the US.

The Limited Test Ban example is not comforting since a 30 year gap exists between the Treaty and repudiation of Safeguard C (resumption of atmospheric testing). By 1993, there was no significant credible lobby arguing for the resumption of atmospheric tests, including the labs. The reservation to restore above-ground tests fell like an overripe fruit. In 30 years' time from today, there is no telling what SS&M will produce, and testing technologies (such as ICF) may develop to such a sophisticated level that the resumption of underground tests may similarly be viewed as an anachronism and wholly unnecessary to the design of new weapons...

Regards,

Michael Veiluva, Counsel, WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: jbloomfield@gn.apc.org  
Date: Mon, 20 Oct 1997 14:12:02 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: Thoughts on the future of A2000  
To: Lachlan Forrow <lforrow@igc.apc.org>,  
Janet Bloomfield <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>,  
abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org (Unverified)

Dear Friends,

I'd like to add to Lachlan's encouragement and remind ourselves that it only took the nukeheads 1 year to negotiate the CTBT after the commitment was made at the 1995 NPT Extension conference. It's far too early to say that we can't get a treaty negotiated in 3 years--particularly when we've even provided them with a draft, complete with excellent technical scientific input on how we actually get rid of the things and verify against breakout. (Many thanks for the scientists of INESAP for their efforts and to the Lawyers Committee for Nuclear Policy on the draft.)

With Doug Roche's new initiative, adopted by IPB, to organize efforts around the world to get governments to put pressure on Clinton, we're building up steam. And even the arms controllers are talking about a no first use treaty, de-alerting, much deeper cuts by the US and Russia so that multilateral talks can begin with the holders of smaller arsenals towards elimination, etc. For the next two and perhaps three years, there will be NPT PrepComs to hold the nuclear powers to account.

Instead of planning for failure by figuring out what to call ourselves after the year 2000, let us make some calls to the people who can reach Mandela and ask South Africa to take the lead at this 1998 PrepCom in Geneva; or contact Colin Archer at IPB@gn.apc.org to see how your country can get on board their exciting new initiative. In the US, UK, France, and Russia we must keep meeting with parliamentarians, congresspeople, the press, administration officials and let them know we're serious about a treaty by 2000. This weekend in Boston, AFSC has put together a conference, Abolition 2000: Reaping what We Sow: Organizing for a Nuclear Free Century of Peace. Hope to have some good news and US strategies to report from there.

Onward and upward! Peace, Alice Slater

PS: In the interest of forwarding the action, I am re-posting the enrollment form for other organizations and the list of working group contacts. Please work on our 1000 enrollees campaign and 2000 (at least) by 2000. The landmines group got their treaty with 1000 grassroots organizations.

Dear Friends,

Below is an Abolition 2000 enrollment form and a list of our Working Groups. We would like to move from 700+ enrollees to 1000 by the time we get to the NPT PrepCom in Geneva this April. If you are already enrolled, please pass it on to your various e-mail networks. **REMEMBER TO RESPOND TO WAGINGPEACE@NAPF.ORG**, not to me.

The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation at that address is keeping the list of signers. They can also provide you with an information packet about the A-2000 Network and hard copies of the sign-on form if you want to work on more organizations. If you don't know whether you've signed on to the Abolition Statement, they will also be able to help you. Many thanks for working on our 1000 NGOs campaign. Regards, Alice

Abolition 2000  
A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

"Sunflowers instead of missiles in the soil will insure peace for future generations"

US Secretary of Defense William J Perry on June 4, 1996, the day the Ukraine officially gave up its nuclear weapons. Russian and Ukrainian defense secretaries joined him in a ceremony planting sunflowers on a former missile site.

The following organization endorses the Abolition 2000 Statement:

Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

We enclose \$100\_\_\_\$50\_\_\_\$25\_\_\_\$other\_\_\_for network support.

We would like to participate in and/or receive more information about the following

Working Group(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Please remember to fill out the form completely to ensure we can contact you in the future!!!

Abolition 2000, c/o David Krieger, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation  
1187 Coast Village Road, #123, Santa Barbara, CA 93108  
tel:805.965.3443, fax:805.568.0466, email: [wagingpeace@napf.org](mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org)

**REGIONS AND WORKING GROUPS:** The development of strategies and initiatives occurs through the regions and the working groups. Anyone can participate in the activities of the working groups by contacting the convenor. For more information about the purpose and work of each working group, please contact the convenor.

1) Nuclear Weapons Convention: Jurgen Scheffran INESAP, Institut fuer Kernphysik, Schlogartenstrae 9, D-64289 Darmstadt, Germany, Tel: +49-6151-163016, fax: 166039, E-mail: [scheffran@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de](mailto:scheffran@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de)

- 2) Non-Nuclear Security Model for Europe: Solange Fernex, (WILPF and Greens, France)  
F-68480 Biederthal, France, Tel: +33-1-89-407183, Fax: 407804
- 3) Chernobyl and Nuclear Power: "For Mother Earth" Lange Steenstraat 16/D, B-9000 Gent, Belgium, Tel: + 32-9-233-73-02, Fax: +32-9-233-8439, E-mail: [fme@int.knooppunt.be](mailto:fme@int.knooppunt.be)
- 4) Media, Communication and Outreach: Janet Bloomfield, 25 Farmadine, Saffron-Walden, Essex, England CB11 3HR, Tel: +44-179-951-6189, Fax: same, call first,  
E-mail: [jbloomfield@gn.apc.org](mailto:jbloomfield@gn.apc.org)
- 5) CTBT and Beyond: Jackie Cabasso (WSLF), 1440 Broadway, Suite 500, Oakland, CA 94612, Tel: +1-510-839-5877, Fax: 839-5397, E-mail: [wslf@igc.apc.org](mailto:wslf@igc.apc.org)
- 6) Weapons Usable Radioactive Materials: Martin Kalinowski, INESAP, Institut fuer Kernphysik, Schlogartenstrae 9, D-64289 Darmstadt, Germany, Tel: +49-6151-163016, fax: 166039, E-mail: [dh3m@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.DE](mailto:dh3m@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.DE)
- 7) Overcoming Nuclear Threats/Legal Issues: Rob Green (WCP UK), 2 Chiswick House, High Street, Twyford, Berks RG10 8AG, UK, Tel/Fax: +44-734-340-258, E-mail: [robwcpuk@gn.apc.org](mailto:robwcpuk@gn.apc.org)
- 8) NPT Prep Coms: Alice Slater (GRACE), 15 E. 26th St., New York, N.Y. 10010, Tel: +1-212-726-9161, Fax: 726-9160, E-mail: [aslater@igc.apc.org](mailto:aslater@igc.apc.org),  
AND  
Felicity Hill, WILPF/International, Case Postale 28, 1 Rue de Varembo, Geneva,  
Switzerland CH 1211, Tel: +41-22-733-6175, Fax: 740-1063,  
E-mail: [womensleague@gn.apc.org](mailto:womensleague@gn.apc.org)
- 9) Newsletter: Tobias Damjanov, (German Peace Society/DFG-VK, Germany) c/o INES, POB 101707, D-44017 Dortmund, Germany, Tel +49-2327-81987, Fax: 740-1063, E-mail: [dfg-vk.nrw@anarch.ping.de](mailto:dfg-vk.nrw@anarch.ping.de),  
Internet WWW page: <http://cac.psu.edu/~duf/social/ines.html>
- 10) Radiation Health Effects Working Group: Trisha Pritikin, (Hanford Downwinders Coalition), 439 Boynton Ave., Berkeley, CA 94707, USA, Tel/Fax: 1+510-524-0834,  
E-mail: [pritikin@vdn.com](mailto:pritikin@vdn.com),  
AND  
Pamela Meidell (Atomic Mirror), P.O. Box 220, Port Hueneme, CA 93044, Tel: 1+805-985-5073, Fax: 985-7563, E-mail: [pmeidell@igc.org](mailto:pmeidell@igc.org)
- 11) Religious Working Group: Howard Hallman, (Methodists United for Peace with Justice), 16th St. NW, Washington D.C. 20036, USA, Tel/Fax: 1+301-896-0013,  
E-mail: [mupj@igc.apc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.apc.org)  
AND  
David Gracie (American Friends Service Committee), 1501 Cherry St., Philadelphia, PA 19102, USA, Tel: 1+215-241-7162, Fax: 241-7177, E-mail: [dgracie@afsc.org](mailto:dgracie@afsc.org)  
AND  
Clayton Ramey, (Fellowship of Reconciliation), 521 North Broadway, Nyack, N.Y. 10960, USA, Tel: 1+914-358-4601, Fax: 358-4924, E-mail: [cramey@igc.apc.org](mailto:cramey@igc.apc.org)  
To subscribe to the Religious Working Group E-mail list server, contact Howard Hallman.
- 12) NATO Working Group: Karina Wood, (Peace Action), 1819 H St., N.W.,

Suite 420,

Washington, D.C. 20006, USA, Tel: 1+202-862-9740 ext. 3044, Fax: 862-9762,

E-mail: [panukes@igc.apc.org](mailto:panukes@igc.apc.org)

From: Institute for Global Communications <netnews@igc.org>  
Reply-To: IGC NetNews Editors <netnews@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 16 Oct 1997 18:20:00 -0700 (PDT)  
Subject: IGC NetNews - October 1997  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org

---

---

INSTITUTE FOR GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS  
NetNews - October 1997

---

---

NetNews is the official newsletter of the Institute for Global Communications which operates the PeaceNet, EcoNet, ConflictNet, LaborNet and WomensNet computer networks.

The IGC newsletter contains important information about your IGC account, IGC's products and services and allows you to become acquainted with IGC members and projects.

Articles can be found in their entirety:

- On the IGC NetNews Web page at <http://www.igc.org/igc/netnews/>
- In the IGC newsgroup called 'igc.netnews', available to everyone with IGC accounts.
- Send any message to <get-netnews@igc.org> and receive the complete edition of the most current Netnews via e-mail.

Here is a summary of what you will find.

---

---

In the October 97 Issue

---

---

Interview with Marci Lockwood, IGC's New Executive Director

Marci talks about her transition from KPFA to IGC, what the future holds for the organization and its members, and how her horse got its name.

<http://www.igc.org/igc/netnews/lockwood.html>

-----

IGC Offers New Flat-Rate Internet Access Soon

IGC introduces nationwide flat-rate Internet access accounts, starting in January, 1998.

<http://www.igc.org/igc/netnews/flatrate.html>

---

IGC Fights Digital Censorship: Basque Website  
Attacked by Internet Mailbombers

Catch up on how IGC handled the Spain-based "mailbombing" campaign against our system and what has become of the Basque Web site that set off the controversy.

<http://www.igc.org/igc/netnews/ehj.html>

---

News of the Nets:

A regional PeaceNet project helps build connections in rural community development, and a PeaceNet member collaborates with the UN to eradicate land mines.

<http://www.igc.org/igc/netnews/pn.html>

Get the report from LaborNet's participation in LaborTECH 97 and visit the resources assembled for the event, and see what Corporate Watch has to say about global labor issues.

<http://www.igc.org/igc/netnews/ln.html>

Find out about WomensNet's international work and visit the Virtual Sisterhood mailing list, a network of women activists sharing online strategies, information and support.

<http://www.igc.org/igc/netnews/wn.html>

Debra Floyd, the Director of African American Networking at IGC, becomes a media maven as national focus is brought on African Americans using the Internet, and African countries look to the U.S. for expertise.

<http://www.igc.org/igc/netnews/africanam.html>

---

Support News:

Read about the protections IGC installed on its SMTP (mail) server, follow some easy steps to preserve the security of your IGC password, and see IGC's new venue for informing members of current system status.

SMTP Mail Server: <http://www.igc.org/igc/netnews/mailserver.html>

Passwords: <http://www.igc.org/igc/netnews/password.html>

System Status: <http://www.igc.org/igc/netnews/sysstat.html>

---

## IGC Consulting: Building Your Web Database

Want to put your database online, for public or private use? Take a look at examples of full-text and relational databases our consulting team has built on the Web sites of IGC members.

<http://www.igc.org/igc/netnews/consult.html>

---

## News from APC

Read all about APC newest networking programs designed to empower citizen activists and social change organizations throughout the world. Meet newly hired staff in San Francisco, South Africa and Denmark.

<http://www.igc.org/igc/netnews/apc.html>

---

## Featured Members

Eighteen IGC member organizations are featured with publicity banners on IGC's Web site during October and November. Find out who the current featured members are and how your organization can take advantage of this free promotion for your Web site.

<http://www.igc.org/igc/netnews/fmp.html>

Featured are the following organizations:

23rd National Conference on Women and the Law

<http://www.womlaw.org/>

ACORN: The Assoc. of Community Organizations for Reform Now

<http://www.acorn.org/community/>

Alaska Funding Exchange

<http://www.funding-exchange.org>

California Nurses Association

<http://www.califnurses.org/>

Corporate Watch  
<http://www.corpwatch.org>

Equal Rights Advocates  
<http://www.equalrights.org/>

The Farm: Life Inside a Women's Prison  
<http://www.igc.apc.org/thefarm/>

The Fund For Animals  
<http://www.fund.org/>

Inkworks Press  
<http://www.igc.org/inkworks/>

International Project for Sustainable Energy Paths  
<http://www.ipsep.org/>

Mediation Works, Inc.  
<http://www.mwi.org/mwi>

National Writers Union  
<http://www.labornet.org/nwu/>

Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers (OCAW)  
<http://www.ocaw.org/>

On the Issues: The Progressive Woman's Quarterly  
<http://www.igc.org/onissues/>

Pax Consulting  
<http://www.paxconsulting.com/>

Ploughshares Fund  
<http://www.ploughshares.org/>

Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition  
<http://www.igc.org/svtc/>

United Farm Workers  
<http://www.ufw.org/>

-----

Net News is the newsletter of the Institute for Global Communications, home of PeaceNet, EcoNet, LaborNet, ConflictNet and WomensNet.

IGC's mission is to expand and inspire movements for peace, economic and social justice, human rights and environmental sustainability around the world by providing and developing accessible computer networking tools.

Need information?

=====

Institute for Global Communications  
PO Box 29904  
San Francisco, CA 94129-0904  
Tel: 415-561-6100  
Fax: 415-561-6101

Web site:

-----

<http://www.igc.org> IGC's Web page  
<http://www.igc.org/igc/services> IGC's Product Center on the Web  
<http://www.igc.org/igc/netnews> NetNews  
<http://www.igc.org/igc/help> IGC's Support Web page

Auto-Mailers:

-----

[igc-info@igc.org](mailto:igc-info@igc.org) Brochure  
[www-info@igc.org](mailto:www-info@igc.org) Web services  
[www-commerce-info@igc.org](mailto:www-commerce-info@igc.org) Secure Commerce Server  
[dns-info@igc.org](mailto:dns-info@igc.org) Domain Name Service  
[igc-mailing-lists@igc.org](mailto:igc-mailing-lists@igc.org) IGC's Mail List Service  
[majordomo-info@igc.org](mailto:majordomo-info@igc.org) IGC's Majordomo Mail List Services  
[get-netnews@igc.org](mailto:get-netnews@igc.org) Full text of latest NetNews

Email to IGC Staff:

-----

[outreach@igc.org](mailto:outreach@igc.org) questions & orders for products & services  
[support@igc.org](mailto:support@igc.org) technical support for products & services  
[billing@igc.org](mailto:billing@igc.org) billing  
[marketing@igc.org](mailto:marketing@igc.org) interviews, media, press clips, barter

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 20 Oct 1997 16:05:53 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Hugh Gusterson <guster2@leland.Stanford.EDU> (by way of Hugh Gusterson <guster2@leland.stanford.edu>)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: web page announcement  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: guster2@pobox1.stanford.edu

Subscribers to this list may be interested in a moderated internet debate and associated web page that opened last week. The debate is about the political and technical significance of DOE's Science Based Stockpile Stewardship program. The participants in the debate are:

Arjun Makhijani (Director of the Institute for Energy & Environmental Research)

Phil Goldstone, Deputy Director, Los Alamos National Laboratory

David Dearborn, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory weapons designer

Ray Kidder, retired scientist and internal critic at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

I will be moderating the debate, which is structured around Ray Kidder's recent article in Nature, "Problems with Stockpile Stewardship."

Those who are interested can track the debate as it unfolds by visiting the following web site: <http://web.mit.edu/sts/www> (click on "nuclear weapons management"). The web site contains links to other sites related to stockpile stewardship and nuclear abolition as well as the text of the online debate. The entire text of Kidder's article in Nature is posted on the web site too.

We are hoping the debate will continue for a couple of weeks. Once the debate has closed and been archived on the web site, visitors to the web site will be able to post their own comments on and responses to the debate. We hope that the web site will grow organically as people add to it and link into it.

Sincerely,

Hugh Gusterson  
Babak Ashrafi

STS Program  
MIT, E51  
77 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02139

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 21 Oct 1997 11:38:18 -0400 (EDT)  
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)  
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org  
Subject: Coalition press breakfast; W. Post article on seismic event  
To: dkimball@clw.org  
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]

TO: Coalition members and friends  
FR: Daryl Kimball, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers  
RE: more press from Coalition's 10/20 CTBT breakfast

Below are four more stories on the CTBT: one from AP (which also appeared in USA Today); one from Reuters (which includes a quote from an un-named intell. source who says the seismic event was likely NOT connected with Russian activities at their test site); one from the New York Times (which is mainly due to the work of FAS); and one from the Christian Science Monitor (which details the monitoring/verif. system and the organization that will maintain it).

Another story ran on the CTBT ran on NPR's Morning Edition earlier today.

DK

\*\*\*\*\*

10-20-97 1612 EDT

US Renews Drive To Ban Nuke Tests

By JOHN DIAMOND Associated Press Writer

WASHINGTON (AP) Preparing for a months-long arms control debate in the Senate, the Clinton administration says a global ban on nuclear testing, while imperfect, would restrict the spread of the deadly weapons.

Trying out the arguments the administration will make to Congress, Robert Bell, the White House point man on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, told reporters Monday that the pact has its limitations.

``We're making no claim that the CTB will prevent nuclear proliferation or prevent countries from acquiring nuclear capability," said Bell, the arms control policy director at the National Security Council. ``If a country wants to build a crude nuclear weapon without testing it, obviously, the CTB doesn't come into play."

But Bell said the ban will make it more difficult for non-nuclear powers to field viable nuclear weapons and for nuclear-capable countries to develop new types of weapons.

``Our basic argument is that the treaty constrains proliferation," Bell said.

The Senate Governmental Affairs subcommittee on international security and

proliferation plans a hearing next Monday on problems of managing the U.S. nuclear stockpile without actual explosive tests. The following Wednesday, the Senate Appropriations energy and water subcommittee will hold a hearing on the treaty.

The main event, however, hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, are not expected until next year. That panel, chaired by Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., is conducting hearings on aspects of NATO expansion, a more immediate Clinton administration priority.

In the longer term, Bell said, Clinton views ratification of the test ban as a potential legacy of his administration, much as President Kennedy viewed the original limited test-ban treaty as one of his greatest accomplishments.

Bell called the pact "the longest-sought prize in the history of arms control." Because the United States stopped live nuclear explosion tests in 1992 and has no plans to resume them, "It seems to me to be fundamentally in our interest to get as close as possible to a universal agreement that makes the test ban a norm internationally."

Meanwhile, the administration's national security team remains uncertain about whether a tremor emanating from an area near a Russian nuclear test site in August was a mild earthquake or the aftershock of a nuclear test, Bell said.

"We're not ruling out an earthquake. We don't rule out that it was explosive in nature," Bell said.

Government and independent scientists now agree that the location of the tremor was about 80 miles off the coast of the Arctic island of Novaya Zemlya, long a center of Russian nuclear testing.

The offshore site of the tremor points to an earthquake because of the greater difficulty of burying a nuclear device underwater and gathering test results. Russia has denied it conducted a test.

Debate about the tremor is linked to the test ban treaty on two fronts.

First, proof that the tremor was a nuclear test would show Russia to have violated its promise to abide by the treaty, which it has signed along with 145 other nations. Neither the United States nor Russia has ratified the pact.

Second, the apparent inability of a global network of seismic monitoring devices to conclusively determine the nature of the tremor may be seized upon by opponents of the treaty as proof that compliance cannot be verified by scientific means.

\*\*\*\*\*

Earthquake? bomb? U.S. still debates Russian rumble

07:08 p.m Oct 20, 1997

By David Storey

WASHINGTON, Oct 20 (Reuters) - Two months after a "seismic event" in Russia that sparked suspicions Moscow had violated a ban on nuclear tests, the U.S. government still says it may have been a bomb although scientists say it was an earthquake.

It is "some sort of an enigma," Robert Bell, special assistant to President Bill Clinton for national security affairs, said on Monday, again leaving open the possibility of a Russian nuclear blast.

"You can't rule out it was an earthquake. You can't rule out it was an explosion," he said of the comparatively small Aug. 16 shudder close to the Russian test site at Novaya Zemlya island between the Barents and Kara seas.

It was detected by sensors in Sweden, Norway, Finland and Russia and automatically reported to a monitoring center at Arlington, Virginia, just outside Washington.

"I believe the data very strongly showed that the 'event' was a small earthquake in the ocean and not a nuclear explosion," said Dr Lynn Sykes, a seismologist at Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory.

Sykes, an expert on using seismological methods to verify nuclear tests, said the evidence showed the "event" was 80 miles (130 km) from the test site and under the Kara Sea.

Bell and Sykes, both speaking at a Washington seminar to discuss U.S. ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, represented two sides of a debate that has political, scientific and international ramifications.

Moscow denies it set off a nuclear device and even the Central Intelligence Agency appears to be backing away from the likelihood of a test.

If Russia did carry out a clandestine test, it could erode the already shaky trust among many in Washington for Russia's promises and undermine administration efforts to secure Senate ratification for the CTBT.

The treaty is meant to lock nuclear powers into the moratorium on such tests they are already observing.

A vote on ratification is expected next year, but discussion on the subject in Congress starts later this month. U.S. legislation barring American tests is conditional on Russia maintaining its moratorium.

The last confirmed test at Novaya Zemlya was in 1990.

News of the August "event" was initially kept under wraps, but the

Washington Post said on Monday that a CIA report to the administration leaned toward interpreting it as a nuclear explosion at the test site.

The CIA officially declined comment on the controversy on Monday, but an intelligence official said U.S. intelligence agencies had now determined that the event took place in the Kara Sea, "some distance" from the range.

"We have not reached a conclusion as to whether that 'seismic event' was an explosion or an earthquake," he said.

He said there was evidence that the Russians had been conducting "nuclear-related experiments" at the test site at the time of the seismic event.

The Post said heightened activity at Novaya Zemlya in mid-August, similar to that before previous tests, may have prompted the CIA to leap to a conclusion.

In response, the intelligence official defended the first agency report. "Initial reports aren't ever as precise as you would like them to be," he told Reuters.

"Given the fact that there was strong indications of some heavy activity going on at the Novaya Zemlya site and this very unusual seismic activity, people reported that there was probably a connection. It turned out that there probably isn't," he said.

Sykes pointed out that there had been four reported "seismic events" in the area around Novaya Zemlya since 1986 and that scientists had concluded all were small earthquakes.

Richard Garwin, a nuclear weapons expert with the privately funded Council on Foreign Relations, said the most likely explanation of the August event was also an earthquake.

If it were a nuclear explosion above the sea bed it would have been only a very small one with limited value and there would be evidence in the water.

On the other hand it would be "bizarre" for the Russians to go to the trouble of deep underwater drilling to set off an explosion they did not want to have detected so close to the actual test site, he added.

\*\*\*\*\*

The New York Times, October 21, 1997

"Scientists Say Tremor in Russia Was Not Caused by Nuclear Blast"

By WILLIAM J. BROAD

Civilian scientists are strongly criticizing the federal government for saying that a seismic event that rocked the Russian wilds two months ago might have been an underground nuclear blast.

The scientists say the tremor was unquestionably natural in origin, and they suggest that bureaucratic foes of the nuclear test ban treaty are distorting the truth in a bid to torpedo the treaty's ratification in the Senate. A nuclear test would violate the global accord signed by Moscow that outlaws such detonations.

"This test scare should be investigated by Congress and the president," Dr. Jeremy Stone, President of the Federation of American Scientists, said on Monday. The federation, a private group in Washington, advocates arms control.

Dr. Lynn Sykes, a seismologist at the Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia University and an authority on detecting nuclear blasts with sensitive instruments that monitor ground vibrations, said he had canvassed peers around the world and could find none who believed the event was nuclear.

"We need an investigation," Sykes said in an interview. "This is a crucial time for the test ban and this issue is absolutely central to whether it appears verifiable. There are a number of people in government who claim we cannot tell if it was a blast or an earthquake."

Advocates of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty contend that it can be policed; its opponents say it cannot. The treaty's goal is to halt the development of new weapons of mass destruction by imposing a global ban on nuclear detonations.

One of the treaty's main tools is an emerging global network of hundreds of seismometers, both public and private, that track ground vibrations. These rumbles are carefully studied to try to find underground nuclear blasts hidden among the natural din of earthquakes small and large that occur regularly.

The treaty has been signed by 146 nations, including the United States, Russia, China and the other declared nuclear powers. The administration recently sent the treaty for ratification to the Senate, which is not expected to act any time soon.

In late August, the Clinton administration said it had evidence that Russia might have detonated a nuclear weapon on a remote island in the Kara Sea, an arm of the Arctic Ocean, and that it was investigating the matter and seeking an explanation from Moscow. Russia later denied that it had conducted a nuclear blast and reaffirmed its commitment to the test ban.

On Monday, an intelligence official who spoke on condition he not be identified confirmed that the government is still divided about the event's nature. "We haven't reached a conclusion on whether that event was an explosion or an earthquake," he said. "The data is rather ambiguous."

A civilian scientist recently briefed by the CIA on the event said that the agency was stretching the truth to the breaking point.

"They've labeled it an enigma to save face," said the expert, who spoke on the condition of anonymity. "They've spun out bizarre scenarios of deception and cheating." He accused the agency of failing to retract early assessments when accumulating evidence all but ruled out a blast.

By all accounts, the event was worth worrying about at first. On Aug. 16 in the vicinity of Novaya Zemlya, an Arctic island where Russia maintains a site for underground nuclear testing, the ground heaved and alarm bells quickly went off in Washington.

The government's interest was already high because it was remotely monitoring a series of experiments at the site, which Moscow later said were small-scale tests of warhead reliability similar to those conducted by Washington at its underground testing site in Nevada.

Such experiments involve no nuclear blasts and no shaking of the earth but they do involve nuclear components and are therefore held underground to stem the possibility of leaks of radioactive materials into the atmosphere.

One of these Russian experiments took place on the 14th, and another on the 16th, said a federal intelligence expert. The seismic event on the 16th rang alarm bells because analysts immediately seized on it as possible evidence that Russia had detonated a nuclear bomb, albeit a small one.

The nation's intelligence agencies quickly informed the White House and State Department, which asked Moscow for an explanation. The administration's suspicions were first reported publicly in The Washington Times on Aug. 28.

Meanwhile, further analysis showed that the seismic event was centered not on land but about 80 miles southeast of Novaya Zemlya in the Kara Sea, breaking the link to the Russian test site.

The Air Force Technical Applications Center, which aids intelligence agencies in seismic analysis, wrote a secret report on the Kara location dated Sept. 4. That report was distributed widely throughout the White House and executive branch. Even so, intelligence agencies and administration officials have been reluctant to backpedal.

On Monday, the intelligence official conceded that the event's location was in the Kara Sea but emphasized that the event was still suspicious. "It might have been explosive," he said.

In contrast, scientists say the distinctive seismic signature of the event clearly makes it natural in origin. Its waves, they say, are characteristic of an earthquake.

Dr. Carl Kaysen, chairman of the Federation of American Scientists and a White House security adviser during the Kennedy administration, on Monday wrote Sen. Richard Shelby, chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, to ask for a formal investigation of the incident.

"In our view," he said, "this event reflects a longstanding cold war practice of acting on semidigested intelligence information which is,

inevitably, leaked to justify an alarm after which no sound is heard after the alarm turns out to be false."

"Accordingly," Kaysen added, "we believe that the director of Central Intelligence should be asked to explain the role of the Intelligence Community in this matter so that the Committee can determine whether or not this kind of intelligence distortion is symptomatic of a larger problem."

But Frank Gaffney, Jr., a former Pentagon official in the Reagan administration who now directs the Center for Security Policy, a private Washington group that opposes the test ban, strongly criticized the scientists' claims of atomic impossibility for the event.

"There's a lot of thrashing going on to provide certitude where there is no certitude," Gaffney said in an interview. "I believe there is compelling circumstantial evidence to suggest this was a nuclear test."

He added: "The fact that you have these people rushing forward saying we got it wrong, that it was in the ocean, I find to be preposterous. In the service of arms control, the truth is always expendable."

\*\*\*\*\*

The Christian Science Monitor, October 21, 1997

"Nuclear Watchdog Lacks OK to Keep Eye on Tests"

Eve Koudri Kuhn, Special to The Christian Science Monitor

VIENNA -- Tremors shake the area around the Novaya Zemlya weapons test site on a Russian island near the Arctic Circle. Moscow says it is just an earthquake. But other nations wonder: Could Russia be conducting a secret nuclear weapons test?

This incident actually occurred Aug. 16. But a United Nations agency set up to monitor nuclear tests was not called in to investigate. The reason: It still lacks the authority.

So far, 148 countries have signed the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, which the United Nations approved just over a year ago on Sept. 24, 1996.

But all 44 nations with actual or potential nuclear capability first have to ratify the treaty before the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) can begin operation.

The new organization, based in Vienna, has already put together the basic tools to monitor suspicious events. Its executive director, Wolfgang Hoffmann, has a staff of 80, and more will be hired next year. A worldwide network of 321 monitoring stations will be built and run by host countries. The stations will continually monitor air and water as well as analyze underground samples, and information will be sent back to Vienna. If a phenomenon occurs, on-site inspections will be made to clarify whether a nuclear explosion has taken place.

In a speech to the UN last month, President Clinton vowed to push ratification of the test ban treaty, calling it "the longest-sought, hardest-fought prize in the history of arms control."

On a visit last week to South America, Mr. Clinton made a point of praising Brazil's decision to join the treaty. And this week two high-ranking US diplomats are visiting India and Pakistan, both "undeclared" nuclear powers whose ratification of the treaty is deemed crucial. The treaty is high on the US diplomats' agenda. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright is expected to make a follow-up visit in November.

Meanwhile, the CTBTO continues to prepare for action. It has already held three workshops on ways to determine and measure phenomena associated with nuclear explosions. Mr. Hoffmann is looking for \$68 million to run the CTBTO, of which \$49 million will be needed for the global verification system consisting of a data center in Vienna, monitoring stations worldwide, and on-site inspections.

"Once the treaty is ratified by the 44 countries, not only will the five nuclear powers [the United States, Russia, Britain, France, and China] not be able to modernize their nuclear arsenals [or] be able to develop new weapons, but countries suspected of having nuclear weapons will not go undetected," Hoffmann says.

"What we are doing is preventive diplomacy, building up an organization so that no one has a chance to not be globally detected" if there is a nuclear test or explosion, he says.

Close to 20 phenomena distinguish nuclear explosions from non-nuclear explosions or natural events such as earthquakes, and it will be the CTBTO's job to determine the difference.

Some kinds of nuclear tests will not violate the treaty. "Safety is the main priority of all weapons design and lab operations," explains seismologist Peter Marshall, a consultant to the CTBTO. So-called subcritical tests will be allowed "because there is no fissionable release of energy in these tests and a fission chain reaction does not occur within these materials."

Mr. Marshall says subcritical tests are primarily to ensure that weapons do not become unsafe over time. "The nuclear weapon you have today is not the same weapon that you had yesterday, simply because of the radioactive decay of the material....There is also the problem of corrosion, what will happen to a weapon in five or 10 years time."

Some critics charge that subcritical tests will be used to create improved nuclear weapons, rather than to check safety. Hoffmann says that's doubtful.

"If it were possible for the US to develop new weapons, with [its] superior laboratory and computer power, whereas the others could not, this would have been an unequal treaty," he says. "The other four nuclear powers would not have signed the treaty."

My political conclusion is that these states were of the opinion that there would be

no possibility for runaway US development."

So far, only seven countries - the Czech Republic, Fiji, Japan, Micronesia, Mongolia, Qatar, and Uzbekistan - have ratified the treaty. Britain has a ratification bill working its way through Parliament. In the US, the treaty must be ratified by the Senate, where the Republican leadership has shown little interest in speeding it to the floor.

Pakistan, India, and North Korea have refused to sign the treaty. "Pakistan did not sign because India did not, but it has put its stations at the disposal of the CTBTO," Hoffmann says.

By not signing, India could conduct a nuclear test without breaking the treaty. But if the treaty is ratified, "events in countries that have not signed would not go undetected and would have negative political consequences," Hoffmann points out.

---

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers  
at Council for a Livable World Education Fund  
110 Maryland Ave. NE #201  
Washington DC 20002  
p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142  
website: [www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/](http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/)

---

To: paexec@igc.org, nhpeaceact@igc.org, epp92@antenna.nl, 102464.1110@compuserve.com, davidhart@igc.org, flick@igc.org, kalinowski@hrz.pub.th-darmstadt.de, mkantola@kaapeli.fi, bkinsey@peacemission.org, martinez@servedor.unam.mx, btiller@psr.org, wr1@igc.org, pdd@clark.net, wandwill@clark.net, aslater@igc.org, bridget@fcnl.org, propl@propl.org, network@igc.org, galen@om.com.au  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Sign-on letter to President Clinton  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Friends:

We have sent to President Clinton the attached letter signed by persons representing 26 organizations in the United States and abroad. Thank you for your participation.

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

\*\*\*\*\*

October 21, 1997

The Honorable William J. Clinton  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

On a number of occasions you have expressed a desire to see the total elimination of nuclear weapons on Earth. In your second inaugural address you offered a vision of a land of new promise where "our children will sleep free from the threat of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons." This vision has wide public support, indicated in a poll conducted last spring by Celinda Lake of Lake Sosin Snell Associates that revealed 84 percent of American voters would feel safer knowing that no country had nuclear weapons.

Already there are global conventions for the elimination of chemical and biological weapons. In the Celinda Lake survey 87 percent of the respondents agreed that the United States should negotiate a similar agreement to eliminate nuclear weapons. In the next eight months three international bodies will be meeting and will have opportunities to take significant steps toward accomplishing this goal. We hope that under your leadership the United States will play a constructive role in these gatherings.

The first occasion is the 52nd Session of the United Nations General Assembly, now meeting in New York. It is our understanding that the General Assembly will consider a resolution similar to the one proposed by Malaysia and adopted last December that (1) notes the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice that "there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control" and (2) "calls upon all states to fulfill that obligation immediately by commencing negotiations of a nuclear weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deploying, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination." We ask that the United States drop its opposition to such a resolution and strongly endorse it.

The second occasion will be the reconvening of the UN Conference on Disarmament in Geneva in January 1998. Previously some participants have proposed that the Conference establish an ad hoc committee to commence multi-lateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Likely this proposal will come up again. We favor this approach.

Therefore, we ask that the United States support creation of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament.

The third occasion will be the meeting of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee in Geneva in April 1998. In preparation for this meeting we recommend that the United States take several good faith actions that begin to respond to the obligations under Article VI of the NPT. Specifically we urge that the United States begin to carry out "immediate steps" recommended by the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons:

The Honorable William J. Clinton  
October 21, 1997  
Page two.

- Take nuclear weapons off alert
- Remove warheads from delivery vehicles
- End deployment of non-strategic nuclear weapons
- Achieve agreement with other nuclear weapon states for reciprocal no first use

At the meeting of the NPT PrepCom we ask that the United States support efforts to establish a working group to begin negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention. Such a group could work out a division of responsibility with the ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament of the Conference on Disarmament, for there are many tasks to perform in moving toward the goal of nuclear abolition.

None of these multi-lateral efforts would preclude the United States and Russia from working out a START III agreement that would substantially reduce the world's two largest nuclear arsenals. Indeed, such bilateral reductions can set the stage for total elimination by all parties under a nuclear weapons convention.

Mr. President, as you lead the United States on this journey, we promise to help build public support for such bold measures. As previously indicated, the American people are already inclined in this direction and will welcome your leadership to work out arrangements for global elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework.

Sincerely yours,

Gordon S. Clark, Executive Director, Peace Action  
Ellen Davidson, Secretary, North Coast Uranium Action Group, The Channon, Australia  
Sean Donahue, Coordinator, New Hampshire Peace Action  
Dirk Jan Dullemond, Secretary General, Dutch Anti-Nuclear Coalition, The Netherlands  
Dietrich Fischer, Professor, Pace University  
Kerri Frances, Secretary, Big Scrub Environment Centre, Lismore, Australia  
Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
David Hart, Executive Director, Veterans for Peace  
Felicity Hill, International Disarmament Coordinator, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom  
Martin Kalinowski, Member of Coordinating Committee, International Network of Engineers and Scientists against Proliferation, Darmstadt, Germany  
Malla Kantola, Secretary General, Committee of 100, Finland  
Marylia Kelley, President, Tri-Valley Cares, Livermore, California  
Robert A. Kinsey, Chairperson, Peace and Justice Task Force, Rocky Mountain Conference, United Church of Christ  
Laura Lodenius, Press Secretary, Peace Union of Finland  
Marco Martinez, Head of the Physics Department, Faculty of Sciences, University of Mexico  
Robert K. Musil, Executive Director, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
Christopher Ney, Disarmament Coordinator, War Resisters League  
Maurice Paprin, Co-Chairman, Fund for New Priorities in America

Caleb Rossiter, Director, Demilitarization for Democracy  
Susan Share, Executive Director, Women's Action for New Directions  
Alice Slater, President, Global Resource Action Center for the Environment  
Edward (Ned) W. Stowe, Legislative Secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Ellen Thomas, Director, Proposition One Committee  
Kathy Thorton, National Coordinator, NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby  
Edith Villastrigo, National Legislative Director, Women Strike for Peace  
Galen White, Senior Analyst, CTF Software, Mullumbimby, Australia

Reply may be addressed to:

Nuclear Disarmament Advocates  
1500 16th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 21 Oct 1997 12:43:06 -0400 (EDT)  
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)  
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org  
Subject: issue brief #4  
To: dkimball@clw.org  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id JAA22700  
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]

October 21, 1997

TO: Coalition members and friends  
FR: Daryl Kimball  
RE: new Coalition Issue Brief on CTBT for your information and use

The following Coalition "Issue Brief" is being fax blasted this week and will soon be available on Coalition's CTBT web site <[www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/ctbindex.htm](http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/ctbindex.htm)>

DK

\*\*\*\*\*

## COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS

I S S U E B R I E F, VOL. 2, NO. 4, October 20, 1997

"Ten Reasons for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)"

1. The CTBT would help end the nuclear arms race.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty would limit the ability of nuclear weapons states to build new nuclear weapons: by establishing a permanent, "zero-yield" ban on all nuclear explosions in all environments for any purpose, the Treaty would constrain the deployment of new, sophisticated nuclear weapons by the existing nuclear powers. While countries could build new nuclear weapons designs without testing, they will lack the necessary confidence that the weapons will work as designed. Thus, the Treaty can stop a nuclear arms buildup by five declared and three undeclared nuclear weapon states.

2. The CTBT would curb nuclear weapons proliferation.

Under the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, "threshold" states would be prevented from carrying out the types of tests required to field a modern nuclear arsenal. While a country could develop nuclear weapons for the first time without conducting nuclear explosions, the bomb would likely be crude and the non-nuclear country would not have a high degree of confidence in the capacity of the bomb and the nation's ability to deliver the bomb to targets. The CTBT is therefore vital to preventing the spread of nuclear weapons to additional states, where these weapons could destabilize international security.

### 3. The CTBT would strengthen the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The conclusion of the CTBT is a key element in the global bargain that led to the signing and the extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Non-nuclear states agreed to extend that Treaty in May 1995 with the understanding that Article VI of the original treaty would be implemented. Key to that implementation was "The completion by the Conference on Disarmament of the negotiations on a universal and internationally and effectively verifiable Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty no later than 1996." Ratification of the CTBT would further legitimize U.S. non-proliferation efforts and lays the basis for universal enforcement of the CTBT, even against the few nations that may not sign.

### 4. Nuclear testing is not necessary to maintain the safety and reliability of the U.S. arsenal.

The U.S. has a solid and proven warhead surveillance and maintenance program to preserve the safety and reliability of the US nuclear deterrent without nuclear test explosions and this program is being augmented through the Department of Energy Science-Based Stockpile Stewardship Program (SBSS). Although some of the projects that are part of the SBSS program are not essential to the maintenance of the nuclear stockpile, many objective experts — both critics and supporters of the program — agree that the program can ensure the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear stockpile without conducting additional nuclear explosions for several decades or even longer.

All operational U.S. nuclear weapons are already "one-point safe" against accidental detonation of the warhead's high explosives, making even low-yield nuclear explosions, known as "hydronuclear" tests unnecessary. In addition, the nuclear warhead designs of operational U.S. nuclear weapons incorporate additional modern safety features. Since instituting a new annual warhead safety and reliability certification process in 1995, U.S. nuclear weapons have been twice certified without nuclear test explosions.

In a September 26, 1997 press briefing, Dr. Paul Robinson, Director of the Sandia National Laboratory, said: "I think today the nation's [nuclear weapons] stockpile is safe and reliable. We have the numbers to prove it so. With the resources to carry out the essential work ... I feel confident we'll be able to preserve that high level of confidence for the foreseeable future."

### 5. The CTBT is effectively verifiable.

The CTBT would put into place an extensive, global array of 170 seismic monitoring stations, 80 radionuclide monitoring stations, 11 hydroacoustic monitoring stations, and 60 infrasound monitoring stations to detect and deter possible nuclear test explosions. Monitoring capabilities would be especially sensitive at and around the established nuclear test sites. With this monitoring system, the CTBT would — with high confidence — be able to detect nuclear test explosions that are militarily significant. In addition, the CTBT would provide an additional deterrent against potential test ban violations by establishing on-site inspection (OSI) rights that could allow

detection of the radioactive gases leaking from an underground nuclear test.

6. The CTBT would substantially enhance current U.S. monitoring capabilities.

Whether or not the CTBT is ratified, U.S. intelligence agencies will be tasked with monitoring nuclear weapons programs of the nuclear powers and the efforts of non-nuclear states and groups to attain nuclear weapons. The Treaty will make that task easier by establishing a far-reaching international monitoring system across the globe that would augment existing national intelligence tools. Clearly, U.S. intelligence capabilities to detect nuclear tests and nuclear weapons development programs would be far better with the CTBT.

7. The CTBT would enhance the international norm against nuclear testing.

If the five declared nuclear weapon states ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, it will strengthen the global norm against testing and weapons development that helps make the nuclear "have-not" nations far less inclined to develop nuclear weapons. The U.S. has not tested a nuclear weapons since 1992 when Congress passed and President Bush signed the Hatfield-Exon-Mitchell legislation establishing a moratorium on nuclear testing. This law, which is still in effect, says that the U.S. may not conduct a nuclear test explosion unless another nation conducts a test. CTBT ratification would help bring other nations in line with U.S. policy.

8. The CTBT is supported by a large majority of the American people.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is supported by a large majority of the American people. U.S. public support for a nuclear weapons test ban has remained consistently high since the early days of the Cold War. The most recent poll, conducted in September 1997 by the Mellman Group, revealed that 70 percent of Americans support United States ratification of a nuclear test ban treaty.

9. The CTBT is the longest-sought initiative to help reduce nuclear weapons dangers.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty marks an historic achievement pursued by Presidents since Dwight D. Eisenhower. For forty years, Presidents and activists have worked for an end to nuclear testing. Previous negotiations have been hindered by international incidents and the failure to compromise at key times. Ratification of the CTBT would mark an important milestone in the effort to end the nuclear arms race.

10. The CTBT would protect human health and the environment.

Since 1945, six nations have conducted 2,046 nuclear test explosions--an average of one test every nine days. These tests spread dangerous levels of radioactive fallout downwind and into the global atmosphere. A 1997 National Cancer Institute Study estimates that fallout from only 90 U.S. nuclear tests will likely cause 10,000-75,000 additional thyroid cancers in the U.S. Underground testing also poses environmental hazards: each blast spreads highly radioactive material underground; many underground nuclear explosions have vented radioactive gases. The Energy Department reports that 114 of the

723 U.S. nuclear tests since 1963 released radioactive material into the atmosphere.

110 Maryland Avenue, NE, Suite 201, Washington, DC 20002 • phone: (202)546-0795 • fax: (202) 546-5142 • e-mail: [coalition@clw.org](mailto:coalition@clw.org) • website: [www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/](http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/)

---

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers  
at Council for a Livable World Education Fund  
110 Maryland Ave. NE #201  
Washington DC 20002  
p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142  
website: [www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/](http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/)

---

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

X-Authentication-Warning: igc6.igc.org: majordomo set sender to owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org using -f

Date: Tue, 21 Oct 1997 11:22:27 -0700 (PDT)

From: Karina Wood <kwood@igc.apc.org>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII; name="pico41.8156"

Content-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91.971021112227.8156B@igc.apc.org>

Content-Description:

Dear abolitionists:

A quick note to tell you I'm back in abolition internet land, and to give you information about the No to NATO expansion/Yes to nuclear abolition speakers tour of the United States (working title: we are still figuring out a snappy title).

I am now living in Providence, Rhode Island (NE coast of USA) and I have started work organizing the speakers tour, which will take place in late January-early February 1998. (It has to be sooner than previously anticipated because of the US Senate's desire to schedule the vote of ratification for February-March.)

My new contact details:

Karina Wood

Coordinator, No NATO speakers tour

43 Nisbet St., 3rd Floor

Providence, RI 02906

tel: 401 751-8172

fax: 401 751-1476 (operational Oct. 28)

email: kwood@igc.apc.org

I am currently contacting prospective speakers in Eastern Europe, the UK and Russia. I am looking for members/ex-members of parliament, leading policy experts, well-known peace movement leaders, writers, celebrities -- people with name recognition who are good public speakers, who will attract media attention here in the US. **IF YOU HAVE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SPEAKERS, PLEASE CONTACT ME.** If you know how to reach Gorbachev, I would really like to hear from you.

If you live in the following cities and want to help host the speakers and generally help out organizing the tour, please contact me. Cities planned for visits: Boston, New York, Washington, DC, Ashville or Durham, NC, Miami, Atlanta, Chicago, Madison and/or Milwaukee, WI, a major city in Texas, Los Angeles, San Fransico, Portland, OR, Seattle.

These cities are *\*provisional\** venues, not definite tour stops. I can't promise that your suggestions for speakers and/or offers of

assistance will be acted upon, as we are still at the preliminary planning stages, but I would appreciate receiving your recommendations.

For those of you who will be attending the New England Abolition conference this weekend, I look forward to seeing you there, and talking further about this exciting project.

Wishing you all the best,

Karina.

The Anti-NATO Expansion Speakers Tour is a project of:

Fourth Freedom Forum

Peace Action/Peace Action Education Fund

Physicians for Social Responsibility

Women's Action for New Directions

Center for Defense Information

To: dce@wcc-coe.org  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Events at PrepCom  
Cc: atwood@pop.unicc.org, dgracie@afsc.org, crramey@igc.org, dave@paxchristiusa.org  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Dwain:

Since conferring with you, I have had e-mail and phone communications with several other persons about a possible event involving world religious leaders in Geneva next spring when the NPT PrepCom meets. They include David Atwood at the Quaker office in Geneva, through him with Colin Archer of the International Peace Bureau, David Gracie of AFSC in Philadelphia, Clayton Ramey of the FOR in Nyack, NY, David Robinson of Pax Christi USA, Alice Slater of GRACE in New York, and Felicity Hill of Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. All agree that it would be desirable to bring world religious leaders to Geneva at the beginning of the PrepCom session. Several possibilities have been suggested for what these leaders might do.

1. There could be a public forum addressed by religious leaders on the opening day, Monday, April 27, 1998 to which PrepCom delegates would be invited. It could occur during the luncheon period, 13:00 to 15:00, or in late afternoon or early evening after delegates adjourn for the day. It should be as close to the UN as possible, such as at the Ecumenical Center (we would rely on Geneva people to pick the best spot). If in late afternoon, there might be a reception afterward with light refreshments.

The main message would be to draw upon religious and moral teachings of the respective faiths to call for global elimination of nuclear weapons. Although not experts on details of nuclear disarmament, the religious leaders could speak favorably about proposals which experts have advanced, such as (a) establishing a working group within the NPT process to start drafting a nuclear weapons convention, comparable to biological and chemical weapons conventions, and (b) carrying out intermediate steps recommended by the Canberra Commission (such as taking nuclear forces off alert, removal of warheads from delivery vehicles, further bilateral reductions of the U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals).

Would Dr. Konrad Reiser be willing and available to participate in such a forum to represent the World Council of Churches?

We are working with Pax Christi USA to obtain Catholic participation. Although not yet accomplished, they intend to confer with Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, about his possible participation. Through him they want to inquire whether Cardinal Etchegary, head of the Pontifical Commission for Peace and Justice, would participate.

If Dr. Reiser and a leading Catholic would agree to participate, we would seek involvement of comparable persons from other faith communities. Your suggestions would be welcome. Three Nobel Peace laureates could also be considered: the Dalai Lama, Archbishop Desmond Tutu, and Elie Wiesel, all of whom are on record supporting nuclear abolition.

2. A complementary proposal is to have these world leaders hold a joint news conference to discuss their recommendations with reporters.

3. Another suggestion is to have religious leaders call upon delegations of the nuclear weapons states and threshold states to make their case for serious action toward nuclear disarmament. This could be extended to many other delegations by inviting others from the religious community to come to Geneva to join NGOs in their lobbying efforts.

Prior to the NPT PrepCom interfaith delegations could call upon their governments at home and urge them to go to Geneva committed to moving ahead with nuclear disarmament measures.

4. Another idea is to have an ecumenical worship service at some time during the two weeks the PrepCom is in session.

All four of these proposals could be implemented or only some of them. We would be interested in your views on these possibilities.

The Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, of which I am a co-convenor along with David Gracie and Clayton Ramey, is willing to work on this activity as best we can. This would include helping shape the message and lining up key participants. However, we will need assistance from persons in Geneva on local arrangements.

I look forward to your response.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
301 897-3668

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Cc: mvtpaix@globenet.org, Dominique.Belougne@u-bordeaux2.fr,  
Claude.Panne@wanadoo.fr, Roland.nivet@univ-rennes1.fr,  
Patrick.simon@wanadoo.fr, claude.roussie@wanadoo.fr,  
karkar@ccr.jussieu.fr, ganguet@francemultimedia.fr,  
Yves-J.Gallas@wanadoo.fr, fpseligmann@minitel.net, mac@lia.imt-mrs.fr

Date: Tue, 21 Oct 1997 21:53:31

From: Daniel Durand <ddur@francenet.fr>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: About Goals of the Abolition 2000 Network

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id MAA07511

X-Sender: ddur@mail.francenet.fr

Janet Bloomfield is right to launch a debate on the future of the Abolition2000 network.

We did a lot of progress: there are 700 signatory organizations, the campaign for the signing of CTBT was good, the lobbying during the First Prepcom of TNP was interesting.

But there is still a long way to go.

What gathers us as a global vision of world is the preamble of the Declaration d'Abolition2000. What gathers us as objectives of campaign are the 11 steps of the Abolition Statement.

Campaigns pursuing the same goals as our declaration are OK, useful to be known but our Abolition-caucus list first must help us to implement the 11 objectives.

What is the situation now ?

We made some progresses on three points:

- the n° 3 with the signing of CTBT
- the n° 8 on the extension of nuclear weapons free zones.
- the n° 9 on the illegality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons with the opinion of the ICJ

We could get with a lot of efforts:

- the n° 5 with the signing of a « cut off » treaty on fissile materials
- the n° 2 with the recognition of guarantees of security and no use of nuclear weapons in the next NPT Prepcom ??
- the n° 11 on a better participation of the ONG in the next conferences

But remains the n° 1: the starting of negotiations on a Convention of Abolition of the Nuclear Weapon.

In France, we began making pressure on the French government so that he takes the initiative of starting these negotiations in Paris in January 2000, as had been started in January, 1993, in Paris, the negotiations for the Convention of abolition of the chemicals weapons.

But there are certainly some other good ideas to find.

But we must see that we have failed on several points:

- The two sub-critical tests in the Nevada encourages those that says in nuclear countries that we need to continue researches on nuclear weapons.

I have the feeling that the protest for the 2 nd test had been more difficult ? Am I right ?

- The Committee of Disarmament in Geneva underwent a failure. Peace movements wer'nt able to mobilize in order to put pressure.

- the holding of a SSD4 in 1999 seems uncertain: it would help us in order to create a stream of opinion for disarmament before the Year 2000. There is not a lot of mobilization during the present General Assembly of the UN.

We must therefore work hard and concentrate our efforts on some objectives of decisive action.

The list of discussion Abolition-caucus abolition first help us to it. There is no moderator in the list therefore every group must be responsible and not overflow the list on their initiatives as it happened several times in the past.

Participating to the exchanges on the list is difficult for non speaking-English and non- American.

It is therefore very positive that a debate on the present strategy of Abolition 2000 start again on the network and allows to prepare some good meetings groups during the future Prepcom in Geneva to the spring 1998.

In France, currently, the 1998 Defense budget foresees a 13% decrease on nuclear weapons funds (from 18.8 Billion of F to 16,3) and the delay of a year of the construction of the third nuclear submarine.

200 people demonstrated last Sunday, to Moronvilliers, close to Reims, in front of a laboratory which participates to the PALEN program of nuclear experiences in laboratory.

Yours in peace,

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 21 Oct 1997 13:40:55 -0700  
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: lamenting A2000 goals  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

Dear Abolitionists:

Abolition 2000 is the right goal at the right time. It is a critical goal for humanity's future. I encourage all of us seeking to realize this goal to keep working creatively to achieve it. Keep your focus on what we need to do to succeed rather than on what to do if we should not succeed.

It is possible to achieve a Nuclear Weapons Convention by the year 2000. Far more dramatic changes have happened in shorter time spans in recent history.

David Krieger

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

\*\*\*\*\*

A founding member of  
and global contact point for the  
Abolition 2000 Global Network for the  
Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

\*\*\*\*\*

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123  
Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794  
Phone (805) 965-3443 \* Fax (805) 568-0466  
E- <mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org>  
<http://www.wagingpeace.org>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
Date: Wed, 22 Oct 1997 06:28:54 +0800  
From: Graham Daniell <gdaniell@wt.com.au>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: lamenting A2000 goals  
To: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>  
X-Sender: gdaniell@mail.wt.com.au

I agree whole-heartedly. For the last several years at our Hiroshima day vigil here in Perth we have had an A2000 petition for people to sign, and we find often we have people queueing up to sign it.

Most people at first walk past without looking, not wanting to get involved, But if we have someone spruiking "sign here to abolish n-weapons" those same people will very often turn around, come back to our table and sign.

I am convinced that the people of the world want it, what we need is politicians who are ready (and can see the political advantages) to give them what they want.

Towards a nuclear-free millennium,  
Graham Daniell

-----

At 13:40 21/10/97 -0700, you wrote:

>Dear Abolitionists:

>

>Abolition 2000 is the right goal at the right time. It is a critical goal for humanity's future. I encourage all of us seeking to realize this goal to keep working creatively to achieve it. Keep your focus on what we need to do to succeed rather than on what to do if we should not succeed.

>

>It is possible to achieve a Nuclear Weapons Convention by the year 2000. Far more dramatic changes have happened in shorter time spans in recent history.

>

> David Krieger

>

Graham Daniell  
Western Australia  
gdaniell@wt.com.au

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 22 Oct 1997 01:00:00 +0000  
From: IPPNW@OLN.comlink.apc.org (IPPNW Int Aerzte gg Atomkrieg)  
Lines: 36  
Organization: IPPNW Germany  
Path: oln.comlink.apc.org  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Nobel Declaration for NWFZ  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Gateway: ZCONNECT sonne.comlink.apc.org [UNIX/Connect v0.74b4MB06]  
X-ZC-DDA: 19971022133300W+0  
X-ZC-POST: Koertestrasse 10

## Nobel Declaration for Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone

Berlin, October 23rd 1997. Nine Nobel Peace Laureates issued a declaration today to mark UN Disarmament Day (October 24th), calling for a nuclear weapon-free zone in Central and Eastern Europe. The declaration is motivated by the discussion to expand NATO eastwards and NATO's policy of nuclear deterrence.

Although NATO has declared its intention not to base nuclear weapons on the territory of its new members, it retains the right to do so in the future. The Declaration of Peace Laureates states: "We believe that the transfer of nuclear weapons to Central and Eastern European States, which are presently free of nuclear weapons, pose grave consequences for security and stability in Europe."

The original idea for such a declaration was suggested by the German affiliate of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) and the International Network of Engineers and Scientists (INES) to Professor Bernard Lown, Founder of IPPNW and Professor Joseph Rotblat, Former President of the Pugwash Conferences, both recipients of the Nobel Peace Prize. In a letter to the other Nobel Peace Laureates, Professors Lown and Rotblat warned that in response to NATO expansion, "the Russian military is discussing a return to first use policy. The role of short-range tactical nuclear weapons may also be revived in response to the perception of NATO expansion as a threat to Russia's security. These changes in policy would set nuclear disarmament back enormously."

The Declaration remains open for signature by other Nobel Peace Laureates until the end of the year. The first nine signatures are from: Oscar Arias (1987), Michail Sergejevich Gorbachev (1990), Prof. Dr. Joseph Rotblat (1995), Bishop Desmond Mpilo Tutu (1984), Betty Williams and Máiread Corrigan Maguire (1976), the International Peace Bureau (1910), American Friends Service Committee (1947), and the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (1985)

For further Information, please contact:  
Xanthe Hall/Jens-Peter Steffen, IPPNW Germany, +49-30-693 0244  
## CrossPoint v3.1 ##

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 22 Oct 1997 01:00:00 +0000  
From: IPPNW@OLN.comlink.apc.org (IPPNW Int Aerzte gg Atomkrieg)  
Lines: 95  
Organization: IPPNW Germany  
Path: oln.comlink.apc.org  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Arms Control and Abolition  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Gateway: ZCONNECT sonne.comlink.apc.org [UNIX/Connect v0.74b4MB06]  
X-ZC-POST: Koertestrasse 10

DEUTSCHE SEKTION DER INTERNATIONALEN AERZTE  
FUER DIE VERHUETUNG DES ATOMKRIEGES  
AERZTE IN SOZIALER VERANTWORTUNG  
International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW)

Koertestraße 10, Tel: +49 (0)30 693 0244  
D-10967 Berlin 61, Fax: +49 (0)30 693 8166

IPPNW@VLBerlin.comlink.de IPPNW@OLN.comlink.apc.org  
<http://www.ippnw.de>

---

22.10.97

Dear Abolitionists,

I am still reeling from the blows I received at the weekend at the BITS conference on The Russian Nuclear Legacy. I remain, however, reassured that my hopeless idealism remains intact.

I would like to find time to write a full report for you all to read, since the stuff that was discussed was all fascinating and CRUCIAL to our campaign to abolish nuclear weapons. But in the absence of time right now, I thought I would try a quick overview of some points that are worth mentioning. These are only, of course, my impressions.

The arms control community is beginning to debate a Nuclear Weapons Convention. Some members feel so threatened by a NWC that they attack it with a fierceness that can only be described as psychotic, using words like "stupid", "impractical", "counterproductive", and "it just makes me crazy even to think about it". Other voices, however, stood up for the "need to reiterate our vision of a nuclear weapon-free world", and the panel was even attacked for lacking radicalism and being too moderate, or not mentioning popular pressure at all.

Ambassador Thomas Graham (US) was invited to talk about "The Future of Nuclear Disarmament" and gave a speech which was nearly identical to the one he gave at the NPT extension conference in 1995, revering the NPT as the best thing since sliced bread, saying that "The NPT is unmistakably a Treaty on the abolition of nuclear weapons". But he also said "the abolition of nuclear weapons is not conceivable today,

a year from now, and perhaps not for several decades."

Most importantly, Graham said: "Strident criticism of the US stockpile stewardship program threatens the ratification of the CTBT in the Senate". This will come as no news to you US-Americans out there. So I asked him which criticism he meant exactly - domestic or international? It seems to US politicians that even criticism from US NGOs is more important than criticism from other states - so keep the good work up over there!

I do not argue with steps towards abolition, in fact I think they are useful, particularly as Confidence Building Measures. But the debate on de-alerting has to be addressed with some care. One Russian participant (who I believe is near to the government) scorned the Blair/Nunn article in the Washington Post on De-Alerting (June 23) for the following proposal: "Russian mobile land rockets could be taken out of their garages and faced south to prevent their rapid firing in a northerly direction (i.e. toward the United States). The erector launchers could also be put on blocks with their tires removed." This was quoted as an example of a de-alerting measure that insults Russian intelligence, and was described as "ridiculous". However well-meant the suggestion was, it was not thought out enough how it might be received.

This problem was often put forward by the Russian participants as being a hindrance to disarmament - cultural misunderstanding. Russians are a very proud and traditional people in general, and their dignity has taken a battering during the last ten years. As one Russian said: "How would the USA like it if Russia said to them - we will pay for you to destroy your best fleet?". Despite this, we should not fall into the trap of saying that poor Russia should be able to keep her nuclear weapons because of her damaged dignity, to allow her to remain a superpower. She must accept that she is no longer more than a regional power. Unfortunately the mentality of arithmetical parity is still alive and kicking in the Russian Duma.

Another important point is the ecological consequences of disarmament. It is not enough to call for disarmament, we have to call for effective clean-up as well, and not just in Russia but at all nuclear sites and of course the money to pay for it.

There are a great deal more points that I could mention, but I think I should stop at this. I hope I will be able to write a longer report in the next few weeks. Please indicate if there is interest in this.

Xanthe Hall  
(Co-Director)

---

IPPNW is a member of Abolition 2000  
- a Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons -

---

## CrossPoint v3.1 ##



Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 22 Oct 1997 14:44:49 -0400 (EDT)  
From: LCNP@aol.com  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: UN and nuclear abolition: Ready, Set....  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
cc: peace-caucus@igc.apc.org

## MALAYSIA FINALISING UN RESOLUTION ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS CONVENTION

### GET READY TO ACT.....

In 1996 the United Nations adopted resolution 51/45 M, calling for the implementation of the International Court of Justice advisory opinion on nuclear weapons by the commencing of negotiations leading to the conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention.

No progress has been made on commencing such negotiations this year, and so Malaysia intends to re-introduce the resolution, with some modifications, to the UN next week (to be voted on in the week of November 10-15).

Malaysia hopes to attract more support from western countries, East Europe and former Soviet countries, most of which abstained or opposed last year. In order to attract such support, Malaysia has added a paragraph to the draft resolution welcoming progress made in bilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations, and has softened the paragraph calling for an ad hoc committee of the Conference on Disarmament to commence negotiations on nuclear disarmament.

The text should be finalised in a few days, after which we urge all activists from countries that did not support the resolution last year to urge their governments to support it this year.

We will post the text as soon as it is released by the Malaysian delegation.

For more information contact Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy, 666 Broadway #625, New York, NY 10012, USA. Phone (1) 212 674 7790. Fax (1) 212 674 6199.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 23 Oct 1997 13:37:59 +0100 (BST)  
From: npc@gn.apc.org (National Peace Council UK)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Thoughts on the future of A2000  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: npc@gn.apc.org (Unverified)

Thank you for your responses to Janet Bloomfield's paper on the future of Abolition 2000. We are in the process of collecting the responses together and discussing them amongst ourselves here in the UK before we reply to you all.  
Frances (Abolition 2000 UK Co-ordinator)

National Peace Council UK (npc@gn.apc.org)

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 23 Oct 1997 06:42:25 -0700 (PDT)  
From: john burroughs <jburroughs@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: NAS at UN Disarmament Week  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
X-Sender: jburroughs@pop.igc.org

Jackie Cabasso, Alice Slater, and I, among many other network participants, are at the Un Disarmament Week activities in New York, speaking up on behalf of abolition. Wednesday afternoon, October 22 featured a panel of the National Academy of Scientists, John Steinbrunner and Richard Garwin, moderated by Douglas Roche, with Joseph Rotblat also commenting. Roche and Rotblat spent considerable time talking about the Abolition 2000 Network and what it could/should focus upon, so the network received much attention. Some of the many points that came up:

1) As you may know the NAS Committee in its report The Future of US Nuclear Weapons Policy has recommended a path of bilateral negotiations on arms reduction/de-alerting, to be widened to multilateral among all nuclear weapon states after US and Russia get to 1000 or so. But Steinbrunner said that the NAS Committee would welcome a parallel track of negotiations, for example in Geneva at the Conference on Disarmament, which addressed a global regime for elimination of nuclear weapons.

2) Steinbrunner said to Jackie and myself that the Russians are very interested in a de-alerting plan that would leave 200 warheads on alert (i.e., ready for instantaneous use) **\*\*if\*\*** US is willing to de-alert its first strike weapons, which he said are the MX and the W88 warheads deployed on Trident missiles. We noted that W76 warheads, which are the largest part of the warheads deployed on Trident missiles, are the subject of replacement research work for a W88 type warhead (not necessarily identical to that now deployed) by the US laboratories (to be accomplished without underground test explosions), which would mean that the entire Trident force would be first-strike capable (if it is true that W76 warheads now deployed are not first-strike capable). (Note that if the distinction between W76 and W88 warheads is correct this means that a hugely significant change in entire US nuclear posture could be accomplished without underground testing of the replacement/modified warhead.) He agreed this is something to head off. Steinbrunner did not really say how interested the US is in the de-alerting proposal, but he and/or NAS is pushing this.

3) Rotblat argued that as a shorter term goal to galvanize public abolition campaign should focus on something both significant and achievable, namely a treaty to prohibit any first use (not merely declarations). However, many of us were not convinced, responding that the network has already made elimination of the nuclear threat, including by no first use commitments as well as such physical operational measures as separation of warheads from delivery systems a major priority in its petition (along with "sign the treaty" and "reallocate resources"); that unlike de-alerting and elimination/reduction measures, a no first use treaty would not necessarily involve actual changes in nuclear postures; that it would be a very significant investment of resources to make this a campaign priority.

4) Steinbrunner emphasized again and again that the very dangerous Cold War situation of nuclear forces deployed so as to enable "rapid reaction" "mass attack" response to perceived nuclear attack by other side remains in place, and that particularly on Russian side, this is not well controlled and is very risky. Therefore de-alerting is highest priority, to get away from rapid reaction, mass attack targeting. Negotiation of alert status (i.e. numbers of weapons on alert) could provide a means for making the START negotiations more equitable, feasible, and acceptable from Russian point of view.

5) Steinbrunner emphasized that reductions to low total numbers (including reserve etc.) will require major advances in warhead and materials accounting and that much attention needs to be focussed on this. (Note here Abolition 2000 has made an international registry one of the items on the statement.)

More later re this week I hope -

To: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter to President Clinton  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

David,

The letter to President Clinton has already been sent. Sorry to have missed your signature.

Howard

At 10:08 AM 10/23/97 -0700, you wrote:

>Dear Howard,

>

>This is a very positive and constructive letter to President Clinton. I'm happy to sign on.

>

> David Krieger

> - President -

> Nuclear Age Peace Foundation

>

>

To: relctbt  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: CTBT Activities  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

To: Religious Organizations Participating in CTBT Ratification Campaign

From: Howard W. Hallman

Re: Meeting of Nuclear Weapons Working Group, October 23, 1997

Discussion at this meeting reviewed the progress of setting up state delegation visits to senators in key states. We reviewed efforts to form delegations in Maine, New Mexico, Michigan, Ohio, and Washington State. More participation from religious organizations is needed. If you haven't provided your contacts who are willing to participate, please send the names to the Washington contact on the list previously distributed, or send them to this week to Lisa Ledwidge at PSR (ph: 202 898-0150, x. 222; fax: 202 898-0172; e-mail: ledwidge@psr.org). She's filling in for Kathy Crandall, who is on sick leave this week. You can provide your contacts in the other key states in the same manner.

There is a desire to encourage Senator Lugar to play a leadership role in CTBT ratification. Kathy Guthrie of FCNL is facilitating our contacts, individually and possibly through a delegation. Please get in touch with her if you can help (ph. 202 547-6000),

We are still looking for persons to take the lead in Arizona, Iowa, and Long Island, New York. If you have recommendations, get in touch with David Culp of Plutonium Challenge (ph. 202 289-2388); fax: 202 289-1060; e-mail: dculp@nrdc.org).

Persons who sent out announcements of the regional conference in Denver, scheduled for November 15, are asked to make follow-up phone calls. Registration deadline is November 7.

The announcement flyer for the Pittsburgh conference, scheduled for January 17, 1998, is about ready.

Previously announced Senate committee hearings will start next week.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: jbloomfield@gn.apc.org  
Date: Fri, 24 Oct 1997 16:48:01 +0100 (BST)  
From: Janet Bloomfield <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Abolition 2000 Report Card 1997  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

ABOLITION 2000 PROGRESS REPORT CARD  
UNITED NATIONS DAY: OCTOBER 24, 1997.

Last year we produced and distributed an Abolition 2000 report card in October assessing progress in nuclear matters. One year later, we pause again to take stock of the state of the Nuclear World, and of the efforts to abolish nuclear weapons. Since last year's Report Card, the issue of nuclear abolition has gained increasing credence in the public mind, continuing the pressure on the nuclear states to keep their promise to the world's people to eliminate their nuclear arsenals. How much closer are we this year to our goal of a treaty, agreed by the year 2000, mandating the elimination of the world's nuclear arsenals? Looking at this year's activities in the context of the Abolition 2000 Statement offers a simple way to make such an evaluation. This Report Card offers a brief assessment of progress in the past year in the implementation of the 11 points of the Abolition Statement. We offer it on United Nations Day, October 24, to recall the initial promise of the UN Charter: "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war," keeping in mind our future descendants, knowing that the elimination of nuclear weapons will go far in fulfilling our promise to them.

1) Immediately initiate and conclude by the year 2000 negotiations on a nuclear weapons abolition convention that requires the phased elimination of all nuclear weapons within a timebound framework, with provisions for effective verification and enforcement.

Report: The Abolition 2000 Working Group for a Nuclear Weapons Convention, under the leadership of the Lawyers Committee for Nuclear Policy and the International Network of Engineers and Scientists against Proliferation, issued a Draft Nuclear Weapons Convention, unveiled to the world on April 7, 1997 at the The Non Proliferation Treaty Preparatory Committee Meeting (NPT PrepCom) in New York. This document, written by scientists, lawyers, and citizen activists, outlines how nuclear weapons will be eliminated from the earth. Many groups are working to publicise it and to encourage sympathetic governments to table it at the United Nations and other appropriate international meetings. In 1996 the United Nations adopted resolution 51/45 M, calling for the implementation of the International Court of Justice advisory opinion on nuclear weapons by the commencing of negotiations leading to the conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention. No progress has been made on commencing such negotiations this year, and so Malaysia intends to re-introduce the resolution, with some

modifications, to the UN next week (to be voted on in the week of November 10-15). (Canada's leadership in the historic landmines convention, and the use of a draft treaty prepared for the International Campaign to Ban Landmines greatly accelerated progress toward the ban at a crucial time.)

Two opinion polls commissioned by Abolition 2000 in the US in April and in the UK in September show overwhelming public support for a Nuclear Weapons Convention: 87% in both the US and in the UK.

The NPT Prep Comm in April made no progress in implementing Article VI and the Conference on Disarmament is bogged down in Geneva. The road blocks put up by the nuclear weapon states (both declared and undeclared) are still in place.

Grade: 4 out of 10.

2) Immediately make an unconditional pledge not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons.

Report: China remains the only nuclear state committed to no first use and has been advocating it more strongly in a number of international fora. None of the other nuclear weapons states has responded. NATO expansion means that more states in Europe have come under the "nuclear umbrella" and therefore tacitly support the policy of first use. South Africa tabled a proposal on negative security assurances at the NPT Prep Comm.

Grade: 1 out of 10.

3) Rapidly complete a truly Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) with a zero threshold and with the stated purpose of precluding nuclear weapons development by all states.

Report: Following the signing of the CTBT in September 1996, the ratification process has made very slow progress. Of the 44 countries required to ratify the CTBT before it becomes international law, so far only Japan has ratified. The UK aims to ratify the CTBT by the end of the year and President Clinton has begun the process of US ratification. However, so-called "safeguards agreements" attached to President Clinton's ratification proposal to the U.S. Senate virtually guarantee the development of new US nuclear weapons (such as the B-61-11 "Buster Bunker" deployed this year) by the weapons labs, and an enduring (read eternal) stockpile of nuclear weapons under the dubiously named Stockpile Stewardship and Management System (see No. 7). The CTBT Verification Centre has been established in Vienna.

Grade: 3 out of 10.

4) Cease to produce and deploy new and additional nuclear weapons systems, and commence to withdraw and disable deployed nuclear weapons systems.

Report: We still await the implementation of Start II, which remains unratified by the Russian Duma. At the Clinton-Yeltsin Summit in March, the prospect of START III was raised. There are indications that the new British government is reviewing the current deployment and patrols of Trident nuclear submarines. Sir Michael Quinlan, formerly the senior civil servant at the British Ministry of Defence, advocated reducing Trident patrols in a recent speech. The Canberra Commission proposal to "de-alert" current nuclear forces is gaining momentum, but again nothing significant has happened so far.

Grade: 2 out of 10.

5) Prohibit the military and commercial production and reprocessing of all weapons-usable radioactive materials.

Report: The plutonium economy continues but is under increasing public scrutiny. New governments in France and the UK have been more willing to challenge the activities of reprocessing facilities at Sellafield, Britain and La Hague, France on environmental grounds. The Japanese nuclear industry has been deeply embarrassed by revelations of incompetence and poor safety, and representatives have publicly apologized to the Japanese people. But the nuclear industry still continues to promote itself as the answer to the world's energy problems and to generate, transport and store nuclear waste in great quantities. China, which currently has only 3 nuclear reactors, has agreed to buy 300 more from Westinghouse which can no longer peddle its wares in the US. With its recently announced plans to burn excess weapons plutonium using it as mixed plutonium and uranium oxide (MOX) fuel for commercial nuclear reactors, the US has violated its long standing nuclear policy to separate commercial and military production in order to discourage the proliferation of nuclear weapons technology

Grade: 1 out of 10.

6) Subject all weapons-usable radioactive materials and nuclear facilities in all states to international accounting, monitoring, and safeguards, and establish a public international registry of all weapons-usable radioactive materials.

Report: The Conference on Disarmament has made no progress on the fissile material cut off process. The proposal for a cut-off treaty deals only with weapons materials and fails to address commercial material. It has become part of a stand off at the CD between those states who wish to see the formation of an ad-hoc committee on nuclear disarmament and those who wish to keep nuclear disarmament off the agenda of that body. The International Atomic Energy Agency's recently agreed 92+3 programme represents a major overhaul of the IAEA's safeguards regime and has put a more backbone into the monitoring of weapons-usable materials but stories of the possible leakage of materials and even weapons from

the former Soviet Union are compelling reasons to step up our efforts to implement the Abolition 2000 proposal for dealing with these materials.

Grade: 2 out of 10.

7) Prohibit nuclear weapons research, design, development, and testing through laboratory experiments including but not limited to non-nuclear hydrodynamic explosions and computer simulations, subject all nuclear weapons laboratories to international monitoring, and close all nuclear test sites.

Report: The nuclear weapons laboratories have shown no intention of relinquishing their capacity to develop nuclear weapons. The US exploded two sub-critical tests in Nevada in 1997 with more planned in 1998 and beyond and there have been unsubstantiated reports of Russian sub-criticals on Novaya Zemlya. The CTBT has been submitted to the US Senate for ratification complete with "safeguards" for the weapons labs which provide a \$60 billion program over the next 13 years enabling them to produce new nuclear warheads in return for their support of the treaty. (see no. 3).

Grade: - 1 out of 10.

8) Create additional nuclear weapons free zones such as those established by the treaties of Tlatelolco and Rarotonga.

Report: At the recent South Pacific Forum in the Cook Islands, the UK government finally ratified the protocols of the Treaty of Rarotonga (South Pacific Nuclear Weapons Free Zone). Also in September, an international conference was held in Tashkent on a Central Asia Nuclear-Weapons Free Zone. United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan noted in a message to the conference that more than 110 UN Member States were currently covered by nuclear-free zone agreements, stating that additional zones would be a "boon to regional security cooperation, would contribute to non-proliferation and disarmament, and would represent a further step in the direction of a nuclear-free world". NATO expansion has unfortunately blocked progress on a possible Central European Nuclear Weapons Free Zone for the time being, although the proposal for such a zone has recently been backed by 9 Nobel Peace Prize laureates.

Grade: 4 out of 10.

9) Recognize and declare the illegality of threat or use of nuclear weapons, publicly and before the World Court.

Report: On July 8, 1996 the International Court of Justice in the Hague declared that the nuclear weapons states share "an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control." It also

declared that the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons was illegal in every conceivable circumstances except, possibly, where the very survival of a state was at stake, a limited circumstance under which the Court declined to issue an opinion. In July and August 1997, as part of International Nuclear Abolition Days, thousands of citizens around the world conducted on-site inspections of nuclear "scenes of the crime." In each location, they delivered a citizen summons, giving notice that the site violated international law, as laid down by the International Court of Justice. No nuclear weapons state has yet agreed to abide by the opinion.

Grade: 5 out of 10.

10) Establish an international energy agency to promote and support the development of sustainable and environmentally safe energy sources.

Report: Non-governmental organisations meeting in New York in April at the NPT Prep Comm and the Commission for Sustainable Development issued a joint statement calling for the establishment of such an agency. The idea is on the agenda but needs more work and support.

Grade: 2 out of 10.

11) Create mechanisms to ensure the participation of citizens and NGOs in planning and monitoring the process of nuclear weapons abolition.

Report: NGOs attended the Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee meeting in the spring of 1997 in New York. These meetings were expanded by the President of the NPT Review and Extension Conference in May 1995 from 7 to 10 days to encourage the active participation of citizens in this process. Official access was by no means satisfactory. Although the NGOs did address the Prep Comm, the session was unofficial and did not take place until the Prep Comm was almost over. However, many delegates attended the series of briefings organised and hosted by abolition NGOs on crucial issues affecting the NPT. NGOs are currently preparing their strategies and input for the 1998 meeting in Geneva and have formally requested earlier and more extensive access at the 1998 Prep Comm.

Grade: 4 out of 10

Total grade: 27 out of 110

Conclusions: While some progress has been made in 1997, it is slow. NATO expansion, continued commitment to "nuclear deterrence", the apparent stranglehold of weapons laboratories on the political process in the US and lack of will and momentum at both the NPT and the CD have had a major negative effect. On the positive side, new governments in two nuclear weapons states,

France and the UK, are more open to new ideas about nuclear issues. The UK government has embarked on a major review of its defence and foreign policy and has been in discussion with a number of Abolition 2000 groups. The Canadian parliament, responding to citizen pressure, will re-examine its participation in NATO as a result of the World Court Decision. Public opinion is clearly on the side of abolition. The concept of abolishing a whole category of weapon has received an enormous boost with the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, which won this year's Nobel Peace Prize. A key challenge for 1998 is to think and act creatively to maximise the chances of a global landmines ban being followed swiftly by a global nuclear weapons ban.

Janet Bloomfield and Pamela Meidell, October 24, 1997.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 27 Oct 1997 00:00:00 +0000  
From: IPPNW@OLN.comlink.apc.org (IPPNW Int Aerzte gg Atomkrieg)  
Lines: 91  
Organization: IPPNW Germany  
Path: oln.comlink.apc.org  
Reply-TO: IPPNW@OLN.comlink.apc.org (IPPNW Int Aerzte gg Atomkrieg)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: Arms Control and Abolition  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Gateway: ZCONNECT sonne.comlink.apc.org [UNIX/Connect v0.74b4MB06]  
X-ZC-POST: Koertestrasse 10

DEUTSCHE SEKTION DER INTERNATIONALEN AERZTE  
FUER DIE VERHUETUNG DES ATOMKRIEGES  
AERZTE IN SOZIALER VERANTWORTUNG  
International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW)

Koertestraße 10, Tel: +49 (0)30 693 0244  
D-10967 Berlin 61, Fax: +49 (0)30 693 8166

IPPNW@VLBerlin.comlink.de IPPNW@OLN.comlink.apc.org  
<http://www.ippnw.de>

---

27.10.97

Dear Abolitionists and IPPNW affiliates,

Thanks for responding to my summary of the BITS Conference in Berlin on October 17th and 18th 1997.

As one person rightly pointed out, it is the amopunt of time it takes that has kept me from writing this up although I took copious notes by hand. The subject matter is also very varied and so I will split the Conference Report up into the parts of the Conference agenda as follows:

1. The Environmental Legacy
2. The Future of Russia's Nuclear Deterrent
3. The Nuclear Legacy and Russian Politics
4. The Nuclear Legacy and the International Community
5. The Future of Nuclear Disarmament

I will try to combine the final panel discussion into the above list according to whichever subject was under discussion.

"Part One: The Environmental Legacy" is finished and I will upload it together with this message. I am happy to answer any questions on its content or to forward any addresses of the speakers or papers I picked up.

The speakers were as follows:

1. Kay van der Horst, Texas A&M University, Washington D.C.

Prof. Vitaly Shelest, Scientific Adviser to the State Duma, Moscow  
Thomas Nilssen, Bellona Foundation, Norway  
Joshua Handler, Princeton University, USA

2. Dr. Alexander Nikitin, Center for Political and International Studies, Moscow  
Dr. Igor Sutyagin, USA and Canada Institute, Moscow  
Douglas Shaw, LAWS Washington
3. Prof. Vitaly Shelest, Scientific Advisor to the State Duma, Moscow  
Prof. Ulrich Albrecht, Free University, Berlin  
Dr. Phil Rogers, Central European University, Budapest
4. Jo Husbands, National Academy of Sciences, Washington  
Dr. Annette Schaper, PRIF, Frankfurt  
Alexander Nikitin, CPI, Moscow  
Dr. Viktor Zaborsky, University of Georgia, USA
5. Ambassador Thomas Graham, Jr., LAWS Washington  
Nicola Butler, BASIC Washington  
Oliver Meier, BITS, Berlin  
Dr. Igor Sutyagin, USA and Canada Institute, Moscow

Final Panel: Tom Graham, Jo Husbands, Igor Sutyagin, Kay van der Horst and Otfried Nassauer (BITS, Berlin)

The NGOs attached to these names can be misleading. For example: Dr. Zaborsky is Ukranian and Dr. Sutyagin Russian. Many of the speakers are former government people and are still closely allied to government policy. Some are funded by government sources. However, all seemed to feel the need to put their NGO hats on, not that it disguised anything.

The reports I will send to the abolition-caucus and IPPNW-campaign conferences reflect only my personal understanding of what I heard at the conference. It does not mean I share the opinions of the speakers or that I have correctly understood what they wished to say - although I have attempted of course to do so. It is also not in any way endorsed by the the Berliner Information Centre for Transatlantic Security (BITS), who I thank for letting me attend.

Xanthe Hall  
(Co-Director)

---

IPPNW is a member of Abolition 2000  
- a Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons -

---

## CrossPoint v3.1 ##

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 27 Oct 1997 00:00:00 +0000  
From: IPPNW@OLN.comlink.apc.org (IPPNW Int Aerzte gg Atomkrieg)  
Lines: 91  
Organization: IPPNW Germany  
Path: oln.comlink.apc.org  
Reply-TO: IPPNW@OLN.comlink.apc.org (IPPNW Int Aerzte gg Atomkrieg)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: BITS Conference Part 1  
To: teemu@kaapeli.fi, ippnw.campaign@conf.igc.apc.org,  
abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Gateway: ZCONNECT sonne.comlink.apc.org [UNIX/Connect v0.74b4MB06]  
X-ZC-DDA: 19971027131020W+0  
X-ZC-POST: Koertestrasse 10

## Report

International Workshop  
The Nuclear Legacy of the Former Soviet Union:  
Implications for Security and Ecology

October 17th/18th 1997  
Berlin

The workshop in Berlin, organised by the Berlin Information Centre on Transatlantic Security (BITS), covered several aspects of the nuclear legacy of the Soviet Union: the environmental consequences, current trends in Russian nuclear policy, the nuclear legacy and Russian politics, international programmes to deal with the nuclear legacy, and the future of nuclear disarmament. Finally, there was a discussion with a panel of prominent participants.

The term „nuclear legacy" was not exactly defined by this workshop, but various elements of it were listed by different participants dealing with the clean-up of nuclear sites and the disarmament process. The major programme that was repeatedly mentioned was the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programme instigated by US Senators Nunn and Lugar to deal in particular with the security of fissile materials in Russia. Through the implementation of START I and the dismantling of warheads, the question of safe storage of the removed fissile materials has become paramount to the non-proliferation regime, but also the ecological question remains largely unanswered and unpaid for.

## Part One

### The Environmental Legacy

The prevailing attitude that it is only the Russians that have committed environmental crimes is mistaken - Hanford and Sellafield are evidence that in countries with the wealth to deal with radioactive contamination, the political will has not always been present. Russia does not have the \$1 billion to pay 14,000 workers that Hanford does. In Russia many other problems hinder assistance in dealing with the nuclear legacy: intermilitary distrust, perceived victor and loser attitudes between the USA and Russia, taxation on imported technologies, competition between overlapping programmes, ownership of intellectual property and so on. In addition to competitiveness between the US and Russia, internal competition between different departments and agencies play a role. Sometimes a choice is made to favour continued employment over the environment.

Workers at Murmansk have not been paid for a year now and there is no money to renovate the storage facility in Andreeva Bay on the Kola Peninsula. The storage site is filled to capacity and since the end of 1996 transports to Mayak have stopped, so that it is now overfilled. The waste containers are stored in the open air without any protection. The concrete that has been poured in between the waste-filled casks threatens to crack with the first severe weather and needs to be covered with plastic to prevent a catastrophe. This would not be particularly expensive but it is not being done because all information on Northern Fleet radioactive waste and submarines has been classified as a state secret and therefore does not exist. The storage site is close to the Norwegian border, right next to a large town and the biggest fishing grounds in the area.

In the Russian naval nuclear complex the major problems are in three areas: dumping at sea; shoreside naval waste; and accidents aboard nuclear-powered submarines. The Yablokov Report identified the dumping problem in the Arctic Sea and in the Pacific. Although no significant radiation has yet been found at these sites so far, it is probable that not all the sites have been found and investigated. The objects that have been dumped still need to be found, removed from the sea and properly disposed of. More information is needed on the Novaya Semlya dumping site, especially on the shifts in the ice, which need to be monitored, but there is a lack of funds and equipment for this.

The naval bases close to Norway and Japan have similar problems to one another: unsafe storage of waste; nuclear accidents and shipyard contamination. A major problem is the decommissioning of nuclear submarines. Only around a third of the 150 submarines have had their spent fuel removed. Even after the spent fuel is removed from the submarines, they remain radioactive for about 100 years. The ships carrying the spent fuel are old and frequently have accidents. The spent fuel is taken to Mayak at Chelyabinsk to be reprocessed or stored. The volumes of waste from decommissioning are very large. In 1985 a reactor exploded on a submarine during defuelling, releasing 7 million curies. Ten people died instantly and the whole area was contaminated. Most naval bases are contaminated to some extent or another. There have been sinkings and leakages since, but officers at the bases are very nervous about the possibility of another accident on the same scale as in 1985.

Money is a major problem, which also lies at the root of the problem of who takes responsibility for the clean-up process. While the fleet is still active, the responsibility lies with the Ministry of Defence. After decommissioning it shifts to Minatom. Because only about 10% of the money needed to deal with the problem is allocated, the Navy prefers to spend money on keeping its forces active and developing new submarines, than in decommissioning the old ones. The question of selling uranium to the US to raise more money to decommission raises ideological problems and a conflict has arisen over this between the civilian and military sectors of Minatom.

The State Duma issued an act on "the critical situation with the utilisation of atomic submarines decommissioned by the navy fleet" in June 1997, expressing concern over the situation arising from "the unsatisfactory financing" of decommissioning, particularly at the Northern Fleet sites at Murmansk and Arkhangelsk. The Duma proposes that the government should pay off their debt to the organisations involved in the clean-up process for 1996 and ensure the regular financing of the work in 1997. They recommended further that actions should be taken to activate international cooperation and attract organisations to assist in the decommissioning and treatment of radioactive waste, as well as ensuring the unimpeded transfer of appropriate equipment provided by foreign partners as technical assistance to Russian organisations.

## CrossPoint v3.1 ##



Return-Path: <DCulp@nrdc.org>  
Date: Mon, 27 Oct 1997 08:12:10 -0500  
From: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)  
Subject: DEF. BILL: Stockpile Stewardship and New Nuclear Weapons  
To: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)  
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

## Stockpile Stewardship and New Nuclear Weapons in the Defense Bill

The defense authorization conference report was completed last week. Two provisions on stockpile are below.

It contains one small victory by Rep. Ron Dellums. The language includes "It is the policy of the current administration that new nuclear warhead designs are not required to effectively implement the nuclear deterrence strategy of the United States."

The text was scanned from the "Congressional Record," Thursday, October 23, 1997. There may be some errors from scanning.

-----  
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD-HOUSE, October 23, 1997,  
pp. H9193 and H9194

## CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1119, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

### SEC. 3151. PLAN FOR STEWARDSHIP, MANAGE- MENT, AND CERTIFICATION OF WAR- HEADS IN THE NUCLEAR WEAPONS STOCKPILE.

(a) PLAN REQUIREMENT.--The Secretary of Energy shall develop and annually update a plan for maintaining the nuclear weapons stockpile. The plan shall cover, at a minimum, stockpile stewardship, stockpile management, and program direction and shall be consistent with the programmatic and technical requirements of the most recent annual Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Memorandum.

(b) PLAN ELEMENTS.--The plan and each update of the plan shall set forth the following:

(1) The number of warheads (including active and inactive warheads) for each warhead type in the nuclear weapons stockpile.

(2) The current age of each warhead type, and any plans for stockpile lifetime extensions and modifications or replacement of each warhead type.

(3) The process by which the Secretary of Energy is assessing the lifetime, and requirements

for lifetime extension or replacement, of the nuclear and nonnuclear components of the warheads (including active and inactive warheads) in the nuclear weapons stockpile.

(4) The process used in recertifying the safety, security, and reliability of each warhead type in the nuclear weapons stockpile.

(5) Any concerns which would affect the ability of the Secretary of Energy to recertify the safety, security, or reliability of warheads in the nuclear weapons stockpile (including active and inactive warheads).

(c) ANNUAL SUBMISSION OF PLAN TO CONGRESS.--The Secretary of Energy shall submit to Congress the plan developed under subsection (a) not later than March 15, 1998, and shall submit an updated version of the plan not later than March 15 of each year thereafter. The plan shall be submitted in both classified and unclassified form.

...

#### SEC. 3156. STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.--Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Eliminating the threat posed by nuclear weapons to the United States is an important national security goal.

(2) As long as nuclear threats remain, the nuclear deterrent of the United States must be effective and reliable.

(3) A safe, secure, effective, and reliable United States nuclear stockpile is central to the current nuclear deterrence strategy of the United States.

(4) The Secretary of Energy has undertaken a stockpile stewardship and management program to ensure the safety, security, effectiveness, and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile of the United States, consistent with all United States treaty requirements and the requirements of the nuclear deterrence strategy of the United States.

(5) It is the policy of the current administration that new nuclear warhead designs are not required to effectively implement the nuclear deterrence strategy of the United States.

(b) POLICY.--It is the policy of the United States that-

(1) activities of the stockpile stewardship program shall be directed toward ensuring that the

United States possesses a safe, secure, effective, and reliable nuclear stockpile, consistent with the national security requirements of the United States; and

(2) stockpile stewardship activities of the United States shall be conducted in conformity with the terms of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty signed by the President on September 24, 1996, when and if that treaty enters into force.

###

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 27 Oct 1997 14:09:10 -0800 (PST)  
From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: NPT NGO participation  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org (Unverified)

Dear Friends,

At a meeting last week at the UN, Douglas Roche, former Canadian Ambassador for Disarmament at the UN, suggested that we write follow up letters from our organizations to Ambassador Strulak urging him to honor the requests of the Abolition 2000 supporters who signed the letter below. (The letter was written on letterhead of the Abolition 2000 Working Group for the NPT) Doug plans to write a letter too. Listed below is the letter which was sent to Ambassador Strulak.

At an organizing meeting to form the New England Network for Abolition 2000, participants agreed to write a letter to President Clinton urging greater access for NGOs at the PrepComm. For those of us outside the USA, similar letters to government leaders would be helpful. Regards, Alice Slater

October 10, 1997

Ambassador Tadeusz Strulak  
Foreign Ministry's Department of the UN  
Al. J. Szucha 23, 00580  
Warsaw Poland

Dear Ambassador Strulak,

The Abolition 2000 Network for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons would like to congratulate you on your assumption of the chairmanship of the second Preparatory Committee Meeting for the NPT Review, to be held in Geneva in 1998. We wish you much success in moving the world closer to the promise of the NPT for nuclear disarmament. Abolition 2000, now supported by over 700 organizations, came into being at the 1995 Non-Proliferation Treaty Review and Extension Conference when more than 60 NGOs from every continent met to adopt our founding document, the Abolition Statement, which is enclosed for your information. Impelled by the lack of urgency on the part of the nuclear powers to honor the promise of the NPT's Article VI, the men and women gathered there joined forces to put nuclear abolition on the world's agenda.

Now we are writing to seek your assistance to enable our voices to be heard in a meaningful and constructive way during the 1998 PrepCom. At the 1997 PrepCom, only a small number of the NGOs present were permitted to address the delegates at an unofficial session two days before the conference closed. We received numerous comments from delegates that our information was new and valuable and would have been more useful to them if they had it before their deliberations were virtually completed. Complimenting the NGOs at the end of their presentations, Chairman Patokallio said the comments

were "valuable, interesting, knowledgeable and passionate." Mexico thanked the NGOs for their "technical, specialized information." The NAM paper said that NGOs could make a "positive contribution" towards realizing the objectives of the NPT. Enclosed are the NGO presentations for your review as well as our "Sunflower Statement" to the delegates which urged more meaningful NGO participation in the future.

Unfortunately, NGOs had almost no access to the official proceedings and were admitted at only three sessions during the two week meeting. In this post cold war era, when the NPT is so important to prevent new threats of nuclear proliferation, and in light of the demonstrated competence by NGO leaders to contribute to greater understanding of the issues addressed, we request your support for a minimum level of participation as follows:

1. Access to all plenary meetings
2. NGO presentations at the opening debate at a regular session of the PrepComm (We propose a two hour time allotment at the opening debate for 15 NGO speakers for eight minutes each.)
3. Distribution of all documents to the NGO Committee on Disarmament, which will further distribute them to NGOs present, as well as a mechanism for reciprocal distribution of NGO papers to the delegates.

The proposals above, while absolutely necessary, are not sufficient. We would like an opportunity to discuss with you the importance of our attendance at the main committee meetings as well.

NGOs will be arriving in Geneva, many traveling great distances at their own expense, to participate in helping to move the agenda forward. It is important for the health of the democratic process and for the advancement of the NPT's promise that NGOs be permitted the same level of access and ability to share their information as they have enjoyed at meetings organized to address social, economic, and human rights issues. Dialogue on nuclear disarmament is too important to be engaged in only by government representatives. NGOs have a long and valuable tradition of shedding light on critical global issues and moving us all towards a more peaceful and secure world.

During the two weeks of the PrepCom meeting, Abolition 2000 will organize a series of panel discussions on relevant issues as we did in 1997 in New York. We deeply appreciated your attendance at our panel discussion on the new programs at the nuclear weapons laboratories and hope that you will also find our 1998 panels of interest.

We very much hope that you will support our proposals for greater participation of NGOs at the 1998 PrepCom and help us to broaden the opportunity for dialogue and movement at this meeting towards the swift implementation of the NPT promise for nuclear disarmament.

Sincerely yours,

Alice Slater, Convenor, Abolition 2000 NPT Working Group  
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment, USA  
Kilali Alailima and Richard Salvador, American Friends Service Committee  
Pacific Program, USA

Martin Kalinowski, Internat'l Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation, Germany  
Martin Hemingway, Nuclear Free Local Authorities, UK  
Zia Mian, Center for Energy & Environmental Studies, Princeton University, USA  
Rev. Robert Moore, New Jersey Coalition for Peace Action, USA  
Ellen Thomas, Proposition One Committee, USA  
Cathey Falvo, New York Physicians for Social Responsibility, USA  
Joan Davis, Gray Panthers, USA  
Alyn Ware, Lawyer's Committee on Nuclear Policy, USA  
Hannah Wasserman, Peace Links New York, USA  
Vince Comiskey, Pax Christi International/New Jersey, USA  
Gordon S. Clark, Peace Action National, USA  
John Burroughs & Jackie Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation, USA  
David Krieger, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, USA  
Terje Stokstad & Ole Kopreitan, Nei Til Atomvapen, Norway  
Xanthe Hall, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, Germany  
Tina Bell, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom/New York Metro, USA  
Francisca van Holthoon, International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms, Netherlands  
Selma Brackman, War and Peace Foundation, USA  
Sonya Ostrom, Metro New York Peace Action, USA  
Bob Murken, Pax Christi/Metro New York, USA  
Zachery D. Stein, Life Insurance Committee for Social Responsibility, USA  
Fredrik S. Heffermehl, Norwegian Peace Alliance and Norwegian Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms, Norway  
Ak Malten, Global Anti-Nuclear Alliance, Netherlands  
Robert K. Bogen, Architects/Designers/Planners for Social Responsibility, USA  
Robert Schwartz and Lucy Webster, Economists Allied for Arms Reduction, USA  
Dirk Jan Dullemond, Nederlandse Kernstop Coalitie, Netherlands  
Colin Archer, International Peace Bureau, Switzerland  
Cora Weiss, International Peace Bureau, USA  
Debbie Grisdale, Physicians for Global Survival, Canada  
Kate Dewes, Aotearoa/New Zealand Foundation for Peace Studies, Aotearoa/New Zealand  
David Robinson, Pax Christi International, USA  
Lysiane Alezard, Mouvement de la Paix, France  
Clayton Ramey, Fellowship of Reconciliation, USA  
Ruth Sartisky and Doris K. Miller, Professional Network for Social Responsibility, USA  
Anne Zanes, Communication Coordination Committee for the United Nations, USA  
Anne Anderson, Psychologists for Social Responsibility, USA  
Claire B. Greensfelder, Plutonium Free Future, USA  
Gary Ferdman, Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities, USA  
Robert Green, World Court Project, United Kingdom  
Chris Nye, War Resisters League, USA  
Hiro Umebayashi, Pacific Campaign for Disarmament and Security, Japan  
Frances Connelly, National Peace Council, UK  
David Gracie, American Friends Service Committee, Peace Education Division, USA  
Dave Knight, Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, UK  
Howard W. Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, USA  
Gururaj Mutalik, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War International, USA  
Gabriel Tetiarahi, Hiti Tau Organization, Papeete, Te Ao Maohi (Tahiti,

French Polynesia)

cc: NGO Committee on Disarmament, Geneva

Alice Slater

Global Resource Action Center for the Environment(GRACE)

15 E. 26 St., New York, NY 10010

212-726-9161 (tel)

212-726-9160 (fax)

aslater@igc.apc.org

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 28 Oct 1997 19:04:08  
From: achin@avk.unv.ernet.in  
Organization: Achin Vanaik, Trustee INREP, N.Delhi  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: nuclear terrorism  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, brucehall@igc.org, Dculp@nrdc.org,  
johnpike@fas.org, disarmament@igc.apc.org, wagingpeace@napf.org,  
dkimbal@igc.apc.org

The following article was published in "The Hindu" (a leading national daily of India) on October 27, 1997.

Nuclear Terrorism: A Diversionary Alarm  
By Achin Vanaik

Recent Hollywood blockbusters like "Peacemaker" and "Broken Arrow" are about nuclear terrorism. The U.S. Congress declares this the greatest potential threat to world stability. Even before the USSR's collapse there were fissile "materials unaccounted for" (MUF) which could be traded not only for commercial or civilian but possible military uses. But the scale may have increased significantly because of the decline of Moscow's centralised control over earlier sources and regions no longer in Russia. It is safe to assume that some states are very likely to be involved in such efforts at clandestine acquisition. But the worry is that some end buyers could be private, non-state agents among which could be terrorist groups -- hence the louder, but not new, alarm bells of nuclear terrorism.

Unfortunately, those ringing these bells face a highly awkward yet stubborn historical fact. Forget films and fiction, in the 52 years since the nuclear age began, there has been no evidence that any independent terrorist organisation, criminal or political, has acquired or wanted to acquire nuclear weapons. Designing a crude atomic bomb hasn't been difficult for decades. While establishing facilities for regular supply of weapons grade fuel is only within the province of states, acquiring the wherewithal for making one or two bombs is much easier. Incidentally, the only actors which have exercised nuclear blackmail (veiled or direct) have been some of the nuclear weapons states (NWSs), overwhelmingly the USA.

Furthermore, no terrorist organisation has even bothered to threaten mass destruction through more easily available means, for example, poisoning the water supply of a metropolis (or any city/town/village) to secure its objectives. "Mass killings" carried out by religious cults, and by some political terrorist groups often arising out of some hostage scenario, have amounted at most to a few hundreds, usually much less. In contrast, the scale of terrorism launched by states e.g. in Vietnam, Kampuchea, etc. can figure in the millions. Also, the only actual acts of nuclear terrorism -- Hiroshima and Nagasaki -- were perpetrated by a state.

True, states have much greater means at their disposal, but non-nuclear technologies for mass destruction, though available, have not been used by terrorists. This is because the crux of the matter is

not availability of means but of the contrast in ends between those of states and terrorist combat groups or individuals. Most alarmists fail to understand the basic nature of terrorism, whether political or criminal. The fundamental purpose of an act of political terrorism is either symbolic (making a 'dramatic' statement of political intent or commitment) or very specific (demanding the release of prisoners, etc.) or both. Non-political, criminal terrorism is purely functional usually having financial gain as its limited objective. In both these forms there is always a very strong relationship of proportionality between ends sought and means to be used.

A political terrorist act aims to raise morale among supporters and to weaken it among the enemy forces and its wider support base. When this is not for revenge, the act itself is pointless unless responsibility for it is made public. Nor should casualties be of such a scale or kind that the purpose of the act is nullified. It is one thing, therefore, to carry out a bomb attack (often suicidal) killing scores, another to threaten to, or poison, the water supply of a city and kill in tens of thousands, let alone in hundreds of thousands. The latter makes no political sense whatsoever. Since the attacker's political affiliation must be made public, the act itself should never be of such a nature as to massively alienate its popular support or to rationalise and justify state retaliation against the terrorists' 'home population' on a scale itself involving thousands or hundreds of thousands. Which is what a terrorist act involving the use or even threat of use of an instrument of mass destruction, chemical, biological or nuclear, would do.

In short, it has never made any sense for terrorist groups to even think of competing with governments when it comes to upping the scale of destruction threatened or carried out. Even a revenge killing e.g. the assassinations of Rajiv Gandhi and Mrs. Gandhi, makes sense only because the target is a specifically defined 'culprit' or 'culprits' which can never be large populations. Thus, even when terrorist actions are repeatedly used in the course of a national liberation struggle, each of these acts require specific and therefore limited means related to the specificity of the objectives.

This brings us to the nub of the issue. It is only the sustenance of 'grandiose' objectives that can justify and rationalise comfortably the possession, use or threat of use of 'grandiose' means, that is, instruments of mass destruction. A national liberation movement has a 'grand' ultimate objective (to establish a new country or rule) but it is states alone that can most convincingly claim such grandiose objectives as a matter of regularised routine. These can range from the claim to 'defending the security of the nation' to 'defending the free world' to 'defeating world imperialism' to behaving like a 'world power' (for which purpose having nuclear weapons can be deemed vital) to shifting the 'balance of power' in one's favour by sending a political message to one's perceived rival (this was one reason for the dropping of bombs on Hiroshima/Nagasaki). The objective functions of such alarm bells over nuclear terrorism are threefold.

First, it justifies states retaining nuclear weapons to the point where either the goal of a completely nuclear weapons free world or the pace at which we should move towards it, is undermined. In a fully nuclear free world, there is always the abstract possibility of

a 'break-out'. But the recalcitrant is far more likely to be a state or states than a terrorist organisation. To guard against such a possible 'break-out' some might argue for the existence of some small nuclear arsenal under some form of international control for a transitional period until complete and permanent global disarmament becomes a universally accepted norm. But it is states not nuclear terrorist groups that are the strongest (probably only) candidates for 'break-out'.

The second function is to divert focus away from the behaviour, attitudes and thinking of state elites. Terrorists are supposed to be frighteningly irresponsible unlike those who run or influence states. This assumption is nonsensical and flies in the face of all historical evidence. It is precisely the mind-set of nuclear elites everywhere that is the principal barrier to achieving a nuclear free world. Of course, the elites of the NWSs are mostly responsible for this, but every addition to the number of NWSs does not improve but worsens the global situation.

The third function is to quietly let the mind-set of nuclear deterrence get off the hook. Deterrence is simply a way of rationalising the adoption of a fundamentally terrorist way of thinking about nuclear weapons. This is precisely why so many anti-nuclearists and indeed the International Court of Justice has considered deterrence thinking deeply immoral and itself the fundamental source of the problem of nuclear insecurity. It is why, until recently, the official position of the Indian government used to be that nuclear deterrence is an "abhorrent doctrine". A supposed sign of India's reaching political maturity is that it is now more willing than ever (in the names of deterrence and world status) to consider going openly nuclear.

Of course, a fuller critique of nuclear deterrence thinking would expose not only its moral but political bankruptcy, and why it generates lesser not greater security. Suffice it to say here, that it is not the dramatic threat posed by some very distinctive or evil or insane group of people -- the nuclear terrorists -- that is the source of greatest future or current danger. It is the routinised and disguised terrorism of deterrence thinking by very ordinary, sane, and in so many other ways very humane and moral-minded, people who shape and make policy decisions, that constitutes the biggest danger and the strongest obstacle towards the emergence of a nuclear weapons free world.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 28 Oct 1997 09:19:26 -0800  
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: changed article on CLINTON AND DISARMAMENT  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

There has been a change in the text of an article we sent you earlier. You can find it at  
[http://www.wagingpeace.org/clinton\\_disarmament.html](http://www.wagingpeace.org/clinton_disarmament.html)  
Sorry for reposting!

PRESIDENT CLINTON AND DISARMAMENT:  
MISSING AN APPOINTMENT WITH HISTORY?  
by David Krieger

At the outset of President Clinton's second term there was hope among those working for a more peaceful world that the new term would be different and more positive than the first term. Clinton has been a master at generating hope--and then dashing it with policies that fail to meet the expectations he has engendered. Sadly, by his lack of positive initiative in the area of disarmament, President Clinton may be missing his appointment with history.

Clinton began his first term as U.S. President by announcing support for gays in the military. The military opposition to this was so strong that Clinton has not challenged the military on any issue since. Even now in his second term, with no further elections facing him, Clinton appears to be incapable of challenging the military in any significant way, no matter how outrageous their appetite for armaments and other resources.

Most recently, under pressure from the military, Clinton refused to support the ban on land mines, which has now been signed by over 100 other countries. The reason given was that land mines were needed to protect U.S. troops in Korea. Weighing the risks to U.S. troops from a low probability of attack by North Korea against the ongoing carnage of some 26,000 civilians annually caused by land mines, Clinton again made a short-sighted choice. It is a choice, however, which fits his pattern of supporting the position espoused by the military regardless of the values of human decency being trampled upon or the prospects of creating a more peaceful world.

Congressman Walter Capps responded to the President's refusal to support the land mine ban, stating, "I rise today in great dismay over the President's decision not to sign the Ottawa Treaty banning antipersonnel land mines. The administration's position defies reason. The only way that the United States can show leadership on this issue is to sign the comprehensive ban treaty on these deadly devices. One hundred nations courageously have changed their policy, but U.S. lawyers have simply changed the definition of a land mine.

"But a land mine by any other name is still a land mine, and land mines are immoral. People around the globe have come together to say, no more. No more killing, no more maiming, no more maiming of innocents. No more fear of leaving one's home to find food. No more social and economic dislocation to the world's neediest countries. I ask the President to sign the treaty to ban the antipersonnel land mines."

President Clinton has supported an unnecessarily high military budget in the post-Cold War period. The U.S. budget for "defense" of around \$265 billion per year exceeds the combined military expenditures of the next nine highest spending countries. It is more than 25 times greater than the combined military budgets of countries which might be perceived as potential enemies of the United States, such as Iran, Iraq, Libya, Syria, and North Korea. These huge military expenditures are expected to continue throughout Clinton's second term to the detriment of domestic programs for health and education and alleviation of poverty in the

United States and abroad.

Under Clinton's leadership, the U.S. continues to be the world's largest arms dealer. In 1996 the U.S. sold \$13.8 billion in weapons and military supplies to the rest of the world, including some \$7.3 billion to developing countries. The Clinton Administration has been active in seeking new markets for U.S. weapons. In 1997 President Clinton reversed a 20 year prohibition on the sale of sophisticated weapons systems to Latin America. He appears to be willing to sell high-tech military equipment to Latin America, such as jet fighters, that even Presidents Reagan and Bush would not consider doing.

When the U.S. Congress passed an Arms Trade Code of Conduct as an amendment to the State Department Authorization Act, which set limits on selling arms to dictators, including the most egregious violators of human rights, the Clinton Administration opposed the legislation. The Administration argued that the President needed the freedom to sell arms to whatever countries he chose, regardless of their human right records or whether or not they were democracies.

Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney, the principal sponsor of the Arms Trade Code of Conduct amendment, has pointed out, "In the past four years, 85 percent of U.S. arms sales to the Third World have gone to undemocratic governments. The United States is responsible for 44 percent of all weapons deliveries in the world. The United States is unqualifiedly the arms dealer to the world, and the merchant for death to the world's dictators." During Clinton's first term in office, his administration supported the militaries of non-democratic governments with \$35.9 billion for arms and training, an average of \$9 billion per year. This was 82 percent of the \$44 billion in total U.S. military support for developing nations.

In the area of nuclear disarmament, President Clinton has been a great disappointment. He has done virtually nothing to advance the process toward a nuclear weapons free world. In fact, he has taken steps which move us in the opposite direction. His strong advocacy of NATO expansion is viewed by the Russians as threatening and has been an impediment to the Russian Duma ratifying START II. George Kennan has called NATO expansion "the most fateful error of American policy in the entire post-Cold War era."

The Clinton administration agreed with the Russians earlier this year to push back the date for completing START II reductions to 3,000-3,500 deployed strategic nuclear warheads for five years from the beginning of 2003 to the end of 2007. The number of deployed strategic nuclear warheads is only about one-third of the total number of nuclear weapons that each side will continue to retain in its arsenal. At the same time, the administration negotiated Russian approval for the U.S. to continue its extensive Ballistic Missile Defense testing without being in violation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

President Clinton has had preliminary discussions with Russian President Yeltsin about a START III agreement to reduce deployed strategic nuclear arsenals to 2,000-2,500 by the year 2007. This would be a reduction of some 1,000 nuclear warheads beyond START II levels in the five year period following the initial date set for completion of START II. While this is a welcome small step, it is a step of minimal significance which largely misses the unique opportunity now available to take larger strides.

While President Clinton did give leadership in achieving a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), the U.S. has already begun conducting "sub-critical" nuclear weapons tests in the first year of his new term. This testing, which may be used to improve the reliability and efficiency of nuclear weapons and even to test new weapons designs, is widely viewed by non-nuclear weapons states to be a sign of bad faith and to undermine the treaty. U.S. "sub-critical" tests may lead other nuclear weapons states to conduct similar tests, and could lead to a breakdown of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The U.S., under Clinton's leadership, is also embarking on a \$60 billion Stockpile Stewardship Program over the next 13 years, a main feature of which is laboratory testing of nuclear weapons. The program includes the development of the National Ignition Facility (NIF) at Lawrence Livermore Laboratory for conducting thermonuclear tests with high powered lasers.

The most positive effort made by President Clinton on disarmament issues was his leadership in achieving Senate ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention. He has also indicated his intention to provide leadership for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It is unlikely that this treaty will ever enter into force, however, because India's ratification is also necessary for this to happen. India has stated that it will not ratify the treaty until the declared nuclear weapons states make a serious commitment to eliminate their nuclear arsenals, as they are required to do by Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The Clinton Administration has taken some positive steps to control the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Overall, however, the Administration's record on disarmament leaves considerable room for improvement. President Clinton's Administration has continued to feed the military's gargantuan appetite for resources, has been the major pusher of armaments throughout the world, has been largely indiscriminate in the sale of armaments, has been hypocritical in its approach to arms control and disarmament, has failed to seize the extraordinary opportunity now present for nuclear disarmament, and has opposed reasonable and needed measures such as the ban on landmines.

In part, the Clinton administration's record on disarmament may be attributable to having to compromise in order to contend with a conservative Congress. This, however, does not explain fully why President Clinton has failed to provide more significant leadership in realizing the opportunities for disarmament presented by the end of the Cold War.

If Mr. Clinton wants to be remembered positively for his accomplishments in the area of controlling armaments and achieving disarmament in his second term, he will need to rethink most of his present policies and exercise more visionary and courageous leadership in approaching disarmament and the curtailment of arms transfers as a means to increase U.S. and global security. If he fails to exercise such leadership, he will almost certainly miss his appointment with history.

---

\* David Krieger is president of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.

#### NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

\*\*\*\*\*

A founding member of  
and global contact point for the  
Abolition 2000 Global Network for the  
Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

\*\*\*\*\*

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123  
Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794  
Phone (805) 965-3443 \* Fax (805) 568-0466  
E- mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org  
<http://www.wagingpeace.org>

\$\$\$\$\$\$\$ 12 LINES REFORMATTED BY POPPER AT [igc.apc.org](http://igc.apc.org) \$\$\$\$\$

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

X-Authentication-Warning: igc2.igc.apc.org: majordomo set sender to owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org using -f

Date: Tue, 28 Oct 1997 13:06:39 -0800 (PST)

From: NGO Committee on Disarmament <disarmtimes@igc.apc.org>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Nukes in 52nd UNGA

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

FACTS ON THE 52nd U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
from the NGO Committee on Disarmament, New York

## NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

### RESOLUTIONS OF THE 51st G.A.

Last year's General Assembly adopted a number of resolutions calling for the elimination of nuclear weapons. A resolution introduced by Japan called for efforts toward the "ultimate" goal of eliminating nuclear weapons, without reference to any specific measures to achieve this goal, and was thus able to be adopted unanimously. A resolution introduced by the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) asked the Conference on Disarmament to establish an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament to commence negotiations on "the elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework," a disarmament program which is not supported by the nuclear weapon states or their Western allies. The resolution was approved by 110-39, with 20 abstentions. There was no resolution on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

The resolution that received the greatest attention was the one introduced by Malaysia, noting the 1996 Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice (which found the threat and use of nuclear weapons generally illegal and reaffirmed the legal obligation to conclude negotiations on nuclear disarmament in all its aspects) and calling for the first time for negotiations to commence leading to a Nuclear Weapons Convention which would eliminate the weapons. The vote was 115-22, with 32 abstentions; China voted yes, the other nuclear states no. The issue of follow-up to the Advisory Opinion is on the First Committee's agenda this year.

### ACTION SINCE LAST YEAR'S GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Efforts to advance nuclear disarmament this year have been marred by stalemates and setbacks. The Conference on Disarmament concluded its year's session without even agreeing on its work program. The Group of 21 (mostly non-aligned countries now numbering 30) wants nuclear disarmament to be discussed as the top priority of the CD, and to encompass a program leading to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. The nuclear weapon states, and many Western allies, will not agree to establish an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament in the CD, asserting that the CD should be working on a treaty to cut off the production of fissile material for weapons, and that other negotiations such as cuts in nuclear weapon stockpiles should be conducted by the nuclear states themselves. The Group of 21 rejects the limited mandate for fissile material cutoff negotiations. The meeting of the Preparatory

Committee for the NPT Review, though a successful initiation of the strengthened review process, did not produce significant momentum on disarmament issues.

As of this writing, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty has been ratified by only one (Japan) of the 44 states whose ratifications are required for the treaty to enter into force, and 3 of the 44 (India, Pakistan, North Korea) have still not signed. The "subcritical" tests conducted by the U.S. -- and speculation that Russia is also planning subcritical experiments -- substantiate some of the objections that led to India's rejection of the treaty, making its entry into force very unlikely in the near future. The U.S. Senate has begun debating CTBT ratification, but the treaty's passage is far from assured.

Current U.S. policy rejects multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament until U.S. and Russian stockpiles are dramatically reduced. However, the atmosphere for bilateral negotiations may be threatened as plans for the eastward expansion of NATO move forward. U.S. and Russian officials, hailing their recent agreement to slow the implementation of START II, claim the new protocol will ease that treaty's ratification in the Russian Duma.

Pressure from the non-governmental community for progress on nuclear disarmament has been intense. In December 1996, over sixty retired military leaders called for a renewed commitment to eliminate nuclear weapons. The U.S. National Academy of Sciences and other prestigious NGOs have produced high-level reports advocating preliminary disarmament steps. A group of diplomats, lawyers and disarmament experts released a model Nuclear Weapons Convention at the U.N. during the NPT PrepCom meeting in April 1997. Their efforts complement those of the rapidly growing Abolition 2000 network, which seeks agreement on a Nuclear Weapons Convention by the year 2000.

#### STATEMENTS AT THIS YEAR'S G.A.

"I am pleased to announce that today I am sending this crucial treaty [the CTBT] to the United States Senate for ratification. Our common goal should be to enter the CTBT into force as soon as possible, and I ask for all of you to support that goal." - U.S. (President)

"Nuclear weapon powers owe it to the world to answer the question why they need nuclear weapons. Global opinion wants a Nuclear Weapons Convention, as already outlined for the class of biological and chemical weapons, and will not rest till it is achieved. We appeal to nuclear weapon states to align their policies to what the world wants. We see the United Nations as the forum in which the international community must continue to demand universal nuclear disarmament, and we expect therefore that the Secretariat's programmes will support this inter- governmental objective."  
- India (Prime Minister)

"...the arsenals of the two largest nuclear weapon powers will be reduced by eighty per cent as compared to what they used to be at the height of the Cold War. I wish to say in the full sense of responsibility that we do not view those cuts as the limit and we are ready to move ahead." - Russian Federation (Foreign Minister)

"Now is the time for serious consideration of an integrated approach, encompassing both bilateral and multilateral negotiations, culminating in an international agreement on a total ban on nuclear weapons....My plea is for reflection on the part of all; for compromise and for cooperation and for a flexible rather than a dogmatic approach." - Ireland (Foreign Minister)

"The international community last year hailed the adoption of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test- Ban Treaty. My country, Fiji, was the first to ratify it. In the interest of lasting peace and security on our planet and in the interest of all mankind, we would urge all States which have not done so yet, to sign and ratify the Treaty. The Treaty would be meaningless, however, unless we pursue the rapid and positive implementation of its provisions. We therefore deplore the recent announcement by one nuclear weapon State to conduct a series of "sub-critical" underground nuclear tests which, in our view, represent a blatant disregard of the expressed concerns of the international community."  
- Fiji (Ambassador, to the First Committee)

#### ISSUES BEFORE THE FIRST COMMITTEE

Not much has changed in the diplomacy of nuclear disarmament over the past year, especially in light of revitalized NGO campaigning on the issue. The debate in the First Committee may be little more than an echo of last year, with the non-aligned countries insisting on the "time-bound framework" approach over the opposition of the nuclear powers and their NATO allies. Look for a repeat of the Malaysian resolution on a Nuclear Weapons Convention. If more of the Western group were to embrace such a convention in principle, it could open a way to significant negotiations not pinned to a predetermined timeframe. Among the nuclear weapon states, the position of the U.K. could show new flexibility. The new Labour government is more inclined toward disarmament measures, and public opinion there strongly favors abolition. According to a Sept. 1997 Gallup opinion poll, 87% of the British public want their government to help negotiate a treaty to eliminate nuclear weapons.

The CTBT is likely to be a key point of contention in the debate, whether or not any resolutions emerge on the issue. The slow pace of ratifications, the subcritical tests (which are seen by some to violate the spirit of the treaty), and the absence of key nuclear weapons-capable states from the treaty all figure in the political posturing in the First Committee. Bilateral nuclear arms negotiations may be another source of controversy, with competing resolutions again likely.

#### 52nd GENERAL ASSEMBLY CALENDAR

Session opens 16 Sept.

First Committee (Disarmament and International Security) Debate begins 13 Oct.

First Committee Voting on Resolutions 10-18 Nov

G.A. Voting on Resolutions in December

\*\*\*\*\*

The NGO Committee on Disarmament has also produced factsheets on land mines and conventional arms issues before the 52nd General Assembly. Contact the Committee if you would like those factsheets faxed or e-mailed to you.

NGO Committee on Disarmament  
777 U.N. Plaza #3B, New York NY 10017, USA  
tel 1.212.687.5340 fax 1.212.687.1643  
internet [disarmtimes@igc.apc.org](mailto:disarmtimes@igc.apc.org)  
and <http://www.peacenet.org/disarm/>  
Roger K. Smith, Network Coordinator

Return-Path: <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Date: Wed, 29 Oct 1997 10:41:23 -0500  
From: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Balances  
Sender: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id HAA03059

Re your letter of October 27, my records show Rubin Grant expenditures of \$9424.27 leaving a balance of \$575.73.

I'll pick up the IGC bill this evening and write checks for it and the telephone bill thereafter and put them in the mail to you.

I would suggest honoring your request for \$600 for three days work in October and allow the Rubin Grant account to show a modest loss for the official record. Might that not make a better overall report than zeroing out?

At any rate, I'll send you another print out in case I've wrongly credited some expenditure.

To: jimvert@worldnet.att.net  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject:  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Carol:

Thanks for giving me accurate information on your contributions. Our records were in somewhat disarray, and we have been trying to straighten them out. We appreciate your continued support.

The campaign for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is proceeding. We are encouraging grassroots delegations to meet with their senators when Congress is in recess from mid-November until late January 1998. In Tennessee Senator Frist deserves particular attention because he is a swing vote and might influence others. Perhaps you could form a delegation in your area with other religious groups and persons from Physicians for Social Responsibility and the like. Also, could you encourage your bishop to get in touch with Senator Frist.

The CTBT campaign has established "principal contacts" in various key states, persons who have agreed to help form state coalitions. The one for Tennessee is Bill Aiken, Mid-South Peace and Justice Center, P.O. Box 11428, Memphis, TN 38111-0428; phone 901 452-6997; fax 901 452-7029; e-mail pax@magibox.net. I realize that he is at the other end of the state, but I'll channel your name to him in case he wants to get in touch with you. Maybe we need a principal contact in Eastern Tennessee. Is this something you might undertake? It would require getting in touch with grassroots contacts supplied by cooperating national organizations and facilitating their working together.

Whatever you can do, we greatly appreciate your activities.

With best regards,

Howard Hallman

To: nfpb@gn.apc.org  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Religious Working Group  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Philip Austin:

Excuse my delay in responding to your inquiry about the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition. It was formed this spring among American abolitionists from religious organizations. We have previously cooperated in developing joint worship and celebration material, such as when the CTBT was signed, and have discussed other ways we can work together within the Abolition 2000 movement.

At the moment we are developing plans for religious organizations to have an impact at the next NPT PrepCom meeting in Geneva. We would like to develop contacts with you and others in the UK for this purpose. I'll let you know as plans unfold.

We have established a list-serve to keep in touch on matters of special concern, supplemental to abolition-caucus. We are just beginning to develop the list. You can subscribe by sending a message to <majordomo@igc.org> and in the body of the message say: subscribe abolition-caucus.

With best regards,

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

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 29 Oct 1997 15:17:03 -0500  
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org  
Subject: Pena - SS& CTBT  
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

To: CTBT Organizers  
From: Disarmament  
Subject: Pena - SS & CTBT

The Washington Times  
October 29, 1997

Nuclear Weapons and the CTBT  
Federico Pena

On Sept. 24, 1996, President Clinton signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the culmination of a 40-year, bipartisan quest to end nuclear testing. The treaty is now before the Senate for approval, and this week the first hearings have begun. The Test Ban Treaty should be approved because it is an important tool to combat nuclear proliferation and will strengthen regional and global security. It serves the national security interests of the United States.

The hearings will focus on two fundamental questions: Can we maintain our nuclear arsenal without nuclear explosive testing and can we effectively monitor whether other countries are conducting tests? The answer is yes to both.

In 1992, a bipartisan majority in the Congress led by Sens. Mark Hatfield, Oregon Republican, James Exon, Nebraska Democrat and George Mitchell, Maine Democrat, legislated a ban on U.S. nuclear testing to begin in 1996. In 1993, Mr. Clinton directed the Energy Department to develop the Stockpile Stewardship program — a way of maintaining our nuclear weapons without nuclear testing.

The Stockpile Stewardship program gives us the information necessary to determine whether our nuclear weapons are safe, secure and reliable, now and in the future. We are using data from past nuclear tests, high-speed super-computers, non-nuclear subcritical experiments and high-tech simulation experiments to check and correct problems in the nuclear stockpile — problems that in the past would have been resolved by nuclear testing. We are also constructing new facilities, such as the National Ignition Facility which will have the world's largest laser, to give us the additional laboratory capabilities and the data we will need to maintain our nuclear weapons in the future.

Some charge that stockpile stewardship is too costly, that it will be used to develop new and more destructive nuclear weapons, or that it can not work and that the United States needs to conduct nuclear tests. Let me address these concerns.

First, Stockpile Stewardship costs — about \$4.5 billion in 1999 - are about 2 cents out of every dollar this nation spend on defense — a small price to pay to ensure our nuclear deterrent is safe and reliable. This represents a significant reduction from Cold War expenditures when the United States averaged more than \$6 billion per year to develop, build, test and maintain our nuclear arsenal.

Second, Stockpile Stewardship will not support the development of advanced new types of nuclear weapons. Without nuclear testing, the nuclear weapons states will not be able to develop, with confidence, advanced new nuclear weapons types.

Third, Stockpile Stewardship is already working today to maintain our nuclear deterrent, and it is on course to do so in the future. The president has directed a new annual certification procedure for each weapons type in the stockpile, to identify any safety or reliability problems that could undermine our deterrent.

In this review, the defense secretary and I must certify to the President, in writing, that our nuclear arsenal is safe and reliable. We do so with the full input and advice from the Energy Department's nuclear weapons laboratory directors, the Nuclear Weapons Council and U.S. Strategic Command, after they thoroughly examine each weapons type. We have completed one annual review and certification that our weapons are safe and reliable, and we will soon complete the second certification.

We have a high degree of confidence in Stockpile Stewardship. But if I were informed that there is a problem with the stockpile we could not correct without returning to underground nuclear testing, I would so advise the president.

President Clinton has made clear that Stockpile Stewardship will require sustained bipartisan support from the administration and the Congress for the next decade and beyond. We're committed to working with Congress to ensure that support, both from the Stockpile Stewardship budget and for the president's six Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty safeguards. These safeguards are important — they strengthen our commitment to Stockpile Stewardship and specify the conditions under which the United States would be prepared to withdraw from the Treaty in the event nuclear testing were required.

Critics of the CTBT also argue the United States can not effectively verify a ban on nuclear testing. But our intelligence capabilities, the Treaty's verification provision and our diplomatic efforts provide the tools we need to effectively verify compliance.

Moreover, Mr. Clinton has directed a number of enhancements in our monitoring capabilities and included them in the six Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty safeguards. Congress has not yet provided full funding for these vital enhancements — which are needed with or without a CTBT — and we are committed to working with Congress to ensure adequate funding.

The vision of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty began with Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy. The zero-yield Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty signed by President Clinton can finally make this vision a reality.

We have the means to end nuclear testing and to maintain the safety, security and reliability of our nation's nuclear weapons. We look forward to working with the Senate as it begins its review of this landmark treaty.

\*\*\*\*\*

Federico Pena is U.S. Secretary of Energy

\*\*\*\*\*

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005  
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232  
FAX: 202 898 0172  
<disarmament@igc.org>

Return-Path: <mupj>  
Date: Thu, 30 Oct 1997 08:00:22 -0500 (EST)  
From: LCNP@aol.com  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Alert: Nuclear Abolition resolution at UN  
ReSent-Date: Thu, 30 Oct 1997 09:52:36 -0800 (PST)  
ReSent-From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
ReSent-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
ReSent-Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91.971030095236.799A@igc.apc.org>  
To: "undisclosed-recipients:;"

!!!NUCLEAR ABOLITION RESOLUTION SUBMITTED TO UN!!!

\*\*\*\*VOTE LESS THAN TWO WEEKS AWAY\*\*\*\*

October 29, 1997

Malaysia today submitted a draft resolution to the United Nations General Assembly recalling the International Court of Justice advisory opinion on the threat or use of nuclear weapons, and calling for implementation of this opinion by the commencement of negotiations leading to the conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention.

A similar resolution was adopted by the United Nations on 10 December 1996, by a vote of 115 in favour to 22 against and 32 abstentions.

Last year the only Western States to support were Sweden, Ireland, Aotearoa-New Zealand and San Marino (which also cosponsored). However, a number of Western countries, including Austria, Iceland, Australia, Japan and Norway abstained. Of the nuclear weapon States, China voted in favour while the other opposed. This year Malaysia is trying to encourage more support from the west by welcoming efforts made by the US and Russia in bilateral disarmament steps.

In addition, the draft resolution introduces a reporting process on efforts to implement the ICJ decision and to achieve nuclear disarmament.

The resolution will be voted on in the disarmament committee of the United Nations in the week of November 10, and in the UN plenary in early December. Most countries vote the same way in both fora.

**ACTION:** Please contact your foreign minister or leader or ambassador to the United Nations immediately and request that your country joins as a cosponsor of the resolution, or at least votes in favour.

Attached is the draft resolution and list of current cosponsors.

For more information, including the voting pattern for last year's resolution, contact:

Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy  
666 Broadway, #625  
New York, NY 10012.

Phone (1) 212 674 7790. Fax (1) 212 674 6199.  
Email; lcnp@aol.com

Return-Path: <mupj>  
Date: Thu, 30 Oct 1997 08:01:07 -0500 (EST)  
From: LCNP@AOL.COM  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: UN resolution: text  
ReSent-Date: Thu, 30 Oct 1997 09:52:56 -0800 (PST)  
ReSent-From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
ReSent-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
ReSent-Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91.971030095255.799B@igc.apc.org>  
To: "undisclosed-recipients:;"

Delegation of Malaysia  
First Committee

Agenda Item 71 (k)

Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons.

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 49/75 K of 15 December 1994 and 51/45 M of 10 December 1996,

Convinced that the continuing existence of nuclear weapons poses a threat to all humanity and that their use would have catastrophic consequences for all life on Earth and recognizing that the only complete defence against a nuclear catastrophe is the elimination of nuclear weapons and the assurance that they will never be produced again,

Mindful of the solemn obligations of States, undertaken in Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament;

Recalling the "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament" adopted at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and in particular the objective of determined pursuit by the nuclear-weapon States of systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally with the ultimate goal of eliminating those weapons;

Recalling also the adoption of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty by the General Assembly in its resolution 50/245 on 10 September 1996;

Recognizing with satisfaction that the Antarctic treaty and the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba are gradually freeing the entire southern hemisphere and adjacent areas covered by those treaties from nuclear weapons,

Noting the efforts by the States possessing the largest inventories of nuclear weapons to reduce their stockpiles of such weapons through bilateral and unilateral agreements or arrangements, and calling for the intensification of such efforts to accelerate the significant reduction of nuclear weapons arsenals,

Recognizing the need for a multilaterally negotiated and legally binding instrument to assure non-nuclear weapon States against the threat or use of nuclear weapons,

Reaffirming the central role of the Conference on Disarmament as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum and regretting the lack of progress in disarmament negotiations, particularly nuclear disarmament in the Conference on Disarmament in its 1997 session,

Emphasizing the need for the Conference on Disarmament to commence negotiations on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time,

Desiring to achieve the objective of a legally binding prohibition of the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, threat or use of nuclear weapons and their destruction under effective international control,

Recalling the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, issued on 8 July 1996,

1. Underlines once again the unanimous decision of the Court there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control;

2. Calls upon once again all states to immediately fulfill that obligation by commencing multilateral negotiations in 1998 leading to an early conclusion of a Nuclear Weapons Convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination;

3. Requests all States to inform the Secretary-General of the efforts and measures they have taken on the implementation of this resolution and nuclear disarmament, and requests the Secretary-General to appraise the general Assembly of that information at its fifty-third session;

4. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its fifty-second session the item entitled "Follow up to the International Court of Justice advisory opinion on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons".

29 October, 1997

Return-Path: <mupj>  
Date: Thu, 30 Oct 1997 08:01:28 -0500 (EST)  
From: LCNP@aol.com  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: UN resolution: Cosponsors  
ReSent-Date: Thu, 30 Oct 1997 09:53:08 -0800 (PST)  
ReSent-From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
ReSent-To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
ReSent-Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91.971030095308.799C@igc.apc.org>  
To: "undisclosed-recipients:;"

Malaysian draft resolution to the UN

Cosponsors  
as at October 29

Bangladesh  
Brazil  
Brunei Darussalam  
Burundi  
Colombia  
Ecuador  
El Salvador  
Fiji  
Ghana  
Guyana  
Honduras  
India  
Indonesia  
Iran  
Iraq  
Kenya  
Lao People's Democratic Republic  
Malawi  
Malaysia  
Marshall Islands  
Mexico  
Mongolia  
Myanmar  
Namibia  
Niger  
Nigeria  
Panama  
Peru  
Philippines  
Samoa  
San Marino  
Singapore  
Solomon Islands  
Sri Lanka  
Sudan  
Tanzania  
Thailand

Uruguay  
Viet NAM  
Zimbabwe

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Cc: abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca, disarmament@igc.apc.org, elsa@nic.inbe.ne,  
faom@myriad.its.unimelb.EDU.AU, foesydney@peg.ap,  
GCC01403@niftyserve.or.jp, geowcpuk@gn.apc.org, guardian@peg.apc.org,  
ipb@gn.apc.org, jovall@perth.dialix.oz.au, k.graham@int-idea.se,  
KARAKIA@aol.com, Lars.Albath@recht.uni-glessen.de,  
mcmaholu@wpof.parliament.govt.nz, nei.til.atomvapen@sn.no,  
osen@basalmed.uio.no, Pacific@rainbow.net.au, pacificnews@peg.apc.org,  
pdpjones@peg.apc.org, peace-caucus@igc.apc.org, petweiss@igc.org,  
pma@xtra.co.nz, rfpicr@sol.racsa.co.cr, takubo@alles.or.jp,  
Thomas.Pfeiffer@stud.uni-regensburg.de, wareham@ozemail.com.au

Date: Thu, 30 Oct 1997 16:43:59 GMT

From: NATO Alerts Network <nan@gn.apc.org>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Re: Alert: Nuclear Abolition resolution at UN

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, LCNP@aol.com

Congratulations, Alyn and company, on all the good work you have been doing on this issue. It is certainly receiving a lot of attention and support. And because of this hard work, the Lawyers' Committee received at least three mentions by name in the speeches of three separate countries at the UN First Committee recently.

This is rare and deserves to be recognized. Keep up the excellent work!!

Sharon Riggle  
CESD

>From mupj Thu Oct 30 12:29:57 1997

Return-Path: <mupj@igc.apc.org>

Date: Thu, 30 Oct 1997 12:29:39 -0800 (PST)

X-Sender: mupj@pop.igc.org (Unverified)

To: ograbc@aol.com, jmatlack@erols.com, washofc@aol.com,  
cwu\_washington.parti@ecunet.org, bridget@fcnl.org, mccwash@igc.apc.org,  
mupj@igc.apc.org, network@igc.apc.org, barbara\_green@pcusa.org,  
uuawo@aol.com, joannabaker@juno.com, dgracie@afsc.org,  
tom.hart@ecunet.org, epf@igc.apc.org, cramey@igc.apc.org,  
mark.brown@ecunet.org, mknolldc@igc.apc.org, ncc\_washington@ecunet.org,  
lwyolton@prodigy.com, dave@paxchristiusa.org, gpowers@nccbuscc.org

From: mupj@igc.apc.org

Sender: mupj@igc.org

To: Religious Organizations Participating in CTBT Ratification Campaign

From: Howard W. Hallman

Re: Meeting of Nuclear Weapons Working Group, October 30, 1997

Bob Tiller (PSR) reported on two days of Senate subcommittee hearings on CTBT and Stockpile Stewardship.

Lisa Ledwidge (PSR) is generating contacts in Indiana to urge Senate Lugar to take a leadership role on the CTBT. She will be in Indiana the week after next and would like to meet with activists in Indianapolis on Monday evening, November 10. Get in touch with her if you have contacts who can participate.

Lisa is also working with a PSR contact in New Mexico to put together a delegation to seek a meeting with Senator Domenici. If you have names to suggest, get in touch with her.

Fran Teplitz (Peace Action) is working with a contact in Maine to form a delegation to call upon the two senators. She would welcome other names. Fran also needs contacts in Kentucky.

Laura Kriv (20/20) is working with a Michigan contact to put together a delegation to talk with Senator Abraham. She would you like your suggestions of persons who could join in.

In various other states if you have persons in your network who would join delegations, please provide the names to the Washington contacts listed on the previously distributed list.

The Nuclear Weapons Working Group also reviews the "Stockpile Stewardship" program and intends to schedule a meeting to consider long-range strategy for dealing with this program. More information will be forthcoming.

To: basic@basic.int.org, kathy@fctl.org, paprog@igc.org, btiller@psr.org  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject:  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

To: Michelle Suchan, Kathy Guthrie, Fran Teplitz, Bob Tiller

From: Howard Hallman

Re: Seminar on Nuclear Disarmament and International Bodies

After the Nuclear Weapons Working Group meeting, I talked with Kathy Guthrie. She feels that the Internationalism Working Group would have an interest in a seminar to consider nuclear disarmament initiatives in international bodies. As a point of departure, I would like to offer my ideas and invite you to respond with suggestions for additions or changes. Please reply by e-mail to the above list, and maybe we can work things out without adding another meeting to our schedule.

My proposal is to invite three persons from New York who have been working with international bodies to come to Washington to make presentations on approaches to nuclear disarmament in the UN General Assembly, the Conference on Disarmament, and the NPT PrepCom. They are Alice Slater of GRACE, who has organized NGO activities related to the PrepCom and is working on plans for the next meeting in Geneva in April-May 1998; Alyn Ware of the Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy, who has drafted a nuclear weapons convention; and Roger Smith of the NGO Committee on Disarmament. Because the Abolition 2000 movement is focusing particularly on the next PrepCom, that might be a major focus of our seminar.

Perhaps the second week in December might be a good time, probably in the afternoon to give the New Yorkers time to travel. The seminar might last two hours to cover the subject properly but might be somewhat longer.

Invitees would be persons from the Monday Lobby and the religious community who are interested in the subject. The purpose of the seminar would be educational, but we could also talk strategy and determine whether our community in Washington would like to follow through in some manner.

Perhaps we could invite congressional staff who are sympathetic on this issue. We could consider having a brief response from a Senate staffer and a House staffer. However, this might be too much to handle in one seminar.

Please share your thoughts on this. If you want to have a phone conversation with me, you can reach me at 301 896-0013.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 30 Oct 1997 14:45:13 -0500  
From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Newbook by Doug Roche  
To: "Abolition Caucus List (E-mail)" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>

Doug Roche, former Canadian Disarmament Ambassador and Chairman of the 1988 Session UN Disarmament Committee has produced a new book - just issued - that will surely be welcomed by Abolition List members.

It includes a review of the current situation which is by no means rosy, and it includes some new proposals for action.

The book was the centerpiece of a series of Round Table follow-up discussions in Hamilton, Ontario in the last few days.

"The Ultimate Evil: The Fight to Ban Nuclear Weapons" by Douglas Roche, Lorimer, 1997.

This book is now available from Bryan Prince, Bookseller, 1060 King St, Hamilton, ON. L8S 1L7, Canada, Tel: +1-800-867-0090 or Fax: +1-905-528-1877. Cost: CN\$19:95 + shipping.

Ross Wilcock  
rwilcock@web.net  
<http://www.pgs.ca/>

>From nukemuse Thu Oct 30 16:03:50 1997  
Return-Path: <nukemuse@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 30 Oct 1997 16:03:41 -0800 (PST)  
X-Sender: nukemuse@pop.igc.org (Unverified)  
To: "Bob Kinsey" <bkinsey@peacemission.org>,  
"Alice Slater" <aslater@igc.apc.org>,  
"Dietrich Fischer" <102464.1110@compuserve.com>,  
"abolition-caucus" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
From: Susan Lee Solar <nukemuse@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: CTBT ratification  
Cc: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: nukemuse@igc.org

Alice-- I agree with your plea -- but considering my own senators  
(Republicans Gramm and Kay BAiley Hutchison)who enthusiastically push not  
one but two national nuke waste dumps on our own state, and presumably  
support MOX at Pantex, my response is we need to focus on electing other  
kinds of Senators!

love and hugs

susan

At 12:18 PM 10/14/97 -0600, Bob Kinsey wrote:

>A great phrase "A Clean CTBT" -- Another idea--how dare the Dr.  
>Strangeloves appropriate the Christian concept of Stewardship for their  
>nefarious plans to extend earth and human destroying devices?  
>Their choice of terms reveals their duplicity. Proper Stewardship of the  
>stockpile would be to find the quickest way to eliminate it.

>-----

>> From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>  
>> To: Dietrich Fischer <102464.1110@compuserve.com>; abolition-caucus  
>><abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
>> Cc: Bob Kinsey <bkinsey@peacemission.org>; Howard W. Hallman  
>><mupj@igc.apc.org>  
>> Subject: Re: CTBT ratification  
>> Date: Monday, October 13, 1997 4:49 PM

>>

>> Dear Dietrich,  
>> There is no issue among any abolitionists about whether we should support  
>> the ratification of the CTBT. Many of us have worked for it for all our  
>> adult lives. The issue is, will we silently support the ratification of  
>the  
>> CTBT without bringing to public attention the terrible price that Clinton  
>is  
>> willing to pay for it? \$60billion worth of stockpile stewardship over the  
>> next 13 years which includes underground sub-critical tests, stadium  
>sized  
>> facilities such as the NIF and supercomputing initiatives which will  
>enable  
>> the weaponeers to continue to design new nukes. They have already  
>designed



Return-Path: <paprog>  
Date: Thu, 30 Oct 1997 16:56:50 -0800 (PST)  
From: Fran Teplitz <paprog@igc.apc.org>  
To: basic@basic.int.org, btiller@psr.org, kathy@fcnl.org, mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: December session

Thanks for your leadership on this Howard. I think your proposal is a good one, and would help improve the DC community's understanding of issues related to our work which we are not addressing at our regular working group meetings. I support a session of a few hours, 4 to 6 or 3 to 5, during the week of December 8th. I'd also be interested in hearing about next steps on the revised/reintroduced Malaysia resolution, assuming it passes next month. I could help with calls to our colleague orgs. in DC to help boost attendance and with the agenda. Let me know what else you have in mind. Paz, Fran Teplitz, Peace Action/Peace Action Ed Fund

To: basicus@basicint.org  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject:  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

To: Michelle Suchan

From: Howard Hallman

Re: Seminar on Nuclear Disarmament and International Bodies

After the Nuclear Weapons Working Group meeting, I talked with Kathy Guthrie. She feels that the Internationalism Working Group would have an interest in a seminar to consider nuclear disarmament initiatives in international bodies. As a point of departure, I would like to offer my ideas and invite you to respond with suggestions for additions or changes. Please reply by e-mail to the above list, and maybe we can work things out without adding another meeting to our schedule.

My proposal is to invite three persons from New York who have been working with international bodies to come to Washington to make presentations on approaches to nuclear disarmament in the UN General Assembly, the Conference on Disarmament, and the NPT PrepCom. They are Alice Slater of GRACE, who has organized NGO activities related to the PrepCom and is working on plans for the next meeting in Geneva in April-May 1998; Alyn Ware of the Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy, who has drafted a nuclear weapons convention; and Roger Smith of the NGO Committee on Disarmament. Because the Abolition 2000 movement is focusing particularly on the next PrepCom, that might be a major focus of our seminar.

Perhaps the second week in December might be a good time, probably in the afternoon to give the New Yorkers time to travel. The seminar might last two hours to cover the subject properly but might be somewhat longer.

Invitees would be persons from the Monday Lobby and the religious community who are interested in the subject. The purpose of the seminar would be educational, but we could also talk strategy and determine whether our community in Washington would like to follow through in some manner.

Perhaps we could invite congressional staff who are sympathetic on this issue. We could consider having a brief response from a Senate staffer and a House staffer. However, this might be too much to handle in one seminar.

Please share your thoughts on this. If you want to have a phone conversation with me, you can reach me at 301 896-0013.

To: kathy@fcnl.org, paprog@igc.org, btiller@psr.org  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject:  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Yesterday I had an erroneous e-mail address for Michelle Suchan at BASIC. The correct one is basicus@basicint.org if you want to share your thoughts with her about the proposed seminar on nuclear disarmament and international bodies.

Howard Hallman

Return-Path: <dave@paxchristiusa.org>  
From: Dave Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>  
To: "'mupj@igc.apc.org'" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: RE:  
Date: Fri, 31 Oct 1997 09:26:37 -0500  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id GAA22409

Dear Howard,

Greetings of peace. A couple of things. First, can you send me the names of contact people in DC for the CTBT effort. You refer to it in this latest message, but I cannot find a copy in my files. Also, I will be in DC for the December 3rd meeting at the Methodist Bldg. I leave that evening for Pax Christi International meetings in Belgium, where I will be meeting with Cardinal Danneels. We should talk over the details of our Geneva plan then.

In peace,  
Dave

-----  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org [SMTP:mupj@igc.apc.org]  
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 1997 7:30 AM  
To: ograbc@AOL.COM; jmatlack@erols.com; washofc@AOL.COM; cwu\_washington.parti@ecunet.org; bridget@fcnl.org; mccwash@igc.apc.org; mupj@igc.apc.org; network@igc.apc.org; barbara\_green@pcusa.org; uuawo@AOL.COM; joannabaker@juno.com; dgracie@afsc.org; tom.hart@ecunet.org; epf@igc.apc.org; crramey@igc.apc.org; mark.brown@ecunet.org; mknolldc@igc.apc.org; ncc\_washington@ecunet.org; lwyolton@prodigy.com  
; dave@paxchristiusa.org; gpowers@nccbuscc.org

To: Religious Organizations Participating in CTBT Ratification Campaign

From: Howard W. Hallman

Re: Meeting of Nuclear Weapons Working Group, October 30, 1997

Bob Tiller (PSR) reported on two days of Senate subcommittee hearings on CTBT and Stockpile Stewardship.

Lisa Ledwidge (PSR) is generating contacts in Indiana to urge Senate Lugar to take a leadership role on the CTBT. She will be in Indiana the week after next and would like to meet with activists in Indianapolis on Monday evening, November 10. Get in touch with her if you have contacts who can participate.

Lisa is also working with a PSR contact in New Mexico to put together a delegation to seek a meeting with Senator Domenici. If you have names to suggest, get in touch with her.

Fran Teplitz (Peace Action) is working with a contact in Maine to form a delegation to call upon the two senators. She would welcome other names. Fran also needs contacts in Kentucky.

Laura Kriv (20/20) is working with a Michigan contact to put together a delegation to talk with Senator Abraham. She would you like your suggestions of persons who could join in.

In various other states if you have persons in your network who would join delegations, please provide the names to the Washington contacts listed on the previously distributed list.

The Nuclear Weapons Working Group also reviews the "Stockpile Stewardship" program and intends to schedule a meeting to consider long-range strategy for dealing with this program. More information will be forthcoming.

\$\$\$\$\$\$ 2 LINES REFORMATTED BY POPPER AT igc.apc.org \$\$\$\$\$\$

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Fri, 31 Oct 1997 15:17:25 +0100 (MET)  
From: fredpax@online.no (Fredrik S. Heffermehl)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: A 2000 ORGANIZATION - we must attend landmines in Ottawa  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

\*\*\*\*\*

\* Fredrik S. HEFFERMEHL \*  
\* President, Norwegian Peace Alliance \*  
\* Vice President, International Peace Bureau \*  
\* Board/Directors, IA Lawyers Ag. Nuclar Arms \*  
\* International Free Vanunu Committee \*  
\* \*  
\* N. Juels g. 28 A, N-0272 Oslo, Norway \*  
\* Phone +47-2244 8003 (fax: +47-2244 7616) \*  
\* E-mail: fredpax@online.no (NB - Note change!)\*

\*\*\*\*\*

Oslo, October 29, 1997

Dear friends

## IMPROVING THE ABOLITION 2000 NETWORK

I am continuously amazed by all the excellent work, initiatives, seminars, presence at UN meetings, highly professional treaty proposals etc. that comes out of Abolition 2000.

A meeting in Canada on Dec. 5 offers us an excellent opportunity to check our experience and consider whether things can be done even better. Could we drive things forward more systematically, planned, find ways to provide more direction and energy? Does the "loose" network model and lack of core or nucleus in the network (with resources) also make it difficult to appear with identity to the outside world and relate efficiently to the media, public and political processes?

Not less important: do we ourselves get a steady input that is efficient and functional? Do we know where we are and what to do to move? I very much doubt this for a major part of the 700 participating organizations that are on the A 2000 periphery. Could even those at the center of A 2000 function better?

Example: Here in Norway we have signed up 30 A 2000 members, but not done very much more. Could we make it easier for much more national contacts in many more countries to generate much more activity? (Or shall we leave everyone to use their time to sort and delete the overflow of A 2000 emails - cfr. the current listserver debate)

This year the Nobel Peace Prize went to Jody Williams and the International Campaign to ban Landmines. It is interesting and VERY encouraging that the Nobel committee gave the award to the NGOs (no foreign minister) and said ...here are the precise words of the announcement:

"There are already over 1 000 organisations, large and small, affiliated to the ICBL, making up a network through which it has been possible to express and mediate a broad wave of popular commitment in an unprecedented way. With the governments of several small and medium-sized countries taking the issue up and taking steps to deal with it, this work has grown into a convincing example of an effective policy for peace.

The Norwegian Nobel Committee wishes to express the hope that the Ottawa process will win even wider support. As a model for similar processes in the future it could prove of decisive importance to the international effort for disarmament and peace."

We have every reason to meet and learn from the success and working methods of the landmines campaign. The time is overripe to check whether our chosen way of organizing A 2000 works as well as it should. Someone (or some more) good at such analysis should make a recommendation to discuss when we gather at the NPT in Geneva next April. We should have a JOINT EVENT there with landmines people.

An first opportunity to move on this will arise on Dec. 5 in Ottawa, during the NGO events connected with the signing of the landmines convention, where the theme for the day is (quote from program):

DECEMBER 5: - Process Forum: Can the experiences from the landmine-campaign be applied to other issues? The forum is open to all NGO delegates and other individuals by invitation. Observations and experiences of participants involved in the ban campaign and the Ottawa Process will examine its successes and strategies and to evaluate applicability to other issues and future roles for government/civil-society cooperation. A more detailed proposal for this Forum and products (academic, publication and video) is included in Appendix A.

I would very much like to see key A 2000 people go to Ottawa and report back with preliminary recommendations (perhaps we can conduct a discussion on the listserv. If everyone labels their contribution "A 2000 ORGANIZATION" it will be easy to delete for those who will/cannot follow it).

Who shall make an organizational report for Geneva in April, who can/should go for us to Ottawa? (instant illustration of a problem - the Abolition 2000 network is very able to communicate, but not to decide much).

Fredrik

To: aslater  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Sign-on letter to President Clinton  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Alice:

I've revised the letter to President Clinton to include the reference to Celinda Lake, as you suggested. No other changes were proposed. I'm now circulating the letter for sign-ons. Will you join the list of initial signers before I put it out on abolition-caucus?

Howard Hallman

The Honorable William J. Clinton  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

On a number of occasions you have expressed a desire to see the total elimination of nuclear weapons on Earth. In your second inaugural address you offered a vision of a land of new promise where "our children will sleep free from the threat of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons." This vision has wide public support, indicated in a poll conducted last spring by Celinda Lake of Lake Sosin Snell Associates that revealed 84 percent of American voters would feel safer knowing that no country had nuclear weapons.

Already there are global conventions for the elimination of chemical and biological weapons. In the Celinda Lake survey 87 percent of the respondents agreed that the United States should negotiate a similar agreement to eliminate nuclear weapons. In the next eight months three international bodies will be meeting and will have opportunities to take significant steps toward accomplishing this goal. We hope that under your leadership the United States will play a constructive role in these gatherings.

The first occasion is the 52nd Session of the United Nations General Assembly, now meeting in New York. It is our understanding that the General Assembly will consider a resolution similar to the one proposed by Malaysia and adopted last December that (1) notes the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice that "there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control" and (2) "calls upon all states to fulfill that obligation immediately by commencing negotiations of a nuclear weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deploying, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination." We ask that the United States drop its opposition to such a resolution and strongly endorse it.

The second occasion will be the reconvening of the UN Conference on Disarmament in Geneva in January 1998. Previously some participants have proposed that the Conference establish an ad hoc committee to commence multi-lateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Likely this proposal will come up again. We favor this approach. Therefore, we ask that the United States support creation of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament.

(over)

The third occasion will be meeting of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee in Geneva in April 1998. In preparation for this meeting we recommend that the United States take several good faith actions that begin to

respond to the obligations under Article VI of the NPT. Specifically we urge that the United States begin to carry out "immediate steps" recommended by the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons:

- Take nuclear weapons off alert
- Remove warheads from delivery vehicles
- End deployment of non-strategic nuclear weapons
- Achieve agreement with other nuclear weapon states for reciprocal no first use

At the meeting of the NPT PrepCom we ask that the United States support efforts to establish a working group to begin negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention. Such a group could work out a division of responsibility with the ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament of the Conference on Disarmament, for there are many tasks to perform in moving toward the goal of nuclear abolition.

None of these multi-lateral efforts would preclude the United States and Russia from working out a START III agreement that would substantially reduce the world's two largest nuclear arsenals. Indeed, such bilateral reductions can set the stage for total elimination by all parties under a nuclear weapons convention.

Mr. President, as you lead the United States on this journey, we promise to help build public support for such bold measures. As previously indicated, the American people are already inclined in this direction and will welcome your leadership to work out arrangements for global elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework.

Sincerely yours,

Return-Path: <lori@paxchristiusa.org>  
From: Lori Swanson Nemenz <lori@paxchristiusa.org>  
To: "'mupj@igc.apc.org'" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: RE: CTBT Grassroots Campaign  
Date: Mon, 6 Oct 1997 09:32:38 -0400  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igcb.igc.org id GAA09005

Please note the change of address for Dave Robinson at Pax Christi USA was paxchristi@igc.apc.org and is now dave@paxchristiusa.org

Thank you,  
Lori Swanson Nemenz  
Pax Christi USA

-----  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org [SMTP:mupj@igc.apc.org]  
Sent: Friday, October 03, 1997 10:19 AM  
To: ogr.parti@ecunet.org; jmatlack@erols.com; washofc@AOL.COM; cwu\_washington.parti@ecunet.org; bridget@fcl.org; mccwash@igc.apc.org; mupj@igc.apc.org; network@igc.apc.org; barbara\_green@pcusa.org; 74637.277@compserve.com; uuawo@AOL.COM; bakerj@ucc.org; dgracie@afsc.org; tom.hart@ecunet.org; epf@igc.apc.org; crramey@igc.apc.org; mark.brown@ecunet.org; mknolldc@igc.apc.org; ncc\_washington@ecunet.org; lwyolton@prodigy.com; paxchristi@igc.apc.org; gpowers@nccbuscc.org  
Subject: CTBT Grassroots Campaign

To: CTBT Supporters within Religious Community

From: Howard W. Hallman  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Meeting notice. The next meeting on Grassroots Activities in Support of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), scheduled for Wednesday afternoon, October 15, has been advanced a half-hour and will run from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. in the Methodist Building, Room 4. The change was made to accommodate another meeting later that afternoon.

CTBT ratification schedule. As you all know, President Clinton submitted the treaty to the Senate for ratification on September 22. Committee hearings are starting this month. The Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee chaired by Senator Domenici will conduct three days of closed hearings on stockpile stewardship. A Governmental Affairs subcommittee under Senator Cochran will hold hearings on the safety and reliability of the nuclear stockpile. After the Foreign Relations Committee completes six weeks of hearings on NATO expansion, it may have a one day hearing on the CTBT for the Administration's top representatives; further hearings will occur in 1988. The Armed Services Committee might also hold a hearing on the CTBT this fall, but it could wait until after the first of the year. It appears that the Clinton Administration wants NATO expansion to go the Senate floor before the CTBT. That means that it may be late spring or summer before the Senate takes up the CTBT.

Home state visits. It is predicted that Congress will adjourn on November 7 or 14, come back for one day on January 5, and reconvene on January 20.

This 21/2-month period, minus the holidays, is a good opportunity for grassroots CTBT advocates to schedule visits with senators in their home states. Organizations working for CTBT ratification are urged to have constituents in key states form delegations to talk with their senators. In some instances this can be delegations of allied organizations. If you need a listing of key states and "lead state contacts" for the grassroots campaign, contact David Culp at 202 289-2388.

Regional training workshops. A one-day workshop to train grassroots leaders on the CTBT is scheduled for Denver, Colorado on Saturday, November 15. It is intended to draw in persons from Nebraska, Kansas, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Arizona. For those who haven't yet sent out information to their key persons in these states, there is still time to recruit participation. A flyer for the event is available from Bridget Moix, Friends Committee on National Legislation at 202 547-6000. A second workshop will take place in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, tentatively scheduled for Saturday, January 17.

CTBT postcards. Organizations ordered over 33,000 postcards on the CTBT from 20/20 Vision to be sent to their members in key states. It is likely that a second postcard campaign will occur as the treaty nears time for floor action in the spring.

Activist's packet. The Disarmament Clearinghouse is preparing an Activist's Packet on the CTBT. If you want the Clearinghouse to send the packet to your lead contacts in the key states or if you want a supply to send yourself, get in touch with Kathy Crandall at 202 898-0150, x.232.

Endorsements. The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Danger is collecting endorsements of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Presumably all of you are included because of your previous commitment. To check on this or add other endorsements, contact Jenny Smith at 202 546-0795.

Web page. The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers has established a web page on the CTBT. It is [www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition](http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition)

\$\$\$\$\$\$\$ 1 LINE REFORMATTED BY POPPER AT [igc.apc.org](http://igc.apc.org) \$\$\$\$\$\$\$

Return-Path: <DCulp@nrdc.org>  
Date: Mon, 6 Oct 1997 09:06:41 -0400  
From: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)  
Subject: Nuclear Calendar  
To: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)  
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

NUCLEAR CALENDAR  
October 6, 1997

Revised the first Monday of each month (and more frequently when warranted) by David Culp, Plutonium Challenge, (202) 289-2388, dculp@nrdc.org.

Changes from last month's calendar are marked with an asterisk (\*).

- \*Week of Oct. 6 House-Senate conference committee on the defense authorization bill, H.R. 1119, continues
- \*Week of Oct. 6 House-Senate conference committee on the Foreign Affairs Restructuring Act, S. 1757, continues
- \*Week of Oct. 6 House-Senate conference committee on the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill, H.R. 2267
- October 6-9 Australia Group (chemical and biological weapons nonproliferation regime) annual meeting, Paris
- \*October 7 House International Relations Committee, hearing on Implementation of the U.S.-China Nuclear Cooperation Agreement: Whose Interests Are Served?, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn
- \*October 7 Senate Foreign Relations Committee, hearing on the strategic rationale for NATO enlargement, with Secretary of State Madeleine Albright testifying, 10 a.m., SD-419 Dirksen
- \*October 7 Russian Duma, Chemical Weapons Convention Ratification Preparatory Committee, vote on CWC ratification
- \*October 8 House Resource Committee, markup of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997, H.R. 1270, 11:00 a.m., 1324 Longworth
- \*October 8 U.S.-Australian ministers meeting, with Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and Defense Secretary Bill Cohen participating, Washington
- \*Oct. 8-Nov. 12 U.S.-Russian Compliance and Inspection Commission (START I Treaty) meeting, Geneva
- \*October 9 House Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Assessing the Department of Energy's Management of the

National Laboratory System, 10 a.m., 2322  
Rayburn

- \*October 9 Senate Foreign Relations Committee, hearing on the pros and cons of NATO enlargement, 2 p.m., SD-419 Dirksen
- \*October 10 Nobel Peace Prize announced, Oslo, Norway
- \*October 10-13 Fall "Call to the Desert" Gathering, Healing Global Wounds, Nevada Test Site
- October 11-19 Congressional fall recess
- October 12-17 President Clinton visits Brazil, Argentina and Venezuela
- \*October 13 NASA launch of the Cassini space probe, 4:55 a.m. EDT, Cape Canaveral Air Station, Fla.
- \*Week of Oct. 13 Russian Duma, International Affairs Committee, vote on Chemical Weapons Convention ratification
- October 15 Russian Defense Council, deadline for recommendations to President Yeltsin on plutonium disposition by a committee chaired by Evgeny Velikhov
- \*October 16 DOE INEEL, high-level waste and facilities disposition EIS, scoping workshop, Idaho Falls, Idaho
- \*Oct. 17, 22 or 24 Russian Duma, floor vote Chemical Weapons Convention ratification
- \* October 20 House National Security Subcommittee on Research and Development, hearing on the security of Russian nuclear weapons, with Russian Gen. Alexander Lebed testifying, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn
- \*Week of Oct. 20 Senate Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services, hearing on the safety and reliability of the nuclear stockpile
- \*Week of Oct. 20 Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, three days of hearings on DOE's stockpile stewardship program and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (closed)
- \*Week of Oct. 20 House floor action on the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997, H.R. 1270
- Week of Oct. 20 NGO Committee on Disarmament, Disarmament Week conference, United Nations, New York
- \*October 22 Senate Foreign Relations Committee, hearing on the costs, benefits and burden sharing of NATO enlargement, 10 a.m., SD-419 Dirksen
- \*Oct. 22-Nov. 12 U.S.-Russian Special Verification Commission (INF Treaty) meeting, Geneva (tentative)
- \*October 23 Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, meeting on DOE's Integrated Safety Management program, 9 a.m., Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, Suite 700, 625 Indiana Ave., N.W.
- \*October 23 DOE INEEL, high-level waste and facilities disposition EIS, scoping workshop, Boise, Idaho
- \*October 27 Senate Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on

International Security, Proliferation and  
Federal Services, hearing on North Korean  
proliferation, 2:30 p.m., SD-342 Dirksen

- \*October 28 Senate Foreign Relations Committee, hearing on  
qualifications of Poland, Hungary and the Czech  
Republic for NATO membership, 10 a.m.,  
SD-419 Dirksen
- \*October 29 Chinese President Jiang Zemin visits Washington
- \*October 30 Senate Foreign Relations Committee, hearing on  
NATO-Russian relations, with former Secretary  
of State Henry Kissinger and other testifying,  
9:30 a.m., SD-419 Dirksen
- \*October Senate floor vote on the nomination of DOE  
Under Secretary-designate Ernest Moniz
- \*October State Department reorganization plan (including  
ACDA) submitted to Congress (tentative)
- \*October House Transportation and Infrastructure  
Subcommittee on Water Resources and  
Environment, markup of the Superfund  
reauthorization bill (estimate)
- \*October Senate Armed Services Committee, confirmation  
hearing for Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety  
Board member-designate Jack Mansfield
- \*October Senate Environment and Public Works Committee,  
markup of the Superfund reauthorization act,  
S. 8 (estimate)
- \*October DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, draft  
request for proposals for MOX disposition for  
plutonium
- \*October DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office,  
decision on preferred immobilization form for  
plutonium disposition (glass or ceramic)
- \*October DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor  
for tritium EIS, notice of intent
- \*October DOE Hanford Site (Wash.), solid radioactive and  
hazardous waste EIS, notice of intent
- \*October DOE Hanford Site (Wash.), draft remedial action  
EIS and land use plan
- \*October DOE Rocky Flats (Colo.), plutonium residues  
draft EIS
- \*October DOE Savannah River Site (S.C.), spent nuclear  
fuel management draft EIS
- \*October DOE WIPP (N.M.), final supplemental EIS
- \*October DOE Environmental Management Office, waste  
management programmatic EIS record of decision
- October U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit, decision  
on electric utilities suit over the Energy  
Department's 1998 commercial high-level nuclear  
waste contract date (estimate)
- \*October Beginning of four-party Korean peace talks,  
Geneva (estimate)
- \*October Russian Duma, debate and ratification of the  
NATO-Russian Charter (estimate)
- \*October Russian Duma, possible ratification of the

Chemical Weapons Convention (estimate)

- \*November 3-7 Joint U.S.-Russian Plutonium Disposition Steering Committee meeting, United States
- November 4 Election day (Special election to fill the seat of former New York Rep. Susan Molinari, New Jersey and Virginia gubernatorial elections, and many city elections.)
- \*November 5 Senate Foreign Relations Committee, hearing with public witnesses on NATO expansion, 10 a.m., SD-419 Dirksen
- \*November 14 Congressional adjournment (target date; could be earlier)
- \*November 15 Denver Regional CTBT Summit
- November 24-25 President Clinton attends the Asian Pacific Economic Cooperation summit, Vancouver, Canada
- \*November Secretary of State Madeleine Albright visits India and Pakistan (estimate)
- \*November DOE Hanford Site (Wash.), public hearing on the draft remedial action EIS and land use plan, Richland, Wash. (estimate)
- \*November DOE WIPP (N.M.), supplemental EIS record of decision
- \*November International Chernobyl financing conference, chaired by Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma, Vice President Al Gore and European Bank for Reconstruction and Development president Jacques de Larosiere, New York
- December 1 National Defense Panel submits its final report on the Quadrennial Defense Review to Defense Secretary Bill Cohen (P.L. 104-201, sec. 924(e))
- December 2-3 NATO defense ministers meeting, Brussels, Belgium
- \*December 5 U.S.-European Union Summit, Washington
- December 8 Tenth anniversary of the signing of the INF Treaty by President Reagan and President Gorbachev
- \*December 10 Nobel Peace Prize awarded, Oslo, Norway
- December 15 National Defense Panel final report on the Quadrennial Review goes to Congress (P.L. 104-201, sec. 923(e)(2))
- \*Week of Dec. 15 United Kingdom Parliament completes ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
- December 16-17 NATO foreign ministers meeting, Brussels, Belgium
- December 18 NATO-Russia Joint Council meeting, Brussels, Belgium (estimate)
- \*December 26 Russian Duma adjourns (estimate)
- \*December DOE Arms Control and Nonproliferation Office, draft study on the nonproliferation impact of reprocessing research reactor fuel at the Savannah River Site (S.C.)
- \*December DOE Environmental Management Office, draft

- accelerated cleanup plan released
- December DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor for tritium EIS scoping meetings, Washington and other cities
- December DOE Savannah River Site (S.C.), accelerator for the production of tritium draft EIS
- \*December DOE Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.), site-wide draft EIS
- \*December DOE Rocky Flats (Colo.), plutonium residues final EIS
- \*December DOE Savannah River Site (S.C.), spent nuclear fuel management final EIS
- \*December EPA hearings on WIPP (N.M.) certification, Albuquerque, Carlsbad and Santa Fe, N.M. (estimate)

1998

- \*January 1 Russian Defense Council, completion of its new military doctrine
- \*January 3 5th anniversary of the signing of START II by Presidents Bush and Yeltsin
- \*January 5 Congress convenes (estimate)
- \*January 6-19 Congressional January recess (estimate)
- \*January 17 Pittsburgh Regional CTBT Summit (tentative)
- \*January 19 Conference on Disarmament, first session begins, Geneva
- \*January 21 President Clinton delivers the State of the Union speech (estimate)
- \*January 26 2nd anniversary of START II ratification by the U.S. Senate
- January 31 DOE takes title to the high-level nuclear waste at commercial nuclear power plants
- \*January DOE Rocky Flats (Colo.), plutonium residues record of decision
- \*January DOE Savannah River Site (S.C.), spent nuclear fuel management record of decision
- January DOE Environmental Management Office, waste management programmatic EIS record of decision
- \*January DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, surplus plutonium disposition draft EIS
- February 2 President Clinton submits the annual federal budget to Congress
- \*February 14-20 Senate Presidents Day recess (estimate)
- \*February 15 Central Intelligence Agency, report on congressional intelligence committees on National Intelligence Estimate on missile threats to the U.S. and on chemical, biological and nuclear weapon threats to the U.S. other than by missiles (Intelligence Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 1998, S. 858)
- \*February Senate floor action on the expansion of NATO (estimate)

- \*February DOE Hanford Site (Wash.), final remedial action EIS and land use plan
- \*February DOE Arms Control and Nonproliferation Office, meetings on the draft nonproliferation study on reprocessing research reactor fuel at the Savannah River Site (S.C.), Washington and near Aiken, S.C.
- February DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, final request for proposals for MOX disposition for plutonium
- \*February President Clinton visits India and Pakistan (estimate)
- \*February Gore- Chernomydrin Commission meeting, Washington (estimate)
- \*February United Kingdom completes its Strategic Defense Review
- March 1 DOE Defense Programs Office, selection of commercial nuclear power plants for tritium production
- March 15 DOE Environmental Management Office, final land use plans for Hanford Site (Wash.), INEEL (Idaho), Rocky Flats (Colo.), and Savannah River Site (S.C.) (P.L. 104-201, sec. 3153(f))
- \*March 27 Conference on Disarmament, first session ends, Geneva
- \*March DOE Environmental Management Office, final accelerated cleanup plan released (estimate)
- March DOE Hanford Site (Wash.), remedial action EIS and land use plan record of decision
- \*March National Academy of Sciences' Institute of Medicine, completion of review of radioactive fallout from nuclear testing (estimate)
- March or April G-8 Energy Ministers Conference, Moscow
- \*April 4-13 Congressional spring recess (estimate)
- \*April 10-13 Spring Healing Global Wounds gathering, Nevada Test Site
- April 22 Earth Day
- April 22 20th anniversary of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which created the Latin American nuclear-free zone, entering into force
- April 26 Chernobyl commemoration day
- April 28 - May 8 Second PrepCom for the 2000 Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference, Geneva
- \*April DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor for tritium draft EIS
- \*April DOE Environmental Management Advisory Board meeting
- April Citizens for Alternatives to Radioactive Dumping, National Conference on Communities Contaminated by Nuclear Facilities, to be held in southeastern New Mexico
- \*Spring DOE Environmental Management Office, receives the first shipment of spent foreign research reactor fuel at the Concord Naval Weapons

Station, (northeast of San Francisco, Calif.),  
to be transported to INEEL (Idaho)

- May 1-3 Physicians for Social Responsibility national conference, Arlington, Va.
- \*May 11 Conference on Disarmament, second session begins, Geneva
- May 15 DOE Environmental Management Office, report to Congress on land use plans for Hanford Site (Wash.), INEEL (Idaho), Rocky Flats (Colo.), and Savannah River Site (S.C.) (P.L. 104-201, sec. 3153(g))
- May 15-17 G-8 Summit, Birmingham, United Kingdom
- \*May 23-31 Congressional Memorial Day recess (estimate)
- May DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, proposals due for MOX disposition for plutonium
- May DOE WIPP (N.M.), target date for opening the facility
- Spring or Summer Senate floor action on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (estimate)
- June 10 35th anniversary of President Kennedy's nuclear testing speech at American University
- \*June 26 Conference on Disarmament, second session ends, Geneva
- \*June 27-July 5 Congressional July 4th recess (estimate)
- \*July 27 Conference on Disarmament, third session begins, Geneva
- July DOE Sandia National Laboratory (N.M.), site-wide draft EIS
- \*July DOE Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.), site-wide final EIS
- July DOE Savannah River Site (S.C.), accelerator for the production of tritium final EIS
- August 5 35th anniversary of the signing of the Limited Test Ban Treaty by the United States, Soviet Union and United Kingdom
- \*Aug. 8- Sept. 7 Congressional August recess (estimate)
- \*August DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, final surplus plutonium disposition EIS
- August DOE Savannah River Site (S.C.), accelerator for the production of tritium record of decision
- \*September 9 Conference on Disarmament, third session ends, Geneva
- September DOE Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Office, viability assessment of the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste repository
- \*September DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, surplus plutonium disposition record of decision
- September DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, contract awarded for MOX disposition for plutonium
- \*September DOE Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.), site-wide EIS record of decision

###

Return-Path: <DCulp@nrdc.org>  
Date: Mon, 6 Oct 1997 09:07:51 -0400  
From: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)  
Subject: Sen. Daschle on CTBT  
To: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)  
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

Minority Leader Tom Daschle (D-S.D.) gave this floor speech on the CTBT last Wednesday. In the past month, Senators Biden, Bingaman and Feingold have also given floor speeches in favor of the Treaty.

[Congressional Record: October 1, 1997]

### THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I come before the Senate this afternoon to talk briefly about the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty submitted to the Senate by President Clinton last week. This treaty represents another useful and important step toward reducing the spread of nuclear weapons. I stand ready to do all that I can to ensure that the Senate considers the CTBT in a timely manner and votes to allow the United States to join 145 other signatories of this treaty to put an end to nuclear testing.

It was on July 16, 1945, at a site called Trinity in the desert near Alamogordo, NM, that the United States conducted the first test of an atomic bomb. In a fraction of a second, the detonation not only released over the isolated test site an amount of energy equivalent to what we consume in the entire United States in 30 seconds--it also changed the world. The nuclear age had loudly begun. For decades to come, humanity would be forced to grapple with the consequences borne out of what occurred at Trinity.

Much has happened since that first test in the New Mexico desert.

The United States was quickly joined in the nuclear club by Russia and several others. We saw the onset of the cold war and an arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union. As each country strove to keep pace with the other, the United States and Russia engaged in a buildup of thousands of nuclear weapons with a destructive power unprecedented in human history.

The United States would go on to conduct more than 1,000 additional nuclear tests; and the Russians more than 700. Several other countries would carry out a total of roughly 300 tests of nuclear weapons.

The Russians would test the largest weapon ever designed by mankind--a monstrous device that, in a split second, produced enough energy to power the entire United States for a whole day. At the height of the cold war, the United States and the Russians had deployed between them roughly 60,000 nuclear weapons.

Taken together, these frightening developments would make a four decade old comment by the preeminent scientist of the 20th century, Albert Einstein, even more poignant. Einstein played a large role in the conceptual development of the atom bomb. Moreover, in 1939, in a letter he sent to President Roosevelt, Einstein urged the President to

begin a nuclear weapons program immediately. Later in life, after observing the early stages of the arms buildup and the development of ever more destructive weapons, Einstein commented, "I made one great mistake in my life, when I signed the letter to President Roosevelt recommending that atom bombs be made."

Fortunately, the outlook has improved markedly since the darkest days of the cold war. The United States and Russia have cooperated repeatedly during the past several years to reduce the nuclear threat. Each country has ratified the START I Treaty.

Following President Clinton's lead, the Senate ratified the START II Treaty, and we hope the Russians will follow suit by year's end. If START II is implemented, each side will reduce its strategic arsenal down to about 3,500 deployed weapons. In addition, once START II enters into force, Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin pledged to immediately begin negotiations on START III. Under the terms of the Helsinki agreement, START III would establish ceilings of as low as 2,000 strategic weapons.

While much has been done to reduce the threat posed by nuclear weapons, much remains to be done. And, President Clinton's submission of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty represents a useful step in the right direction.

The CTBT prohibits any test involving a nuclear explosion, regardless of the test's purpose, size, or location. On behalf of the United States, the President was the first to sign this treaty last September. He would subsequently be joined by representatives from more than 140 other nations.

We will soon hear from the usual critics of arms control, voicing objections to the treaty that are as predictable as they are likely. They will say the CTBT is unverifiable. They will say that it will lead to the inevitable erosion of our nuclear weapons capability. And, they will be wrong on both counts. Although we will have plenty of time to thoroughly address their objections in the days ahead, I will briefly address each of those criticisms.

As to the verifiability of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, this is a familiar refrain uttered by those who oppose arms control agreements in any form. The treaty's verification regime includes a comprehensive international monitoring system composed of hundreds of seismological, radionuclide, hydroacoustic, and infrasound sensors spread out all over the globe. This network is backed up by the ability of Members to conduct onsite inspections of questionable activities. This combination should be more than sufficient to deter would-be cheaters and, if deterrence fails, catch those who try to violate the treaty's restrictions.

As to the concern that CTBT will erode our nuclear capability, I have 4.5 billion reasons why that will not be the case this year and tens of billions more reasons in subsequent years. Last week, the administration reached an important agreement with our weapons development labs. These labs are staffed by the world's foremost nuclear weapons experts. The labs stated that if they are provided with \$4.5 billion this year and similar amounts in each subsequent year, they will be able to conduct a program that will ensure with a high level of confidence the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons in our stockpile. In short, the cessation of nuclear testing need not erode our nuclear capability.

The CTBT is an important step down the path toward a safer world. In simple terms, the United States, the country with one of the largest and certainly the most sophisticated nuclear weapons arsenals in the world, has the most to gain from freezing the competition in place. Countries already possessing nuclear weapons will have a difficult time making qualitative and quantitative improvements to their existing arsenals. And as for countries without nuclear weapons, the CTBT will place an additional hurdle in their path if they seek to develop and deploy such weapons.

I do not believe we can rest with the submission, and, hopefully, ratification of this treaty.

Many more challenges face us if we are to reduce to acceptable levels the threat posed by nuclear weapons. For example, despite the fact that the cold war ended years ago, the United States and Russia still maintain at least 3,000 strategic nuclear warheads poised and ready to launch at a moment's notice. As noted by former Senator Sam Nunn, one of the most distinguished and insightful defense experts to ever serve in this Chamber, while this practice may have been necessary in the cold war, "today it represents a dangerous anachronism." Moreover, tens of tons of nuclear materials and thousands of nuclear weapons remain outside international controls.

Tens of thousands of highly trained employees of the Russian nuclear complex, each armed with the ability to design and build nuclear weapons, go unpaid for months at a time. Future security measures must be designed to speak to these concerns as well.

While I will be doing all I can to ensure smooth ratification of the CTBT in the Senate, I will also be attempting to help design measures that speak to these other security problems. Outside experts such as former Senator Nunn, General Lee Butler, the last Commander in Chief of the now-disbanded Strategic Air Command, and Dr. Bruce Blair, a thoughtful arms control expert at the Brookings Institution, have all raised these same concerns and begun to design solutions. It is an important opportunity for the Senate, the Pentagon, and the country to begin to consider them.

At Helsinki, the administration acknowledged its awareness of these problems and indicated a commitment to resolve them. Unfortunately, the administration appears to have put the detailed discussion of many of these measures on hold until START II enters force and the START III negotiations begin. I hope the administration would begin exploring these steps today. The only real linkage between START and these other measures is that they both can enhance our security. There is no reason why United States action in one arena should be held in abeyance until the Russians act in another.

In summary, Mr. President, I look forward to working with the administration and the other supporters of the CTBT in this body to ensure that the merits of this treaty are fully aired. If that happens, I am confident the CTBT will be ratified, and another step will be taken toward turning back the clock that unfortunately began ticking 52 years ago at a place called Trinity.

---

Return-Path: <epp92@antenna.nl>  
Comments: Authenticated sender is <epp92@mail.antenna.nl>  
From: "D.J. Dullemond" <epp92@antenna.nl>  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Date: Mon, 6 Oct 1997 18:11:47 +0000  
Subject: Re: CTBT Ratification and Stockpile Stewardship  
Priority: normal

To: Howard W. Hallman

I don't see your point, David wrote nothing on a failure. He noted that most of the peace movement went home. And let us face it, despite the hard work: the "victories" are given to us (the people) when it suits the ones it concerns.

And let's face it that most of the people protesting cruise missiles in my country (the Netherlands) went home, took up other issues and thought they had won a great victory. (while there are still American nukes on our soil, to be deployed by Dutch aircraft)

thank you David for this useful reflection, I think it is very necessary for us to do some self reflection every now and then.

Dirk Jan

> To; David McReynolds:

>  
> I don't believe that you can blame the Limited Test Ban Treaty for the  
> failure of the peace movement to press harder for nuclear disarmament in the  
> 1960s. The fault lies within ourselves not with the treaty which had a  
> useful purpose by stopping radioactive fallout.

>  
> Howard W. Hallman

>  
>  
> t 11:40 PM 10/4/97 -0400, DavidMcR@aol.com wrote:  
>> Taking up this question of how much value the earlier test ban treaty did,  
>> let me indulge the heresy that it was a set-back for the peace movement, and  
>> was given us by the U.S. and Soviet governments because they had done all the  
>> tested they needed to do.

>>  
>> The immediate result of the Test Ban Treaty was that a truly massive public  
>> movement (the strong and powerful days of SANE, now over thirty years behind  
>> us) which could call out thousands to Times Square in a matter of a day or  
>> two - and was having repercussions in the Soviet Union since we opposed their  
>> tests also - led to the diminishing public interest in the disarmament issue.  
>>.....

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

Dirk Jan Dullemond  
v Doesburglaan 124 G  
6708 MD Wageningen  
the Netherlands

Nederlandse Kernstop Coalitie  
Herenstraat 9  
6701 DG Wageningen  
the Netherlands

Tel +31 317 423481 (Home)  
+31 317 422140 (Work)  
Fax +31 317 423588

Email [epp92@antenna.nl](mailto:epp92@antenna.nl)

\*\*\*\*\*

Return-Path: <jloretz@tiac.net>  
Date: Mon, 06 Oct 1997 13:12:31 -0500  
From: John Loretz <jloretz@tiac.net>  
Reply-To: jloretz@tiac.net  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
CC: DavidMcR@aol.com, abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: CTBT Ratification and Stockpile Stewardship  
References: <2.2.16.19971006070910.3e7fd462@pop.igc.org>

As I read David's comment, he was not "blaming" the LTBT for anything, nor was he attempting to minimize what it \*did\* accomplish -- bringing a halt to the radioactive contamination of atmosphere, earth, and water via fallout.

David's real point -- that a substantial though limited "victory" can lull a movement into a false sense that the job is done -- has been borne out time and time again not only in the peace movement, but in the environmental movement and in most other social movements that have found themselves in a similar situation -- including some on the far right that we would just as soon stayed dormant, but obviously never do.

His subtext (or my subtext...whichever), that when nuclear tests got driven underground and out of sight enormous amounts of contamination were allowed to continue unchecked as the arms race gained momentum, is a serious reminder of the consequences of a job half done (not that this one is \*ever\* done).

Thanks, David.

-----

John Loretz  
Executive Editor  
Medicine and Global Survival

Howard W. Hallman wrote:

I don't believe that you can blame the Limited Test Ban Treaty for the failure of the peace movement to press harder for nuclear disarmament in the 1960s. The fault lies within ourselves not with the treaty which had a useful purpose by stopping radioactive fallout.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 6 Oct 1997 09:11:21 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: CTB and Stockpile Stewardship linked!  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, tomatompn+@igc.org  
X-Sender: wslf@pop.igc.org (Unverified)

Dear friends,

Please read the following letter and judge for yourselves exactly how closely CTBT ratification is being linked to "Stockpile Stewardship and Management" (SS&M) at the highest levels of the U.S. government. Below is the complete text of the letter sent by President Clinton to the U.S. Senate on September 22, 1997, in connection with his submittal of the CTBT for ratification. It's a long letter, but much of it is taken up with a direct discussion of SS&M and the procedure by which the nuclear weapons labs (Livermore and Los Alamos) will "certify" each year the "safety" and "reliability" of the nuclear weapons in the U.S. stockpile. I urge you to read carefully the section I have marked beginning and ending with [\*\*\*\*\*], and especially the 6 "safeguards," which I have marked like this [\*]. The last and perhaps most important "safeguard," which allows the U.S. to withdraw from the CTBT in its "supreme national interest" I have marked like this [\*\*]. It should be read in conjunction with the "certification" discussion that follows.

After you have read this letter, consider how important it is for you to link your support for CTBT ratification with a strong and unflinching repudiation of SS&M. Our collective future may depend on it. -- Jackie Cabasso

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

September 23, 1997

TO THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

I transmit herewith, for the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (the "Treaty" or "CTBT"), opened for signature and signed by the United States at New York on September 24, 1996. The Treaty includes two Annexes, a Protocol, and two Annexes to the Protocol, all of which form integral parts of the Treaty. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Department of State on the Treaty, including an Article-by-Article analysis of the Treaty.

Also included in the Department of State's report is a document relevant to but not part of the Treaty: the Text on the Establishment of a Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty Organization, adopted by the Signatory States to the Treaty on November 19, 1996. The Text provides the basis for the work of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty Organization in preparing detailed procedures for implementing the Treaty and making arrangements for the first session of the Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty. In particular, by the terms of the Treaty, the Preparatory

Commission will be responsible for ensuring that the verification regime established by the Treaty will be effectively in operation at such time as the Treaty enters into force. My Administration has completed and will submit separately to the Senate an analysis of the verifiability of the Treaty, consistent with section 37 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended. Such legislation as may be necessary to implement the Treaty also will be submitted separately to the Senate for appropriate action.

The conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty is a signal event in the history of arms control. The subject of the Treaty is one that has been under consideration by the international community for nearly 40 years, and the significance of the conclusion of negotiations and the signature to date of more than 140 states cannot be overestimated. The Treaty creates an absolute prohibition against the conduct of nuclear weapon test explosions or any other nuclear explosion anywhere. Specifically, each State Party undertakes not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion; to prohibit and prevent any nuclear explosions at any place under its jurisdiction or control; and to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion.

The Treaty establishes a far reaching verification regime, based on the provision of seismic, hydroacoustic, radionuclide, and infrasound data by a global network (the "International Monitoring System") consisting of the facilities listed in Annex 1 to the Protocol. Data provided by the International Monitoring System will be stored, analyzed, and disseminated, in accordance with Treaty-mandated operational manuals, by an International Data Center that will be part of the Technical Secretariat of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty Organization. The verification regime includes rules for the conduct of on-site inspections, provisions for consultation and clarification, and voluntary confidence-building measures designed to contribute to the timely resolution of any compliance concerns arising from possible misinterpretation of monitoring data related to chemical explosions that a State Party intends to or has carried out. Equally important to the U.S. ability to verify the Treaty, the text specifically provides for the right of States Parties to use information obtained by national technical means in a manner consistent with generally recognized principles of international law for purposes of verification generally, and in particular, as the basis for an on-site inspection request. The verification regime provides each State Party the right to protect sensitive installations, activities, or locations not related to the Treaty. Determinations of compliance with the Treaty rest with each individual State Party to the Treaty.

Negotiations for a nuclear test-ban treaty date back to the Eisenhower Administration. During the period 1978-1980, negotiations among the United States, the United Kingdom, and the USSR (the Depositary Governments of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT)) made progress, but ended without agreement. Thereafter, as the nonnuclear weapon states called for test-ban negotiations, the United States urged the Conference on Disarmament (the "CD") to devote its attention to the difficult aspects of monitoring compliance with such a ban and developing elements of an international monitoring regime. After the United States, joined by other key states, declared its support for comprehensive test-ban negotiations

with a view toward prompt conclusion of a treaty, negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban were initiated in the CD, in January 1994. Increased impetus for the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty by the end of 1996 resulted from the adoption, by the Parties to the NPT in conjunction with the indefinite and unconditional extension of that Treaty, of "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament" that listed the conclusion of a CTBT as the highest measure of its program of action.

[\*\*\*\*\*] On August 11, 1995, when I announced U.S. support for a "zero yield" CTBT, I stated that:

". . . As part of our national security strategy, the United States must and will retain strategic nuclear forces sufficient to deter any future hostile foreign leadership with access to strategic nuclear forces from acting against our vital interests and to convince it that seeking a nuclear advantage would be futile. In this regard, I consider the maintenance of a safe and reliable nuclear stockpile to be a supreme national interest of the United States.

"I am assured by the Secretary of Energy and the Directors of our nuclear weapons labs that we can meet the challenge of maintaining our nuclear deterrent under a CTBT through a Science Based Stockpile Stewardship program without nuclear testing. I directed the implementation of such a program almost 2 years ago, and it is being developed with the support of the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This program will now be tied to a new certification procedure. In order for this program to succeed, both the Administration and the Congress must provide sustained bipartisan support for the stockpile stewardship program over the next decade and beyond. I am committed to working with the Congress to ensure this support.

"While I am optimistic that the stockpile stewardship program will be successful, as President I cannot dismiss the possibility, however unlikely, that the program will fall short of its objectives. Therefore, in addition to the new annual certification procedure for our nuclear weapons stockpile, I am also establishing concrete, specific safeguards that define the conditions under which the United States can enter into a CTBT . . ."

The safeguards that were established are as follows:

[\*] The conduct of a Science Based Stockpile Stewardship program to ensure a high level of confidence in the safety and reliability of nuclear weapons in the active stockpile, including the conduct of a broad range of effective and continuing experimental programs.

[\*] The maintenance of modern nuclear laboratory facilities and programs in theoretical and exploratory nuclear technology that will attract, retain, and ensure the continued application of our human scientific resources to those programs on which continued progress in nuclear technology depends.

[\*] The maintenance of the basic capability to resume nuclear test activities prohibited by the CTBT should the United States cease to be bound to adhere to this Treaty.

[\*] The continuation of a comprehensive research and development program to improve our treaty monitoring capabilities and operations.

[\*] The continuing development of a broad range of intelligence gathering and analytical capabilities and operations to ensure accurate and comprehensive information on worldwide nuclear arsenals, nuclear weapons development programs, and related nuclear programs.

[\*\*] The understanding that if the President of the United States is informed by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy (DOE) -- advised by the Nuclear Weapons Council, the Directors of DOE's nuclear weapons laboratories, and the Commander of the U.S. Strategic Command -- that a high level of confidence in the safety or reliability of a nuclear weapon type that the two Secretaries consider to be critical to our nuclear deterrent could no longer be certified, the President, in consultation with the Congress, would be prepared to withdraw from the CTBT under the standard "supreme national interests" clause in order to conduct whatever testing might be required. With regard to the last safeguard:

The U.S. regards continued high confidence in the safety and reliability of its nuclear weapons stockpile as a matter affecting the supreme interests of the country and will regard any events calling that confidence into question as "extraordinary events related to the subject matter of the treaty." It will exercise its rights under the "supreme national interests" clause if it judges that the safety or reliability of its nuclear weapons stockpile cannot be assured with the necessary high degree of confidence without nuclear testing.

To implement that commitment, the Secretaries of Defense and Energy -- advised by the Nuclear Weapons Council or "NWC" (comprising representatives of DOD, JCS, and DOE), the Directors of DOE's nuclear weapons laboratories and the Commander of the U.S. Strategic Command -- will report to the President annually, whether they can certify that the Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile and all critical elements thereof are, to a high degree of confidence, safe and reliable, and, if they cannot do so, whether, in their opinion and that of the NWC, testing is necessary to assure, with a high degree of confidence, the adequacy of corrective measures to assure the safety and reliability of the stockpile, or elements thereof. The Secretaries will state the reasons for their conclusions, and the views of the NWC, reporting any minority views.

After receiving the Secretaries' certification and accompanying report, including NWC and minority views, the President will provide them to the appropriate committees of the Congress, together with a report on the actions he has taken in light of them.

If the President is advised, by the above procedure, that a high level of confidence in the safety or reliability of a nuclear weapon type critical to the Nation's nuclear deterrent could no longer be certified without nuclear testing, or that nuclear testing is necessary to assure the adequacy of corrective measures, the President will be prepared to exercise our "supreme national interests" rights under the Treaty, in order to conduct such testing.

The procedure for such annual certification by the Secretaries, and for advice to them by the NWC, U.S. Strategic Command, and the DOE nuclear weapons laboratories will be embodied in domestic law.[\*\*\*\*\*] As negotiations on a text drew to a close it became apparent that one member of the CD, India, would not join in a consensus decision to forward the text to the United Nations for its adoption. After consultations among countries supporting the text, Australia requested the President of the U.N. General Assembly to convene a resumed session of the 50th General Assembly to consider and take action on the text. The General Assembly was so convened, and by a vote of 158 to 3 the Treaty was adopted. On September 24, 1996, the Treaty was opened for signature and I had the privilege, on behalf of the United States, of being the first to sign the Treaty.

The Treaty assigns responsibility for overseeing its implementation to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty Organization (the "Organization"), to be established in Vienna. The Organization, of which each State Party will be a member, will have three organs: the Conference of the States Parties, a 51-member Executive Council, and the Technical Secretariat. The Technical Secretariat will supervise the operation of and provide technical support for the International Monitoring System, operate the International Data Center, and prepare for and support the conduct of on-site inspections. The Treaty also requires each State Party to establish a National Authority that will serve as the focal point within the State Party for liaison with the Organization and with other States Parties.

The Treaty will enter into force 180 days after the deposit of instruments of ratification by all of the 44 states listed in Annex 2 to the Treaty, but in no case earlier than 2 years after its being opened for signature. If, 3 years from the opening of the Treaty for signature, the Treaty has not entered into force, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in his capacity as Depositary of the Treaty, will convene a conference of the states that have deposited their instruments of ratification if a majority of those states so requests. At this conference the participants will consider what measures consistent with international law might be undertaken to accelerate the ratification process in order to facilitate the early entry into force of the Treaty. Their decision on such measures must be taken by consensus.

Reservations to the Treaty Articles and the Annexes to the Treaty are not permitted. Reservations may be taken to the Protocol and its Annexes so long as they are not incompatible with the object and purpose of the Treaty. Amendment of the Treaty requires the positive vote of a majority of the States Parties to the Treaty, voting in a duly convened Amendment Conference at which no State Party casts a negative vote. Such amendments would enter into force 30 days after ratification by all States Parties that cast a positive vote at the Amendment Conference. The Treaty is of unlimited duration, but contains a "supreme interests" clause entitling any State Party that determines that its supreme interests have been jeopardized by extraordinary events related to the subject matter of the Treaty to withdraw from the Treaty upon 6-month's notice. Unless a majority of the Parties decides otherwise, a Review Conference will be held 10 years following the Treaty's entry into force and may be held at 10-year intervals thereafter if the Conference of the States Parties so decides by a majority vote (or more frequently if the Conference of the

States Parties so decides by a two-thirds vote).

The Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty is of singular significance to the continuing efforts to stem nuclear proliferation and strengthen regional and global stability. Its conclusion marks the achievement of the highest priority item on the international arms control and nonproliferation agenda. Its effective implementation will provide a foundation on which further efforts to control and limit nuclear weapons can be soundly based. By responding to the call for a CTBT by the end of 1996, the Signatory States, and most importantly the nuclear weapon states, have demonstrated the bona fides of their commitment to meaningful arms control measures. The monitoring challenges presented by the wide scope of the CTBT exceed those imposed by any previous nuclear test-related treaty. Our current capability to monitor nuclear explosions will undergo significant improvement over the next several years to meet these challenges. Even with these enhancements, though, several conceivable CTBT evasion scenarios have been identified. Nonetheless, our National Intelligence Means (NIM), together with the Treaty's verification regime and our diplomatic efforts, provide the United States with the means to make the CTBT effectively verifiable. By this, I mean that the United States: will have a wide range of resources (NIM, the totality of information available in public and private channels, and the mechanisms established by the Treaty) for addressing compliance concerns and imposing sanctions in cases of noncompliance; and will thereby have the means to: (a) assess whether the Treaty is deterring the conduct of nuclear explosions (in terms of yields and number of tests) that could damage U.S. security interests and constraining the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and (b) take prompt and effective counteraction. My judgment that the CTBT is effectively verifiable also reflects the belief that U.S. nuclear deterrence would not be undermined by possible nuclear testing that the United States might fail to detect under the Treaty, bearing in mind that the United States will derive substantial confidence from other factors -- the CTBT's "supreme national interests" clause, the annual certification procedure for the U.S. nuclear stockpile, and the U.S. Safeguards program. I believe that the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty is in the best interests of the United States. Its provisions will significantly further our nuclear nonproliferation and arms control objectives and strengthen international security. Therefore, I urge the Senate to give early and favorable consideration to the Treaty and its advice and consent to ratification as soon as possible.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 22, 1997

\*\*\*\*\*

WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION

1440 Broadway, Suite 500  
Oakland, CA USA 94612  
Tel: (510)839-5877  
Fax: (510)839-5397

wslf@igc.apc.org

\*\*\*\*\* Part of ABOLITION 2000 \*\*\*\*\*

Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

Return-Path: <cfpa@cyberenet.net>  
Date: Mon, 06 Oct 1997 13:33:45 -0400  
From: Coalition for Peace Action <cfpa@cyberenet.net>  
Reply-To: cfpa@cyberenet.net  
Organization: Coalition for Peace Action  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
CC: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: CTBT Ratification and Stockpile Stewardship  
References: <2.2.16.19971003170759.3c2f9f34@pop.igc.org>

Howard,

Your response is well-stated. After a soul-searching debate and consideration within national Peace Action, we have decided to adopt a two-track strategy. We will both lobby for CTBT ratification and against the Stockpile Stewardship Program (aka Nuclear Weapons Forever program). It was our judgement that if we oppose CTBT ratification because of stockpile stewardship, we are likely to end up with no CTBT and stockpile stewardship probably still going strong--an even worse situation than stockpile stewardship with CTBT.

--

Rev. Robert Moore, Executive Director, Coalition for Peace Action  
40 Witherspoon Street, Princeton, NJ 08542  
(609) 924-5022 voice, (609) 924-3052 fax  
cfpa@cyberenet.net

>From davidhart Mon Oct 6 13:42:26 1997  
Return-Path: <davidhart@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Mon, 6 Oct 1997 13:42:24 -0700 (PDT)  
X-Sender: davidhart@pop.igc.org  
To: mupj@igc.org  
From: Veterans for Peace <davidhart@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Sign On Letter - ATTN: Howard Hallman  
Sender: davidhart@igc.org

Dear Howard,

Thanks for your good work on the draft letter.

Please sign us on.

Thanks.

Name, Title: David Hart, Executive Director

Organization: Veterans for Peace

Peace,

David

>From aslater Mon Oct 6 14:59:29 1997  
Return-Path: <aslater@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Mon, 6 Oct 1997 14:59:25 -0700 (PDT)  
X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org (Unverified)  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org, aslater@igc.org  
From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter to President Clinton  
Sender: aslater@igc.org

I would be delighted to sign, Howard. Thanks for doing this. Regards,

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 7 Oct 1997 00:52:42 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Tobdam@aol.com  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Addresses of Abolition 2000 Working Groups  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

Dear Abolition 2000 friends,  
In her email of 30 Sep 1997 (Subject: 1000 enrollees by Geneva) Alice Slater listed me as the contact address for the NEWSLETTER (position 9). Please note the following:

1) After the Abolition 2000 Network was established on 5 Nov 1995 I started serving as the editor of the "Bulletin for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons" (BAN!) which was accepted as the Newsletter of the Abolition 2000 Network. Unfortunately I had to stop this work in Summer 1996 due to lack of funding  
2) However, I am not against being listed as the contact address for a Abolition 2000 Newsletter Working Group. For that purpose, PLEASE NOTE MY CORRECT ADDRESS which reads as follows:

Tobias Damjanov  
Kreutzkamp 33, D-21465 Reinbek, Germany  
phone: (49-40) 722 1319, fax: (49-40) 722 0579  
e-mail: tobdam@aol.com

Please correct all other address details related to both the INES International Office and the German Peace Society (DFG-VK) as follows:

a) Address of INES (International Network of Engineers and Scientists for Global Responsibility) International Office:  
Postfach (PO Box) 101707, D-44017 Dortmund, Germany;  
phone: (49-231) 575 202 or 575 205, fax: (49-231) 575 210,  
e-mail: r.braun@lilly.ping.de <Reiner Braun>  
<http://www.mindspring.com/~us016262/ines-html>

b) Address of DFG-VK (German Peace Society - United War Resisters), National Office:  
Schwanenstr. 16, D-42551 Velbert, Germany;  
phone: (49-2051) 4217 or 4218 or 955 270, fax: (49-2051) 4210,  
e-mail: k\_vogler@muenster.de <Kathrin Vogler>  
<http://www.dfg-vk.de> <<in German language only>>

Peacefully yours,  
Tobias Damjanov

To: Bridget Moix <bridget@fcl.org>  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Re: agenda  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Bridget:

Toward the end of the CTBT discussion, I would like to receive suggestions for the agenda of the October 15 meeting on grassroots strategy that will involve broader participation from the religious community.

Thanks,

Howard

At 05:31 PM 10/6/97 -0400, you wrote:

>TO: Nuclear Weapons Working Group

>

>FROM: Bridget Moix

>

>>

>It's that time again. If you have agenda items for this week's meeting

>(Thursday, 9-10:30, Mott House), please send them to me by 3 pm Wed.

>

>

Return-Path: <paprog>  
Date: Tue, 7 Oct 1997 11:46:16 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Fran Teplitz <paprog@igc.apc.org>  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Sign-on letter

Hi Howard.

Please add Peace Action to the sign-on letter to Clinton regarding nuclear weapons abolition/deep cuts. For the name use Gordon S. Clark, Executive Director.

Thank you, Fran Teplitz

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 07 Oct 1997 14:57:05 -0400  
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org  
Subject: WELCOME!  
To: CTBT-Organize@igc.org

Dear Friends of the CTBT:

Welcome to CTBT-Organize. I am Kathy Crandall, the Disarmament Clearinghouse Coordinator in Washington, DC. There are about 50 people on this list now, and I invite you all to begin sending messages related to your CTBT ratification efforts to all of us at <ctbt-organize@igc.org>

As you initially send messages, please identify who you are (your name), your organization/ affiliation and where you are (what city and state).

In order to facilitate effective strategy work, there may be some messages (like Senate swing lists, or specific legislative intelligence) that should not be downloaded, photocopied or otherwise widely dispersed. Please be thoughtful about how the information from this list is used, and check with person sending a message before sharing information broadly with others.

If you have any questions about how this list works, please contact me directly:

Kathy Crandall  
Disarmament Clearinghouse  
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005  
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232  
FAX: 202 898 0172  
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

Please send us a message to <ctbt-organize@igc.org> and let us know what you're doing to achieve a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW!



Legislative Program Assistant  
Friends Committee on National Legislation  
245 Second St., NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
ph: (202) 547-6000, ex. 122  
fax: (202) 547-6019  
email: [bridget@fcnl.org](mailto:bridget@fcnl.org)

To: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Re: WELCOME!  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Kathy,

Thanks for setting up ctbt-organize

Howard Hallman

At 02:57 PM 10/7/97 -0400, you wrote:

>Dear Friends of the CTBT:

>

>Welcome to CTBT-Organize. I am Kathy Crandall, the Disarmament  
>Clearinghouse Coordinator in Washington, DC. There are about 50 people  
>on this list now, and I invite you all to begin sending messages related  
>to your CTBT ratification efforts to all of us at  
><ctbt-organize@igc.org>.....

>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 8 Oct 1997 10:23:58 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: CTBT  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, tomatompn+@igc.org  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc3.igc.apc.org id KAB03131  
X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org

Dear Friends,  
Below is an eloquent plea for speaking truth to power. Alice Slater

>Return-Path: <DGracie@afsc.org>  
>X-Sender: dgracie@mail.afsc.org (Unverified)  
>Date: Wed, 08 Oct 1997 11:01:51 -0400  
>To: aslater@igc.apc.org  
>From: David Gracie <DGracie@afsc.org>  
>Subject: CTBT  
>X-Info: American Friends Service Committee  
>X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igcb.igc.org id IAA11281

>  
>  
>This message concerning the CTBT was sent to American Friends Service  
>Committee regional staff, 10/7/97, by David Gracie, Peace Education  
>Director, AFSC.  
>  
>  
>Treaties are not enough  
>  
>  
>Much of our time and attention in the demilitarization area is being  
>devoted to work for weapons treaties: Abolition 2000 is calling for an  
>international treaty by the year 2000 that would rid the world of nuclear  
>weapons. We are urged to support ratification by the Senate of the  
>Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). We have joined with Oscar Arias and  
>other Nobel laureates in calling for a global Code of Conduct on the sale  
>of arms and have seen Rep. Cynthia McKinney's work for a U.S. Code of  
>Conduct on arms sales as an important rallying point for disarmament  
>groups. We have celebrated the U.S. ratification of the Chemical Weapons  
>Convention. The recent conclusion of a treaty in Oslo banning the  
>production and deployment of landmines was real cause for rejoicing, even  
>though we have yet to persuade President Clinton to sign that treaty in  
>Ottawa in December without the exceptions dictated to him by the Pentagon.  
>  
>Treaties, whether in successful, final form like the landmines ban or in  
>draft form like the nuclear weapons convention, can provide ways to focus  
>education and advocacy for a weapons free world. The best of them, when  
>adopted by the nations of the world, actually curb the spread of armed  
>violence. But they do not stand apart from other global and national  
>arrangements of power. They must be seen in their political contexts and  
>not as pure handles that peace loving people can grasp to bring about  
>fundamental change in the world.  
>

>At an Abolition 2000 meeting at the national office a few years ago, Corbin  
>Harney, Western Shoshone spiritual leader, well known from the  
>demonstrations and vigils at the Nevada Test Site, grew weary with the  
>discussion about maneuverings at the U.N. related to the Nonproliferation  
>Treaty Review Conference. "Let me tell you about treaties," he said. He  
>did not need to say much more than that to make his point. When a Native  
>American talks about treaties, we all have to swallow hard.

>  
>Peace organizations face a dilemma at present with regard to the CTBT,  
>which President Clinton has sent to the Senate for ratification. We have  
>labeled long and hard for a CTBT. We celebrated its signing at the UN. We  
>sighed with relief that Mother Earth will no longer be violated by  
>underground tests around the world. Any thought of the treaty's rejection  
>by the Senate now is chilling. Would that not guarantee further  
>proliferation of weapons worldwide? Yet we know that a terrible price has  
>been paid to get this treaty signed. The President signed only after  
>promising the nuclear weapons establishment (the laboratories, the  
>military, the contractors) a Stockpile Stewardship Maintenance Program that  
>will cost \$4.5 billion a year and that will assure continued testing and  
>weapons designing in the labs and in underground "subcritical tests" in  
>Nevada. This arrangement means the U.S. does not regard the CTBT as a step  
>towards abolition of the weapons but as a means to hold onto our lion's  
>share of nuclear weapons, thus enabling nuclear diplomacy for the  
>indefinite future. To add insult to injury, we also know that some  
>senators will hold the taxpayers up for further ransom payments to the labs  
>and to the military before they will agree to vote to ratify.

>  
>At that price, is this treaty good for the peace of the world? Even as we  
>ask this question, we remember with sadness the experience of 1963. When  
>President Kennedy agreed to a limited test ban (no further tests in the  
>atmosphere) we rejoiced and gave thanks to God. I did for sure. I was the  
>vicar of a little country church at the time, and the Sunday after the  
>signing I made sure God heard an expression of gratitude from Grace Church,  
>Long Rapids, Michigan. While we may yet be grateful that our children are  
>not exposed to increased levels of atmospheric fallout, we must cry out at  
>the betrayal of our hopes by the deal which produced that treaty. The labs  
>were supported, testing continued underground, and the U.S. went on to  
>engage in a hitherto unimaginable buildup of nuclear weapons in the ensuing  
>years.

>  
>So how should we work now for a CTBT, with integrity? I think the only way  
>to do it is by adding to every expression of support for this treaty a  
>demand that the labs be defunded, the Nevada test site closed, all weapons  
>taken off alert, and the other steps followed that lead the way to  
>abolition. (The steps have been clearly outlined in detail by the Canberra  
>Commission and in brief form in the Abolition 2000 statement.) We should  
>not become closet abolitionists in order to persuade senators to ratify,  
>which is what I am afraid several peace organizations are in danger of  
>doing, by consciously suppressing their critique of Stockpile Stewardship  
>in their lobbying efforts for ratification.

>  
>It was sobering for me to read Pres. Clinton's address to the United  
>Nations on September 22d. What got the headlines was his announcement that  
>he is sending the CTBT to the Senate for ratification. What a careful

>reading of the speech reveals is how he regards weapons treaties as part of  
>the architecture of empire. "The emerging international system" (his term  
>for New Global Order) requires "a new strategy of security (with) a new  
>network of institutions and arrangements with distinct missions, but a  
>common purpose—to secure and strengthen the gains of democracy and free  
>markets while turning back their enemies." And who are the enemies he  
>named?—"rogue states and...an unholy axis of terrorists, drug traffickers,  
>and international criminals."

>  
>The new security strategy includes "expanded military alliances like  
>NATO...free trade arrangements like the World Trade Organization...free trade  
>areas...strong arms control regimes, like the Chemical Weapons Convention and  
>the Nonproliferation Treaty..." I have selected from his somewhat longer  
>list to make a point. The arms control treaties are seen as parallel to  
>the economic arrangements. The whole world noticed that the arms control  
>treaty he failed to mention (after previously having promoted the concept  
>at the U.N.) was the landmines ban. Arms control treaties that fit well  
>with economic hegemony are what the U.S. is after. Since the landmines  
>treaty was written in a way that did not allow the U.S. to write in the  
>exceptions it wanted, it is not to be mentioned in public.

>  
>While reflecting on these things, I was encouraged by receiving a report of  
>the discussion that took place in Santa Rosa, California on September 6th  
>where Wilson Riles, director of AFSC's Pacific Mountain Region, challenged  
>people in Northern California Abolition 2000 "to develop a message in clear  
>and unequivocal language which points toward a more fundamental change of  
>values than a weapons treaty alone, with all the rest of the violence power  
>structure still in place."

>  
>The thoughts that Wilson and I are having are not new to the ongoing  
>discussion at AFSC. Those who have read Joseph Gerson's With Hiroshima  
>Eyes will remember his reflections on empire. Those of us who went to  
>Tahiti will never forget how Gabi Tetiarahi and other Pacific Islanders  
>raised the demand for nuclear abolition as a key component in their  
>struggle to bring an end to the violence of colonial rule.

>  
>Arms control treaties may be very important steps towards our larger goals  
>of peace and justice, but each treaty and each campaign must be carefully  
>examined in the context of the structures of power to which we in AFSC try  
>to speak truth. We have to be careful that we do not sell pieces of  
>ourselves for words on paper.

>  
>I believe we should be promoters of the codes of conduct on conventional  
>arms transfers and of the nuclear weapons convention, with a CTBT as a  
>necessary step on the way to that goal. But in our advocacy we should not  
>speak less than the truth nor promote illusions about power. Our work is  
>for the sake of a transformed world, in which (to paraphrase the prophet )  
>God's law will be written not in treaties but in human hearts.

>

>

>

To: abolition-caucus  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Sign-on letter to President Clinton  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Friends:

I invite you to sign the following letter to President Clinton, asking that the United States take a positive approach to proposals for multi-lateral negotiations for nuclear disarmament when they arise at the UN General Assembly, the Conference on Disarmament, and the NPT Preparatory Committee.

The letter contains ideas I gained from discussion with Alyn Ware of the Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy. A first draft was reviewed by Alice Slater of GRACE and members of the Nuclear Weapons Working Group of the Monday Lobby in Washington, D.C. Several initial signers are indicated.

If you wish to sign, please let me know and indicate the name and title of the signer and name of your organization. Deadline for signing is Wednesday, October 15, 1997.

If you have any questions, you can call me at 301 896-0013 or reach me by e-mail at mupj@igc.apc.org.

With best regards,

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

\*\*\*\*\*

The Honorable William J. Clinton  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

On a number of occasions you have expressed a desire to see the total elimination of nuclear weapons on Earth. In your second inaugural address you offered a vision of a land of new promise where "our children will sleep free from the threat of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons." This vision has wide public support, indicated in a poll conducted last spring by Celinda Lake of Lake Sosin Snell Associates that revealed 84 percent of American voters would feel safer knowing that no country had nuclear weapons.

Already there are global conventions for the elimination of chemical and biological weapons. In the Celinda Lake survey 87 percent of the respondents agreed that the United States should negotiate a similar agreement to eliminate nuclear weapons. In the next eight months three international bodies will be meeting and will have opportunities to take significant steps toward accomplishing this goal. We hope that under your leadership the United States will play a constructive role in these gatherings.

The first occasion is the 52nd Session of the United Nations General Assembly, now meeting in New York. It is our understanding that the General Assembly will consider a resolution similar to the one proposed by Malaysia and adopted last December that (1) notes the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice that "there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control" and (2) "calls upon all states to fulfill that obligation immediately by commencing negotiations of a nuclear weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deploying,

stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination." We ask that the United States drop its opposition to such a resolution and strongly endorse it.

The second occasion will be the reconvening of the UN Conference on Disarmament in Geneva in January 1998. Previously some participants have proposed that the Conference establish an ad hoc committee to commence multi-lateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Likely this proposal will come up again. We favor this approach. Therefore, we ask that the United States support creation of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament.

(over)

The third occasion will be meeting of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee in Geneva in April 1998. In preparation for this meeting we recommend that the United States take several good faith actions that begin to respond to the obligations under Article VI of the NPT. Specifically we urge that the United States begin to carry out "immediate steps" recommended by the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons:

- Take nuclear weapons off alert
- Remove warheads from delivery vehicles
- End deployment of non-strategic nuclear weapons
- Achieve agreement with other nuclear weapon states for reciprocal no first use

At the meeting of the NPT PrepCom we ask that the United States support efforts to establish a working group to begin negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention. Such a group could work out a division of responsibility with the ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament of the Conference on Disarmament, for there are many tasks to perform in moving toward the goal of nuclear abolition.

None of these multi-lateral efforts would preclude the United States and Russia from working out a START III agreement that would substantially reduce the world's two largest nuclear arsenals. Indeed, such bilateral reductions can set the stage for total elimination by all parties under a nuclear weapons convention.

Mr. President, as you lead the United States on this journey, we promise to help build public support for such bold measures. As previously indicated, the American people are already inclined in this direction and will welcome your leadership to work out arrangements for global elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework.

Sincerely yours,

[Initial signers:]

Caleb S. Rositer, Director, Demilitarization for Democracy  
Edward (Ned) W. Stowe, Legislative Secretary, Friends Committee for  
National Legislation  
Alice Slater, President, Global Resource Action Center for the Environment  
Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
Kathy Thorton, National Coordinator, NETWORK: A National Catholic Social  
Justice Lobby  
Gordon S. Clark, Executive Director, Peace Action  
David Hart, Executive Director, Veterans for Peace  
Susan Share, Executive Director, Women's Action for New Directions

To: atwood@pop.unicc.org  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject:  
Cc: dgracie@afsc.org, crramey@igc.apc.org  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear David Atwood:

I am writing to you at the suggestion of David Gracie of the AFSC. He and I along with Clayton Ramey of the FOR (in the US) are co-conveners of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, which is part of the Abolition 2000 Network.

As you may know, Abolition 2000 intends to bring together a number of NGOs in Geneva at the next meeting of the NPT Preparatory Committee, scheduled for April 28 to May 8, 1998. They will conduct a series of forums and make contact with delegates in order to influence the outcome of the meeting.

This may also be an opportunity bring together world religious leaders to make the moral case for abolition of nuclear weapons. We would like your advice and assistance on this matter.

Several weeks ago I wrote to Dwayne Epps at the World Council of Churches, asking him if top leadership of WCC might be involved. I had a brief telephone conversation with him, but I caught him in the midst of the Central Committee meeting. He said he'd get back in touch with me, but I haven't heard from him.

My friends in the Catholic Church believe that the Pontifical Commission on Justice and Peace is examining the matter of nuclear weapons anew. They further note that the Pope is an abolitionist according to statements he has made.

The Dalai Lama has made strong statements favoring nuclear disarmament. Leaders of other faiths have done likewise.

Do you think it would be possible to put together some kind of gathering in which these world leaders or their representatives would participate? For example, one suggestion is to have a forum at 4:00 p.m. on Sunday, April 27, the day before the NPT PrepCom meeting commences, and follow the forum with a reception for delegates. No doubt there are other possibilities.

It is conceivable that a similar event could be organized toward the end of January 1998 when the Conference on Disarmament reconvenes.

We are open to various possibilities and therefore will benefit greatly from whatever counsel you can offer.

To reply you can reach me via e-mail at mupj@igc.apc.org or by phone in the U.S. at 301 896-0013.

With best regards,

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

Return-Path: <bkinsey@peacemission.org>  
From: "Bob Kinsey" <bkinsey@peacemission.org>  
To: <mupj@igc.apc.org>, <abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: CTBT Ratification and Stockpile Stewardship  
Date: Sat, 4 Oct 1997 19:01:23 -0600  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

I totally agree with this statement. There is no way at this time to make subtle distinctions between these two issues. The general public is for a CTBT. At this time they aren't prepared to get the problem of Stockpile Stewardship quick or get behind an effort eliminate it. If we get the CTBT we can move toward challenging the SS program as hypocrisy in the face of what they thought they were getting with the CTBT. CTBT will get an international inspection system in place and commit the US to cooperative anti testing activity. Cooperative is the operative word. We have to establish some sort of commitment to gaining national security via international cooperation. Every inch in that direction, even if accompanied by large bits of hypocrisy is progress.

-----

> From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
> To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
> Subject: CTBT Ratification and Stockpile Stewardship  
> Date: Friday, October 03, 1997 3:10 PM  
>  
> Dear Abolitionists:  
>  
> I would like to offer comments on Alice Slater's recent posting,  
> "Ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty - At What Price?"  
>  
> Her case against the stockpile stewardship program is well-stated and  
should  
> encourage us to work hard to curtail this extravagant and dangerous  
venture.  
> But that need not deter us from simultaneously pressing for Senate  
> ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), which is a  
worthy  
> step toward nuclear abolition.  
>  
> Taking up Alice's parallel, I believe that in a similar manner the  
Limited  
> Test Ban Treaty of 1963 was valuable for what it achieved even if it  
didn't  
> halt the nuclear arms race. My perspective is that of a father with two  
> young daughters in the early 1960s, worried about reports of strontium-90  
> from radioactive fallout getting into the milk supply. (We didn't know  
then  
> about the radioactive iodine.) I was greatly relieved when all  
atmospheric  
> testing was ended. I wish we could have stopped underground testing and  
> further nuclear weapons development, but this failure doesn't take away  
from  
> the significant accomplishment of halting atmospheric testing.

>  
> Likewise the CTBT is valuable for what it accomplishes: a global regime  
with  
> zero threshold for nuclear testing. It may not be 100 percent perfect  
from  
> all perspectives, but it is a significant advance. (Neither in all  
> likelihood will the Nuclear Weapons Convention be perfect when it is  
> achieved, for the final document will bear the mark of negotiations by  
> political leaders rather than copying precisely the model developed by  
the  
> Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy.)  
>  
> Failure of the U.S. Senate to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty  
would  
> be a serious setback for the nuclear disarmament movement, for it would  
mean  
> that forces of reaction have prevailed and would preclude adoption of  
even  
> more far-reaching treaties for the rest of this decade.  
>  
> If there is a deal between President Clinton and the weapons laboratory,  
it  
> is not a legally binding part of the treaty. Even if the Senate places  
> conditions related to stockpile stewardship in the resolution of  
> ratification, such conditions will be more hortatory than binding.  
That's  
> because binding decisions on stockpile stewardship are made instead  
through  
> the authorization and appropriations processes of Congress. If we want  
to  
> curtail subcritical testing and other pernicious aspects of stockpile  
> stewardship, we must go after the appropriations. That, as some may  
recall,  
> was ultimately how we forced an end to the Vietnam War.  
>  
> If our opposition causes ratification of the CTBT to fail, it is we who  
will  
> have paid too high a price. And in the process we won't have blocked the  
> stockpile stewardship program either.  
>  
> The Abolition 2000 movement is broad enough to contain those who want to  
> concentrate on CTBT ratification, others who focus primarily on the  
> stockpile stewardship program, and those who work on both issues  
> simultaneously. As the Unicorn said to Alice in Through the  
Looking-Glass,  
> "If you'll believe in me, I'll believe in you." (You will recall that  
> before they met, each thought the other was a fabulous monster.)  
>  
> With peace and goodwill towards all,  
>  
> Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
>



Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 8 Oct 1997 13:53:03 -0700 (PDT)  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Sign-on letter to President Clinton  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc3.igc.apc.org id NAA15847  
X-Sender: mupj@pop.igc.org

Dear Friends:

I invite you to sign the following letter to President Clinton, asking that the United States take a positive approach to proposals for multi-lateral negotiations for nuclear disarmament when they arise at the UN General Assembly, the Conference on Disarmament, and the NPT Preparatory Committee.

The letter contains ideas I gained from discussion with Alyn Ware of the Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy. A first draft was reviewed by Alice Slater of GRACE and members of the Nuclear Weapons Working Group of the Monday Lobby in Washington, D.C. Several initial signers are indicated.

If you wish to sign, please let me know and indicate the name and title of the signer and name of your organization. Deadline for signing is Wednesday, October 15, 1997.

If you have any questions, you can call me at 301 896-0013 or reach me by e-mail at mupj@igc.apc.org.

With best regards,

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

\*\*\*\*\*

The Honorable William J. Clinton  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

On a number of occasions you have expressed a desire to see the total elimination of nuclear weapons on Earth. In your second inaugural address you offered a vision of a land of new promise where "our children will sleep free from the threat of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons." This vision has wide public support, indicated in a poll conducted last spring by Celinda Lake of Lake Sosin Snell Associates that revealed 84 percent of American voters would feel safer knowing that no country had nuclear weapons.

Already there are global conventions for the elimination of chemical and biological weapons. In the Celinda Lake survey 87 percent of the respondents agreed that the United States should negotiate a similar agreement to eliminate nuclear weapons. In the next eight months three

international bodies will be meeting and will have opportunities to take significant steps toward accomplishing this goal. We hope that under your leadership the United States will play a constructive role in these gatherings.

The first occasion is the 52nd Session of the United Nations General Assembly, now meeting in New York. It is our understanding that the General Assembly will consider a resolution similar to the one proposed by Malaysia and adopted last December that (1) notes the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice that "there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control" and (2) "calls upon all states to fulfill that obligation immediately by commencing negotiations of a nuclear weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deploying, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination." We ask that the United States drop its opposition to such a resolution and strongly endorse it.

The second occasion will be the reconvening of the UN Conference on Disarmament in Geneva in January 1998. Previously some participants have proposed that the Conference establish an ad hoc committee to commence multi-lateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Likely this proposal will come up again. We favor this approach. Therefore, we ask that the United States support creation of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament.

(over)

The third occasion will be meeting of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee in Geneva in April 1998. In preparation for this meeting we recommend that the United States take several good faith actions that begin to respond to the obligations under Article VI of the NPT. Specifically we urge that the United States begin to carry out "immediate steps" recommended by the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons:

- Take nuclear weapons off alert
- Remove warheads from delivery vehicles
- End deployment of non-strategic nuclear weapons
- Achieve agreement with other nuclear weapon states for reciprocal no first use

At the meeting of the NPT PrepCom we ask that the United States support efforts to establish a working group to begin negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention. Such a group could work out a division of responsibility with the ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament of the Conference on Disarmament, for there are many tasks to perform in moving toward the goal of nuclear abolition.

None of these multi-lateral efforts would preclude the United States and Russia from working out a START III agreement that would substantially reduce the world's two largest nuclear arsenals. Indeed, such bilateral reductions can set the stage for total elimination by all parties under a nuclear weapons convention.

Mr. President, as you lead the United States on this journey, we promise to

help build public support for such bold measures. As previously indicated, the American people are already inclined in this direction and will welcome your leadership to work out arrangements for global elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework.

Sincerely yours,

[Initial signers:]

Caleb S. Rositer, Director, Demilitarization for Democracy

Edward (Ned) W. Stowe, Legislative Secretary, Friends Committee for  
National Legislation

Alice Slater, President, Global Resource Action Center for the Environment

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

Kathy Thorton, National Coordinator, NETWORK: A National Catholic Social  
Justice Lobby

Gordon S. Clark, Executive Director, Peace Action

David Hart, Executive Director, Veterans for Peace

Susan Share, Executive Director, Women's Action for New Directions

To: Kathy Spallone <kathy-s@k2nesoft.com>  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Re: ? about 20th of Month  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Yes, feel free to use my e-mail letter on writing to President Clinton on the 20th of the month. I haven't had a direct reply to my 20th of the month letters, but I shared one with a contact on Mrs. Clinton's staff, and she said she circulated it to others on the White House staff. It was a letter suggesting to President Clinton that his grandchildren would retain the fear of nuclear weapons, based upon Pentagon policy to keep them forever.

Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
Phone: 301 896-0013

At 10:49 PM 10/8/97 -0400, you wrote:

>  
>  
>Dear MUPJ,  
>  
> I'm trying to put together a list of action ideas that people can do  
>for Abolition 2000 and would like to know if the 20th of the Month letter  
>writing to President Clinton is still a good idea. Do you have handy a  
>brief explanation of the idea which could be copied from e-mail? If you  
>don't, would it be OK to paraphrase an earlier e-mail on the subject?  
>Thanks for any help. I have written on the 20th a few times at your  
>suggestion.  
>  
> Kathie Spallone  
> (helping out Theresa Fitzgibbon at PYM)  
>  
>

Return-Path: <bkinsey@peacemission.org>  
From: "Bob Kinsey" <bkinsey@peacemission.org>  
To: <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter to President Clinton  
Date: Wed, 8 Oct 1997 18:14:36 -0600  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

Please add my signature  
Robert A. Kinsey  
Chairperson, Peace and Justice Task Force, Rocky Mountain Conference,  
United Church of Christ

-----  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Sign-on letter to President Clinton  
Date: Wednesday, October 08, 1997 2:53 PM

Dear Friends:

I invite you to sign the following letter to President Clinton, asking that the United States take a positive approach to proposals for multi-lateral negotiations for nuclear disarmament when they arise at the UN General Assembly, the Conference on Disarmament, and the NPT Preparatory Committee.

The letter contains ideas I gained from discussion with Alyn Ware of the Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy. A first draft was reviewed by Alice Slater of GRACE and members of the Nuclear Weapons Working Group of the Monday Lobby in Washington, D.C. Several initial signers are indicated.

If you wish to sign, please let me know and indicate the name and title of the signer and name of your organization. Deadline for signing is Wednesday, October 15, 1997.

If you have any questions, you can call me at 301 896-0013 or reach me by e-mail at mupj@igc.apc.org.

With best regards,

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

\*\*\*\*\*

The Honorable William J. Clinton  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

On a number of occasions you have expressed a desire to see the total elimination of nuclear weapons on Earth. In your second inaugural address you offered a vision of a land of new promise where "our children will

sleep

free from the threat of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons." This vision has wide public support, indicated in a poll conducted last spring by

Celinda Lake of Lake Sosin Snell Associates that revealed 84 percent of American voters would feel safer knowing that no country had nuclear weapons.

Already there are global conventions for the elimination of chemical and biological weapons. In the Celinda Lake survey 87 percent of the respondents agreed that the United States should negotiate a similar agreement to eliminate nuclear weapons. In the next eight months three international bodies will be meeting and will have opportunities to take significant steps toward accomplishing this goal. We hope that under your leadership the United States will play a constructive role in these gatherings.

The first occasion is the 52nd Session of the United Nations General Assembly, now meeting in New York. It is our understanding that the General Assembly will consider a resolution similar to the one proposed by Malaysia and adopted last December that (1) notes the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice that "there exists an obligation to pursue in

good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control" and (2) "calls upon all states to fulfill that obligation immediately by commencing negotiations of a nuclear weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deploying, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination." We ask that the United States drop its opposition to such a resolution and strongly endorse it.

The second occasion will be the reconvening of the UN Conference on Disarmament in Geneva in January 1998. Previously some participants have proposed that the Conference establish an ad hoc committee to commence multi-lateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Likely this proposal will come up again. We favor this approach. Therefore, we ask that the United States support creation of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament.

(over)

The third occasion will be meeting of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee in Geneva in April 1998. In preparation for this meeting we recommend that the United States take several good faith actions that begin to respond to the obligations under Article VI of the NPT. Specifically we urge that the United States begin to carry out "immediate steps" recommended by the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons:

- Take nuclear weapons off alert
- Remove warheads from delivery vehicles
- End deployment of non-strategic nuclear weapons

· Achieve agreement with other nuclear weapon states for reciprocal no first use

At the meeting of the NPT PrepCom we ask that the United States support efforts to establish a working group to begin negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention. Such a group could work out a division of responsibility with the ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament of the Conference on Disarmament, for there are many tasks to perform in moving toward the goal of nuclear abolition.

None of these multi-lateral efforts would preclude the United States and Russia from working out a START III agreement that would substantially reduce the world's two largest nuclear arsenals. Indeed, such bilateral reductions can set the stage for total elimination by all parties under a nuclear weapons convention.

Mr. President, as you lead the United States on this journey, we promise to help build public support for such bold measures. As previously indicated, the American people are already inclined in this direction and will welcome your leadership to work out arrangements for global elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework.

Sincerely yours,

[Initial signers:]

Caleb S. Rositer, Director, Demilitarization for Democracy  
Edward (Ned) W. Stowe, Legislative Secretary, Friends Committee for  
National Legislation  
Alice Slater, President, Global Resource Action Center for the Environment  
Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
Kathy Thorton, National Coordinator, NETWORK: A National Catholic Social  
Justice Lobby  
Gordon S. Clark, Executive Director, Peace Action  
David Hart, Executive Director, Veterans for Peace  
Susan Share, Executive Director, Women's Action for New Directions

-----

Return-Path: <alichterman@pop.igc.apc.org>  
Date: Thu, 9 Oct 1997 02:08:58 -0500 (CDT)  
X-Sender: alichterman@pop.igc.apc.org  
To: DavidMcR@aol.com, mupj@igc.apc.org, abolition-caucus@igc.org  
From: Andrew Lichterman <alichterman@pop.igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: CTBT Ratification and Stockpile Stewardship

There are, perhaps, some other lessons to be learned from the 1963 Limited Test Ban Treaty and its aftermath. At that time, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and their allies in the Senate insisted as a condition for ratification that the United States pursue certain initiatives, often referred to as the "four safeguards." These consisted of an extensive underground nuclear weapons testing program, maintenance of "modern nuclear weapons laboratories and programs which will attract and retain 'human scientific resources,'" maintaining the capacity to speedily resume atmospheric testing, and improved capacities to monitor the nuclear testing activities of other nations. Since the history of the peace movement then is only fragmentarily available to us (as of all oppositional movements at all times, with the most conventional portions of movements most likely to leave a documentary trace), I don't know whether there was substantial opposition to that deal.

What we do know is that in the years after the Limited Test Ban, the pace of U.S. nuclear testing on average increased. And as Richard Perle pointed out in 1973, "Arms control agreements have in the past stimulated development of new technologies to compensate for those limited by agreement. The art of underground nuclear testing, for example, has been rapidly advanced in both the United States and the Soviet Union since the partial nuclear test ban was signed in 1961 [sic]"(1) Thirty-four years later, we are left with a nuclear arsenal which far exceeds that of 1963 in sophistication. Yet today, with the adversary which served as the primary justification for our nuclear arsenal splintered both economically and geopolitically, the laboratories and the military propose essentially the same set of "safeguards" which was deemed necessary at the height of the Cold War, updated for more modern capabilities: three nuclear weapons laboratories, extensive nuclear research, development, and testing programs, and the ability to resume underground testing, all at a cost of billions of dollars per year. The name for it this time around is Stockpile Stewardship and Management. Here again, it appears likely that an arms control agreement approached in a conventional way by national security elites will stimulate "development of new technologies," including developments in high energy physics and pulsed power which may lead to a variety of new weapons technologies in the future.

Against this background, we must ask ourselves what the purpose of a Comprehensive Test Ban is. Is it intended to end further development of nuclear weapons, both by those who have them, and those who might wish to acquire them, and hence an important step towards their eventual elimination? Or is it instead just part of the strategic maneuvering setting the terms for another round of arms competition, with the dominant powers seeking to set technological conditions which work to their advantage? And it is in this context that we must evaluate Stockpile Stewardship and Management: a plan for a nuclear weapons design and development complex of unprecedented sophistication, which in its early

stages already has redesigned and deployed without underground testing a nuclear warhead, the B61-11 earth penetrator gravity bomb, with improved military capabilities.

It is impossible to calculate what deal will in the end be struck among the powers-- currently largely unaccountable-- who will determine this important piece of our future. There continues to be a strong faction within the government of the United States which seeks to achieve overwhelming military power-- the ability to prevail militarily anywhere on the globe. Although virtually invisible in public discussion of these issues, their demands carry great weight in determining the limits of debate. In addition, whatever deal is reached will be the product in large part of many subbargains which reflect only short-term considerations of power and profit: whose districts and contributors will gain lucrative contracts, which congressional committees will continue to oversee and allocate funds for prestigious and well-funded programs. Some of the subbargains among legislators will have nothing to do with nuclear weapons-- your vote on this for my vote on your water project.

I believe that the proper role for those of us who wish to build movements for peace and social justice is to speak the truth, to identify as best we can those in power and the goals they seek, and to posit, both in our words and in our actions, an alternative vision in which all those affected have a genuine, and equal, role in the decisions which shape our shared future. There will never be any shortage of people in the centers of power to cut deals. CTBT yes. New nuclear weapons facilities and new nuclear weapons no-- not here, not in other nuclear weapons states, declared or undeclared, not anywhere.

(1) Richard Perle, "Superpower Postures in SALT: The Language of Arms Control," in Morton A. Kaplan, ed., *Salt: Problems and Prospects* (1973), cited in Sean M. Lynn-Jones, "Lulling and Stimulating Effects of Arms Control," in A.Carnesdale and R.N. Haass, eds., *Superpower Arms Control: Setting the Record Straight* (Cambridge, MA 1987), 223, 241.

At 04:11 AM 10/6/97 -0700, you wrote:

>To; David McReynolds:

>

>I don't believe that you can blame the Limited Test Ban Treaty for the  
>failure of the peace movement to press harder for nuclear disarmament in the  
>1960s. The fault lies within ourselves not with the treaty which had a  
>useful purpose by stopping radioactive fallout.

>

>Howard W. Hallman

>

>

>t 11:40 PM 10/4/97 -0400, DavidMcR@aol.com wrote:

>>Taking up this question of how much value the earlier test ban treaty did,  
>> let me indulge the heresy that it was a set-back for the peace movement, and  
>>was given us by the U.S. and Soviet governments because they had done all the  
>>tested they needed to do.

>>

>>The immediate result of the Test Ban Treaty was that a truly massive public

>>movement (the strong and powerful days of SANE, now over thirty years behind  
>>us) which could call out thousands to Times Square in a matter of a day or  
>>two - and was having repercussions in the Soviet Union since we opposed their  
>>tests also - led to the diminishing public interest in the disarmament issue.  
>>.....  
>  
>

Return-Path: <102464.1110@compuserve.com>  
Date: Thu, 9 Oct 1997 06:25:55 -0400  
From: Dietrich Fischer <102464.1110@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Sign-on letter to President Clinton  
Sender: Dietrich Fischer <102464.1110@compuserve.com>  
To: "INTERNET:mupj@igc.apc.org" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline

Dear Howard Hallman,

I would like to co-sign your letter to President Clinton.

Thank you for taking this initiative.

with best wishes,

Dietrich Fischer, Professor, Pace University

(home address: 114 Conover Road, Robbinsville, NJ 08691,  
Tel/Fax 609-799-8319)

Return-Path: <dh3m@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.DE>  
From: Martin Kalinowski <dh3m@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.DE>  
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter to President Clinton  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Date: Thu, 9 Oct 1997 13:23:38 +0200 (CET)  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id EAA27618

Thank you very much for the letter to Clinton.  
Yes, I would like to sign it.  
Martin Kalinowski, member of the Coordinating Committee of the International  
Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation (INESAP)

--

---

Martin Kalinowski, IANUS, c/o Institut fuer Kernphysik  
Schlossgartenstr. 9, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany  
Tel.: +49-6151-163016 FAX: +49-6151-166039  
Internet, private: KALINOWSKI@HRZPUB.TH-DARMSTADT.DE  
Internet, group: IANUS@HRZPUB.TH-DARMSTADT.DE  
<http://www.th-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/welcome.htm> and [.../inesap.htm](http://www.th-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/welcme.htm)

---

Return-Path: <mkantola@kaapeli.fi>

Date: Thu, 9 Oct 1997 15:17:06 +0300

X-Sender: mkantola@kaapeli.fi

To: mupj@igc.apc.org

From: mkantola@kaapeli.fi (Peace Station)

Subject: Re: Sign-on letter to President Clinton

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id FAA07083

We want to sign the letter to President Clinton,

Malla Kantola, secretary general, Committee of 100 in Finland

Laura Lodenius, press secretary, Peace Union of Finland

>Dear Friends:

>

>I invite you to sign the following letter to President Clinton, asking that  
>the United States take a positive approach to proposals for multi-lateral  
>negotiations for nuclear disarmament when they arise at the UN General  
>Assembly, the Conference on Disarmament, and the NPT Preparatory Committee.

>

>The letter contains ideas I gained from discussion with Alyn Ware of the  
>Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy. A first draft was reviewed by Alice  
>Slater of GRACE and members of the Nuclear Weapons Working Group of the  
>Monday Lobby in Washington, D.C. Several initial signers are indicated.

>

>If you wish to sign, please let me know and indicate the name and title of  
>the signer and name of your organization. Deadline for signing is  
>Wednesday, October 15, 1997.

>

>If you have any questions, you can call me at 301 896-0013 or reach me by  
>e-mail at mupj@igc.apc.org.

>

>With best regards,

>

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

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

>The Honorable William J. Clinton  
>The White House  
>Washington, DC 20500

>

>Dear Mr. President:

>

>On a number of occasions you have expressed a desire to see the total  
>elimination of nuclear weapons on Earth. In your second inaugural address  
>you offered a vision of a land of new promise where "our children will sleep  
>free from the threat of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons." This  
>vision has wide public support, indicated in a poll conducted last spring by  
>Celinda Lake of Lake Sosin Snell Associates that revealed 84 percent of

>American voters would feel safer knowing that no country had nuclear weapons.

>

>Already there are global conventions for the elimination of chemical and  
>biological weapons. In the Celinda Lake survey 87 percent of the  
>respondents agreed that the United States should negotiate a similar  
>agreement to eliminate nuclear weapons. In the next eight months three  
>international bodies will be meeting and will have opportunities to take  
>significant steps toward accomplishing this goal. We hope that under your  
>leadership the United States will play a constructive role in these gatherings.

>

>The first occasion is the 52nd Session of the United Nations General  
>Assembly, now meeting in New York. It is our understanding that the General  
>Assembly will consider a resolution similar to the one proposed by Malaysia  
>and adopted last December that (1) notes the unanimous conclusion of the  
>International Court of Justice that "there exists an obligation to pursue in  
>good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear  
>disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international  
>control" and (2) "calls upon all states to fulfill that obligation  
>immediately by commencing negotiations of a nuclear weapons convention  
>prohibiting the development, production, testing, deploying, stockpiling,  
>transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their  
>elimination." We ask that the United States drop its opposition to such a  
>resolution and strongly endorse it.

>

>The second occasion will be the reconvening of the UN Conference on  
>Disarmament in Geneva in January 1998. Previously some participants have  
>proposed that the Conference establish an ad hoc committee to commence  
>multi-lateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Likely this proposal  
>will come up again. We favor this approach. Therefore, we ask that the  
>United States support creation of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament  
>within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament.

>

> (over)

>The third occasion will be meeting of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)  
>Preparatory Committee in Geneva in April 1998. In preparation for this  
>meeting we recommend that the United States take several good faith actions  
>that begin to respond to the obligations under Article VI of the NPT.  
>Specifically we urge that the United States begin to carry out "immediate  
>steps" recommended by the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear  
>Weapons:

>

>· Take nuclear weapons off alert  
>· Remove warheads from delivery vehicles  
>· End deployment of non-strategic nuclear weapons  
>· Achieve agreement with other nuclear weapon states for reciprocal no  
first use

>

>At the meeting of the NPT PrepCom we ask that the United States support  
>efforts to establish a working group to begin negotiations on a nuclear  
>weapons convention. Such a group could work out a division of  
>responsibility with the ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament of the  
>Conference on Disarmament, for there are many tasks to perform in moving  
>toward the goal of nuclear abolition.

>

>None of these multi-lateral efforts would preclude the United States and  
>Russia from working out a START III agreement that would substantially  
>reduce the world's two largest nuclear arsenals. Indeed, such bilateral  
>reductions can set the stage for total elimination by all parties under a  
>nuclear weapons convention.

>

>Mr. President, as you lead the United States on this journey, we promise to  
>help build public support for such bold measures. As previously indicated,  
>the American people are already inclined in this direction and will welcome  
>your leadership to work out arrangements for global elimination of nuclear  
>weapons within a timebound framework.

>

>Sincerely yours,

>

>[Initial signers:]

>

>Caleb S. Rositer, Director, Demilitarization for Democracy

>Edward (Ned) W. Stowe, Legislative Secretary, Friends Committee for  
> National Legislation

>Alice Slater, President, Global Resource Action Center for the Environment

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

>Kathy Thorton, National Coordinator, NETWORK: A National Catholic Social  
> Justice Lobby

>Gordon S. Clark, Executive Director, Peace Action

>David Hart, Executive Director, Veterans for Peace

>Susan Share, Executive Director, Women's Action for New Directions

>

>

Return-Path: <nhpeaceact>  
Date: Thu, 9 Oct 1997 06:03:08 -0700 (PDT)  
From: New Hampshire Peace Action <nhpeaceact@igc.org>  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter to President Clinton

please add my name:

Sean Donahue,  
Coordinator,  
NH Peace Action

>From afscamb Thu Oct 9 06:43:45 1997  
>Return-Path: <afscamb@igc.apc.org>  
>Date: Thu, 9 Oct 1997 06:43:36 -0700 (PDT)  
>X-Sender: afscamb@pop.igc.org  
>To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
>From: Joseph Gerson <afscamb@igc.apc.org>  
>Subject: Abolition Conference  
>Sender: afscamb@igc.org  
>X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc3.igc.apc.org id GAA20827

Oct. 9, 1997

Dear Howard,

I spoke briefly with David Gracie yesterday, and he told me that you were aware of and considering attending our Oct. 24-26 conference. The conference is coming along quite well. I'll be surprised if we aren't at least a couple of hundred people, with some coming from as far as South Carolina and California, but most from New England. If it will tip the balance of your considerations - and even if it doesn't - I wanted to invite you to join the panel for the workshop on organizing in communities of faith. Although we have our differences, I am sure you would make a most helpful contribution. I'm not in a position to help with your travel costs, but we could certainly waive the registration fee.

At 01:53 PM 10/8/97 -0700, mupj@igc.apc.org wrote:

>Dear Friends:

>

>I invite you to sign the following letter to President Clinton, asking that  
>the United States take a positive approach to proposals for multi-lateral  
>negotiations for nuclear disarmament when they arise at the UN General  
>Assembly, the Conference on Disarmament, and the NPT Preparatory Committee.

>

>The letter contains ideas I gained from discussion with Alyn Ware of the  
>Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy. A first draft was reviewed by Alice  
>Slater of GRACE and members of the Nuclear Weapons Working Group of the  
>Monday Lobby in Washington, D.C. Several initial signers are indicated.

>

>If you wish to sign, please let me know and indicate the name and title of  
>the signer and name of your organization. Deadline for signing is  
>Wednesday, October 15, 1997.

>

>If you have any questions, you can call me at 301 896-0013 or reach me by  
>e-mail at mupj@igc.apc.org.

>

>With best regards,

>

>Howard W. Hallman, Chair

>Methodists United for Peace with Justice

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

>The Honorable William J. Clinton

>The White House

>Washington, DC 20500

>

>Dear Mr. President:

>

>On a number of occasions you have expressed a desire to see the total  
>elimination of nuclear weapons on Earth. In your second inaugural address  
>you offered a vision of a land of new promise where "our children will sleep  
>free from the threat of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons." This  
>vision has wide public support, indicated in a poll conducted last spring by  
>Celinda Lake of Lake Sosin Snell Associates that revealed 84 percent of  
>American voters would feel safer knowing that no country had nuclear weapons.

>

>Already there are global conventions for the elimination of chemical and  
>biological weapons. In the Celinda Lake survey 87 percent of the  
>respondents agreed that the United States should negotiate a similar  
>agreement to eliminate nuclear weapons. In the next eight months three  
>international bodies will be meeting and will have opportunities to take  
>significant steps toward accomplishing this goal. We hope that under your  
>leadership the United States will play a constructive role in these gatherings.

>

>The first occasion is the 52nd Session of the United Nations General  
>Assembly, now meeting in New York. It is our understanding that the General  
>Assembly will consider a resolution similar to the one proposed by Malaysia  
>and adopted last December that (1) notes the unanimous conclusion of the  
>International Court of Justice that "there exists an obligation to pursue in  
>good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear  
>disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international  
>control" and (2) "calls upon all states to fulfill that obligation  
>immediately by commencing negotiations of a nuclear weapons convention  
>prohibiting the development, production, testing, deploying, stockpiling,  
>transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their  
>elimination." We ask that the United States drop its opposition to such a  
>resolution and strongly endorse it.

>

>The second occasion will be the reconvening of the UN Conference on  
>Disarmament in Geneva in January 1998. Previously some participants have  
>proposed that the Conference establish an ad hoc committee to commence  
>multi-lateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Likely this proposal  
>will come up again. We favor this approach. Therefore, we ask that the  
>United States support creation of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament  
>within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament.

>

> (over)

>The third occasion will be meeting of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)  
>Preparatory Committee in Geneva in April 1998. In preparation for this  
>meeting we recommend that the United States take several good faith actions  
>that begin to respond to the obligations under Article VI of the NPT.  
>Specifically we urge that the United States begin to carry out "immediate

>steps" recommended by the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear

>Weapons:

>

> Take nuclear weapons off alert

> Remove warheads from delivery vehicles

> End deployment of non-strategic nuclear weapons

> Achieve agreement with other nuclear weapon states for reciprocal no first use

>

>At the meeting of the NPT PrepCom we ask that the United States support

>efforts to establish a working group to begin negotiations on a nuclear

>weapons convention. Such a group could work out a division of

>responsibility with the ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament of the

>Conference on Disarmament, for there are many tasks to perform in moving

>toward the goal of nuclear abolition.

>

>None of these multi-lateral efforts would preclude the United States and

>Russia from working out a START III agreement that would substantially

>reduce the world's two largest nuclear arsenals. Indeed, such bilateral

>reductions can set the stage for total elimination by all parties under a

>nuclear weapons convention.

>

>Mr. President, as you lead the United States on this journey, we promise to

>help build public support for such bold measures. As previously indicated,

>the American people are already inclined in this direction and will welcome

>your leadership to work out arrangements for global elimination of nuclear

>weapons within a timebound framework.

>

>Sincerely yours,

>

>[Initial signers:]

>

>Caleb S. Rositer, Director, Demilitarization for Democracy

>Edward (Ned) W. Stowe, Legislative Secretary, Friends Committee for

> National Legislation

>Alice Slater, President, Global Resource Action Center for the Environment

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

>Kathy Thorton, National Coordinator, NETWORK: A National Catholic Social

> Justice Lobby

>Gordon S. Clark, Executive Director, Peace Action

>David Hart, Executive Director, Veterans for Peace

>Susan Share, Executive Director, Women's Action for New Directions

>

>

Return-Path: <dce@wcc-coe.org>  
Date: Thu, 09 Oct 1997 16:11:09 +0100  
From: Dwain EPPS <dce@wcc-coe.org>  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Cc: sal@wcc-coe.org  
Subject: Request for advice -Reply

Dear Howard,

My sincere apologies for having delayed so long in replying to your good message with respect to the NPT PrepCom meeting in April 1998.

I hope it is needless to say that the WCC stands strongly with those in your network in opposition to the continuing poison of nuclear arms in our midst, and the need to abolish them absolutely.

Depending on the nature of the event you have in mind, we could certainly consider ways we could offer space and limited support here in the Ecumenical Center.

I fear, though, that with our drastically reduced staff now, and especially in light of intensive preparations for the forthcoming WCC Assembly in Harare, we have had to lay aside all other commitments for 1998. Thus promise to be able to do more than this.

But if there were people who could organize, and depending a bit on what is organized, of course, we would welcome such an initiative.

This is not much, I know. But I trust you will understand the dilemma.

Let me know what you think. If this is enough to allow you to move networks in the direction you suggest, then let us keep in touch and see what we might do here locally in Geneva to help.

With best regards,

Dwain C. Epps  
Coordinator  
International Affairs (CCIA)  
WCC

To: atwood@pop.unicc.org  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Request for advice -Reply  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

To: David Atwood

From: Howard Hallman

Since writing you, I received the following reply from Dwain Epps.

>Return-Path: <dce@wcc-coe.org>  
>Date: Thu, 09 Oct 1997 16:11:09 +0100  
>From: Dwain EPPS <dce@wcc-coe.org>  
>To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
>Cc: sal@wcc-coe.org  
>Subject: Request for advice -Reply  
>  
>Dear Howard,  
>  
>My sincere apologies for having delayed so long in replying to your good  
>message with respect to the NPT PrepCom meeting in April 1998.  
>  
>I hope it is needless to say that the WCC stands strongly with those in  
>your network in opposition to the continuing poison of nuclear arms in  
>our midst, and the need to abolish them absolutely.  
>  
>Depending on the nature of the event you have in mind, we could  
>certainly consider ways we could offer space and limited support here  
>in the Ecumenical Center.  
>  
>I fear, though, that with our drastically reduced staff now, and especially  
>in light of intensive preparations for the forthcoming WCC Assembly in  
>Harare, we have had to lay aside all other commitments for 1998. Thus  
>promise to be able to do more than this.  
>  
>But if there were people who could organize, and depending a bit on  
>what is organized, of course, we would welcome such an initiative.  
>  
>This is not much, I know. But I trust you will understand the dilemma.  
>  
>Let me know what you think. If this is enough to allow you to move  
>networks in the direction you suggest, then let us keep in touch and see  
>what we might do here locally in Geneva to help.  
>  
>With best regards,  
>  
>Dwain C. Epps  
>Coordinator  
>International Affairs (CCIA)

>WCC

>

>

Return-Path: <prop1@prop1.org>  
X-Sender: prop1@prop1.org  
Date: Thu, 09 Oct 1997 12:19:08 -0400  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
From: Peace through Reason <prop1@prop1.org>  
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter to President Clinton  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id JAA10571

Dear Howard,

Please sign Proposition One Committee on to your letter to President Clinton.

Ellen Thomas, Director  
Proposition One Committee  
Peace Park Antinuclear Vigil  
PO Box 27217, Washington DC 20038 USA  
202-462-0757 -- prop1@prop1.org -- <http://prop1.org>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>  
>The Honorable William J. Clinton  
>The White House  
>Washington, DC 20500

>  
>Dear Mr. President:

>  
>On a number of occasions you have expressed a desire to see the total  
>elimination of nuclear weapons on Earth. In your second inaugural address  
>you offered a vision of a land of new promise where "our children will sleep  
>free from the threat of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons." This  
>vision has wide public support, indicated in a poll conducted last spring by  
>Celinda Lake of Lake Sosin Snell Associates that revealed 84 percent of  
>American voters would feel safer knowing that no country had nuclear weapons.

>  
>Already there are global conventions for the elimination of chemical and  
>biological weapons. In the Celinda Lake survey 87 percent of the  
>respondents agreed that the United States should negotiate a similar  
>agreement to eliminate nuclear weapons. In the next eight months three  
>international bodies will be meeting and will have opportunities to take  
>significant steps toward accomplishing this goal. We hope that under your  
>leadership the United States will play a constructive role in these  
>gatherings.

>  
>The first occasion is the 52nd Session of the United Nations General  
>Assembly, now meeting in New York. It is our understanding that the General  
>Assembly will consider a resolution similar to the one proposed by Malaysia  
>and adopted last December that (1) notes the unanimous conclusion of the  
>International Court of Justice that "there exists an obligation to pursue in  
>good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear  
>disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international  
>control" and (2) "calls upon all states to fulfill that obligation  
>immediately by commencing negotiations of a nuclear weapons convention

>prohibiting the development, production, testing, deploying, stockpiling,  
>transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their  
>elimination." We ask that the United States drop its opposition to such a  
>resolution and strongly endorse it.

>  
>The second occasion will be the reconvening of the UN Conference on  
>Disarmament in Geneva in January 1998. Previously some participants have  
>proposed that the Conference establish an ad hoc committee to commence  
>multi-lateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Likely this proposal  
>will come up again. We favor this approach. Therefore, we ask that the  
>United States support creation of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament  
>within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament.

>  
> (over)  
>The third occasion will be meeting of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)  
>Preparatory Committee in Geneva in April 1998. In preparation for this  
>meeting we recommend that the United States take several good faith actions  
>that begin to respond to the obligations under Article VI of the NPT.  
>Specifically we urge that the United States begin to carry out "immediate  
>steps" recommended by the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear  
>Weapons:

>  
>· Take nuclear weapons off alert  
>· Remove warheads from delivery vehicles  
>· End deployment of non-strategic nuclear weapons  
>· Achieve agreement with other nuclear weapon states for reciprocal no  
first use

>  
>At the meeting of the NPT PrepCom we ask that the United States support  
>efforts to establish a working group to begin negotiations on a nuclear  
>weapons convention. Such a group could work out a division of  
>responsibility with the ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament of the  
>Conference on Disarmament, for there are many tasks to perform in moving  
>toward the goal of nuclear abolition.

>  
>None of these multi-lateral efforts would preclude the United States and  
>Russia from working out a START III agreement that would substantially  
>reduce the world's two largest nuclear arsenals. Indeed, such bilateral  
>reductions can set the stage for total elimination by all parties under a  
>nuclear weapons convention.

>  
>Mr. President, as you lead the United States on this journey, we promise to  
>help build public support for such bold measures. As previously indicated,  
>the American people are already inclined in this direction and will welcome  
>your leadership to work out arrangements for global elimination of nuclear  
>weapons within a timebound framework.

>  
>Sincerely yours,

>  
>[Initial signers:]

>  
>Caleb S. Rositer, Director, Demilitarization for Democracy  
>Edward (Ned) W. Stowe, Legislative Secretary, Friends Committee for  
> National Legislation

- >Alice Slater, President, Global Resource Action Center for the Environment
- >Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice
- >Kathy Thorton, National Coordinator, NETWORK: A National Catholic Social  
> Justice Lobby
- >Gordon S. Clark, Executive Director, Peace Action
- >David Hart, Executive Director, Veterans for Peace
- >Susan Share, Executive Director, Women's Action for New Directions
- >
- >

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Thu, 09 Oct 1997 14:03:59 -0400  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: sign-on

Thanks for your good work on the sign-on letter to Clinton about weapons. Please add to the signers:

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

Return-Path: <martinez@servidor.unam.mx>

Date: Thu, 9 Oct 1997 13:50:04 -0600 (CST)

From: MARTINEZ NEGRETE MARIO ANTONIO <martinez@servidor.unam.mx>

To: mupj@igc.apc.org

Subject: Re: Sign-on letter to President Clinton

Hello: Add my name to the letter to Mr. Clinton: Marco Martinez, Head of the Physics Department, Faculty of Sciences, University of Mexico

To: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Re: CTBT Ratification and Stockpile Stewardship  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Alice,  
Yes, I'd like to sign the letter to Ambassador Strulak. When I finally read it, I thought I had missed the deadline.  
Thanks for doing this.

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

At 04:45 PM 10/9/97 -0700, you wrote:

>Howard,  
>Would you like to sign and list your organization on the letter to  
>Ambassador Strulak asking for greater NGO participation at the 1998 PrepCom  
>in Geneva? I hope to send it tomorrow. Thanks,  
>  
>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: INESnet@fy.chalmers.se, yaro@glas.apc.org, wiednerb@aol.com,  
armtrade@cdi.org, nirsnet@igc.apc.org  
Date: Thu, 09 Oct 1997 16:23:49 -0700  
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: OPEN LETTER TO LEADERS OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS STATES  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

Dear Abolitionists,

The following letter has been sent, personally addressed, to the leaders of the eight nuclear weapons states. I ask your help in assuring that these leaders are met by sunflowers when they make public appearances. I believe that this can be a very strong way of constantly reminding these leaders of their responsibility to achieve a nuclear weapons free world. It is also an important way to send a message to the public to enlist them in the effort for nuclear weapons abolition.

David Krieger

-----

#### OPEN LETTER TO LEADERS OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS STATES

When Ukraine, which inherited nuclear weapons from the former Soviet Union, became a nuclear weapons free state in 1996, the Defense Ministers of the United States, Russia, and Ukraine celebrated the occasion by planting sunflowers and scattering sunflower seeds on a former Ukrainian missile base. Former U.S. Secretary of Defense William Perry said, "Sunflowers instead of missiles in the soil would ensure peace for future generations."

The sunflower has since become the international symbol of a nuclear weapons free world. When sunflowers are held up before you or presented to you, please understand that this is a message to invoke your active efforts to fulfill your responsibility to eliminate all nuclear weapons from the world.

Nuclear weapons are instruments of genocide. They are the ultimate threat to human rights, to the environment, and to life on Earth. They are, in fact, "the ultimate evil"--as they have been described by Mohammed Bedjaoui, President of the World Court.

No state has the legal or moral right to threaten or use biological, chemical or nuclear weapons. The World Court reached the unanimous conclusion that all states have an obligation to complete good faith negotiations for nuclear disarmament "in all its aspects." As the leader of a nuclear weapons state, the responsibility to fulfill this mandate falls to you.

Let us build a new world order on the hope of sunflowers instead of the threat and despair of nuclear-armed missiles. Sunflowers are bright, beautiful, and natural. They grow from the Earth. Nuclear-armed missiles are instruments that threaten mass annihilation, even of our entire species.

The people choose sunflowers. They choose life. They choose a safer and saner future for their children and grandchildren. The sunflower is the symbol they present to you in silent eloquence of the desire for a nuclear weapons free world.

You are asked to end the nuclear threat by taking nuclear forces off alert status, by making a commitment to "no first use" of nuclear weapons, and by removing all nuclear weapons from foreign soil and international waters.

You are asked to sign a Nuclear Weapons Convention to eliminate nuclear weapons within a timebound framework and to prohibit their development production, acquisition, possession, testing, threat or use.

You are asked to reallocate resources from these instruments of genocide to positive measures for alleviating poverty and suffering in the world, and for fulfilling basic human needs.

You are asked to make a new commitment for a new century--a commitment to end the nuclear weapons era. Sunflowers instead of missiles.

There is no security in the threat and counter-threat of nuclear annihilation. The people speak to you with sunflowers, sending the powerful message of life. They ask you to choose life. They ask you to enter the 21st Century with a treaty in place committing all nations of the world to eliminate their nuclear arsenals within a reasonable period of time.

The message of the sunflower is that the future is in our hands, and you are called upon to act now for a nuclear weapons free future.

Sincerely,

David Krieger  
- President -

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

\*\*\*\*\*

A founding member of  
and global contact point for the  
Abolition 2000 Global Network for the  
Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

\*\*\*\*\*

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123  
Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794  
Phone (805) 965-3443 \* Fax (805) 568-0466  
E- <mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org>  
<http://www.wagingpeace.org>

>From flick Thu Oct 9 22:00:05 1997  
Return-Path: <flick@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Thu, 9 Oct 1997 21:59:48 -0700 (PDT)  
X-Sender: flick@pop.igc.apc.org  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
From: flick@igc.apc.org (flick)  
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter to President Clinton  
Sender: flick@igc.org

please add Felicity Hill, International Disarmament Coordinator of the  
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom to this letter, its  
great!

love felicity

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: ipb@gn.apc.org  
Date: Fri, 10 Oct 1997 15:32:55 +0200 (MET DST)  
From: fredpax@online.no (Fredrik S. Heffermehl)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: NOBEL PRIZE FOR LANDMINES ABOLITION  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id GAA23713  
X-Sender: fredpax@sn.no

Fredrik S. Heffermehl  
International Peace Bureau, Vice President  
Niels Juels gt. 28 A, N-0272 Oslo, Norway  
Tel. +47-2244 8003 (fax:+47-2244 7616)

PRESS RELEASE - OCT. 10, 1997

Statement on the 1997 NOBEL PEACE PRIZE

for the International Campaign to Ban Landmines  
and its coordinator Jody Williams

Oslo, Oct. 10, 1997

A prize for international democracy

The Nobel Peace Prize honors an emerging international political democracy. A group of government have played a necessary role in the development of a ban against landmines, but we in the citizens' peace movement are particularly pleased and proud that the award goes to the organizations of citizens that took the initiative and moved the governments forward. It should encourage everyone to see the great and rapid disarmament steps that can be achieved by a citizens' initiative. The Nobel committee states that the landmines process is a model for future work for disarmament and peace. Indeed this model, of organizations working with governments - and not waiting for the most powerful nations - is has already made important progress under the name of "Abolition 2000". This network, seeking a timebound ban by year 2000 to eliminate nuclear weapons is a clear parallell to the landmines campaign. Important part victories toward a nuclear ban have already been achieved, such as last year's ban under international law by the UN Court in the Hague and various initiatives in the UN.

The landmines campaign and its very capable coordinator Jody Williams truly deserve to share the 1997 prize.

Oslo, 10.10, 1996      Fredrik S. Heffermehl

P.S.

It is worth noting that the Norwegian government, that has played an important role in the work for an international ban, as late as two years ago fought a ban against all Norwegian landmines when the organization brought this matter up in Parliament. They said it would be impossible to get other states in line, - but the treaty achieved in Oslo, mid-September, shows how rapid disarmament can happen if only citizens get together and make their demands heard.

To: relctbt  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Meeting on October 15  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

To: Religious Organizations Working for CTBT Ratification

From: Howard W. Hallman

Reminder of a meeting of the CTBT Grassroots Campaign from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. on Wednesday, October 15, 1997 in the Methodist Building, Conference Room 3.

## PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Introductions
2. CTBT in Congress Update
3. Grassroots Campaign Update
  - List/serve
  - Activist packet
  - Regional conferences in Denver and Pittsburgh; Seattle proposed
4. State contacts, home state visits with senators (most of meeting)
  - See roll call of states below
5. Date and time for subsequent meetings

##

## Roll call of states

As we go through the listing of key states, participants will be asked to indicate in which ones they have contacts who will work for CTBT ratification. If any of your contacts would be willing to work with other groups in their states, please come with their names, address, phone, fax, and e-mail information. The person identified as Washington contact for each state will channel this information to a principal state contact. If you cannot attend the meeting, please supply this information directly to the Washington contact.

| Key States | Washington Contact                        |
|------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Alaska     | Lisa Ledwidge, PSR                        |
| Washington | Kathy Crandall, Disarmament Clearinghouse |
| Oregon     | Fran Teplitz, Peace Action                |
| Utah       | David Culp, Plutonium Challenge           |
| Wyoming    | Kathy Crandall, Disarmament Clearinghouse |
| Colorado   | Lisa Ledwidge, PSR                        |
| New Mexico | Lisa Ledwidge, PSR                        |
| Nebraska   | Laura Kriv, 20/20 Vision                  |
| Kansas     | Kathy Guthrie, FCNL                       |
| Iowa       | Kathy Crandall, Disarmament Clearinghouse |
| Missouri   | Antonia Balazs, Veterans for Peace        |
| Indiana    | Kathy Guthrie, FCNL                       |

Michigan Laura Kriv, 20/20 Vision  
Ohio Fran Teplitz, Peace Action  
Kentucky Fran Teplitz, Peace Action  
Tennessee Fran Teplitz, Peace Action  
Western Pennsylvania Lisa Ledgwidg, PSR  
Eastern Pennsylvania Fran Teplitz, Peace Action  
Deleware David Culp, Plutonium Challenge  
Upstate New York Kimberly Robson, WAND  
Fran Teplitz, Peace Action  
New Hampshire Fran Teplitz, Peace Action  
Maine Fran Teplitz, Peace Action

#### Possible additions

Virginia  
North Carolina  
Arizona

#### Washington Contacts

Antonia Balazs (MO)  
Veterans for Peace  
100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Suite 106  
Washington, DC 20002  
Tel: 202 488-7225  
Fax: 202 488-7224

Kathy Crandall (IA, WA, WY)  
Disarmament Clearinghouse  
1101 14th Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel: 202 898-0150, ext. 232  
Fax: 202 898-0172  
E-mail: [disarmament@igc.org](mailto:disarmament@igc.org)

David Culp (DE, UT)  
Plutonium Challenge  
1200 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel: 202 289-2388  
Fax: 202 898-0172  
E-mail: [dculp@nrdc.org](mailto:dculp@nrdc.org)

Kathy Guthrie (KS, IN)  
Friends Committee on National Legislation  
245 Second Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
Tel: 202 547-6000  
Fax: 202547-6019  
E-mail: [kathy@fcnl.org](mailto:kathy@fcnl.org)

Laura Kriv (MI, NE)  
20/20 Vision  
1828 Jefferson Place, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

Tel: 202 833-2020  
Fax: 202 833-5307  
E-mail: vision@igc.org

Lisa Ledwidge (AK, CO, NM, W.PA)  
Physicians for Social Responsibility  
1101 14th Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel: 202 898-0150, ext. 222  
Fax 202 898-0172  
E-mail: ledwidge@psr.org

Kimberly Robson (NY)  
Women's Action for New Directions  
110 Maryland Avenue, NE, Suite 205  
Tel: 202 543-8505  
Fax: 202 675-6469  
E-mail: wandwill@clark.net

Fran Teplitz (KY, ME, NH, NY, OR, OH, E.PA, TN)  
Peace Action  
1819 H Street, NW, Suite 420-425  
Washington, DC 20006  
Tel: 202 862-9740, ext. 3004  
Fax 202 862-9762  
E-mail: paprog@igc.org

If you have any questions on the October 15 meeting or the "roll call of states", please call me at 301 896-0013.

Howard Hallman  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice

To: nukes  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Meeting on October 15  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

From: Howard W. Hallman

I have sent to religious organizations working for CTBT ratification the following proposed agenda of the meeting of the CTBT Grassroots Campaign from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. on Wednesday, October 15, 1997 in the Methodist Building, Conference Room 3.

## PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Introductions
2. CTBT in Congress Update
3. Grassroots Campaign Update
  - List/serve
  - Activist packet
  - Regional conferences in Denver and Pittsburgh; Seattle proposed
4. State contacts, home state visits with senators (most of meeting)
  - See roll call of states below
5. Date and time for subsequent meetings

##

### Roll call of states

As we go through the listing of key states, participants will be asked to indicate in which ones they have contacts who will work for CTBT ratification. If any of your contacts would be willing to work with other groups in their states, please come with their names, address, phone, fax, and e-mail information. The person identified as Washington contact for each state will channel this information to a principal state contact. If you cannot attend the meeting, please supply this information directly to the Washington contact.

| Key States | Washington Contact                        |
|------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Alaska     | Lisa Ledwidge, PSR                        |
| Washington | Kathy Crandall, Disarmament Clearinghouse |
| Oregon     | Fran Teplitz, Peace Action                |
| Utah       | David Culp, Plutonium Challenge           |
| Wyoming    | Kathy Crandall, Disarmament Clearinghouse |
| Colorado   | Lisa Ledwidge, PSR                        |
| New Mexico | Lisa Ledwidge, PSR                        |
| Nebraska   | Laura Kriv, 20/20 Vision                  |
| Kansas     | Kathy Guthrie, FCNL                       |
| Iowa       | Kathy Crandall, Disarmament Clearinghouse |
| Missouri   | Antonia Balazs, Veterans for Peace        |
| Indiana    | Kathy Guthrie, FCNL                       |
| Michigan   | Laura Kriv, 20/20 Vision                  |

Ohio Fran Teplitz, Peace Action  
Kentucky Fran Teplitz, Peace Action  
Tennessee Fran Teplitz, Peace Action  
Western Pennsylvania Lisa Ledgwick, PSR  
Eastern Pennsylvania Fran Teplitz, Peace Action  
Delaware David Culp, Plutonium Challenge  
Upstate New York Kimberly Robson, WAND  
Fran Teplitz, Peace Action  
New Hampshire Fran Teplitz, Peace Action  
Maine Fran Teplitz, Peace Action

Possible additions

Virginia  
North Carolina  
Arizona

Washington Contacts

Antonia Balazs (MO)  
Veterans for Peace  
100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Suite 106  
Washington, DC 20002  
Tel: 202 488-7225  
Fax: 202 488-7224

Kathy Crandall (IA, WA, WY)  
Disarmament Clearinghouse  
1101 14th Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel: 202 898-0150, ext. 232  
Fax: 202 898-0172  
E-mail: [disarmament@igc.org](mailto:disarmament@igc.org)

David Culp (DE, UT)  
Plutonium Challenge  
1200 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel: 202 289-2388  
Fax: 202 898-0172  
E-mail: [dculp@nrdc.org](mailto:dculp@nrdc.org)

Kathy Guthrie (KS, IN)  
Friends Committee on National Legislation  
245 Second Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
Tel: 202 547-6000  
Fax: 202547-6019  
E-mail: [kathy@fcnl.org](mailto:kathy@fcnl.org)

Laura Kriv (MI, NE)  
20/20 Vision  
1828 Jefferson Place, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
Tel: 202 833-2020

Fax: 202 833-5307  
E-mail: vision@igc.org

Lisa Ledwidge (AK, CO, NM, W.PA)  
Physicians for Social Responsibility  
1101 14th Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel: 202 898-0150, ext. 222  
Fax 202 898-0172  
E-mail: ledwidge@psr.org

Kimberly Robson (NY)  
Women's Action for New Directions  
110 Maryland Avenue, NE, Suite 205  
Tel: 202 543-8505  
Fax: 202 675-6469  
E-mail: wandwill@clark.net

Fran Teplitz (KY, ME, NH, NY, OR, OH, E.PA, TN)  
Peace Action  
1819 H Street, NW, Suite 420-425  
Washington, DC 20006  
Tel: 202 862-9740, ext. 3004  
Fax 202 862-9762  
E-mail: paprog@igc.org

If you have any questions on the October 15 meeting or the "roll call of states", please call me at 301 896-0013.

Howard Hallman  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Fri, 31 Oct 1997 20:25:36 -0800 (PST)  
From: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: USA/Nuclear Weapons the Next Generation/news article & call to  
action  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, rdtandempn+@igc.org  
X-Sender: wslf@pop.igc.org (Unverified)

Happy Halloween. Below is an article from today's Washington Post that confirms our worst suspicions. (Thanks to Ike Jeanes for bringing this to our attention.) The U.S. will agree to eliminate nuclear weapons when they have something "better" to replace them with. What does U.S. Secretary of Defense William Cohen mean by, "when new technology has produced a powerful new non-nuclear deterrent, in the 'indefinite future'?" (6th paragraph of Post article which follows, see also 10th paragraph) Here's a possible answer:

According to Swiss physicist Andre Gsponer, writing in the INESAP (International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation) Information Bulletin, No. 8, February 1996: "Fourth generation nuclear weapon are based on atomic or nuclear processes that are not restricted by a CTBT. In contrast with second generation nuclear weapons, their development will be essentially science-based, making use of many recent advances in fundamental or applied research. In common with first generation nuclear weapons, they could allow for rather simple and rugged designs, although the special materials they will be made of might be much more difficult to manufacture than plutonium or enriched uranium. Fourth generation nuclear weapons may provide really significant military advantages (especially for tactical uses since most of them will produce no residual radioactivity), and considerable political advantages since their development will be restricted to the most technologically advanced countries -- which already possess thermonuclear weapons to deter any potential aggressor or proliferator. A number of fourth generation nuclear weapons have been under construction for a very long time: clean fusion bombs, antimatter bombs, particle and laser beam weapons, laser-triggered bombs, atomic and nuclear isomers, etc....[T]hree examples [Metallic hydrogen, Nuclear isomers, and Antimatter]...have in common the fact that the key scientific instruments for their development are inertial confinement fusion devices such as the ones which are planned in the USA (National Ignition Facility - NIF) and France (Laser Megajoule - LMJ)."

This is one of the primary reasons that some of us are so concerned about the \$4.5 billion/year "Science-Based" Stockpile Stewardship program in the U.S. The suite of new, high-tech experimental facilities (including the NIF) and supercomputers that are being justified on the grounds that they are needed to "ensure the safety and reliability of the enduring stockpile in the absence of underground testing" are exactly the same technologies that can be used to develop new kinds of weapons, including those described above. What's the solution?

In a comprehensive technical report issued by INESAP in August of this year, Gsponer concludes: "A major arms control problem of fourth

generation nuclear weapons is that their development is very closely related to pure scientific research. The chief purpose of the CTBT is to freeze the technology of nuclear weapons as a first step toward general and complete nuclear disarmament. In order to achieve that, it is necessary to implement effective measures of preventive arms control, such as internationally binding restrictions in all relevant areas of research and development, whether they are claimed to be for military or civilian purposes."

If you share this view, it is incumbent on you to vigorously oppose Stockpile Stewardship programs in all of the nuclear weapon states. If you are an American who is committed to the historical purpose of the CTBT, it is essential that you link your support for CTBT ratification in the the Senate with unflinching opposition to Stockpile Stewardship (or, as Vic Siedel calls it, "Deathpile Skewership"). What we need is "Abolition-Based" Stockpile Stewardship, a curatorship program to ensure the safety and security of existing nuclear weapons (with inspectors and guards) while they await dismantlement pursuant to our NPT Article VI obligation. If enough of us demand this loudly and clearly enough, perhaps we can get a Senator to take up our cause. It certainly won't happen otherwise! For copies of Andre Gsponer's articles and more information on "Deathpile Skewership" please contact me. -- Jackie Cabasso (Contact information follows, below.)

-----  
-----  
The Washington Post Friday, October 31, 1997; Page A25

<http://search.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1997-10/31/0491-103197-idx.html>

Still on a Cold-War Footing

By Stephen S. Rosenfeld

With the ending of the Cold War, the nature of the nuclear dilemma changed from the possibility of general war to the possibility of accidental launch or rogue attack. Some believe the change opened the way to a wholesale revision of the American nuclear posture: taking all warheads off virtual hair-trigger alert, shrinking the arsenal swiftly toward zero weapons, ending the strategy of threatening massive nation-destroying retaliation and agreeing not to use nuclear weapons first.

From an interview I had with Defense Secretary William Cohen this week, however, it is clear that hope for these sorts of sweeping change have no home in the Clinton Administration. Whether this is for better or worse remains to be explored. But what is now clear is that this administration and this defense secretary have confirmed the deliberate, incremental, by-negotiation approach already being followed. In short, for now we are, and for many years we will be, ready however improbably to fight Russia or China or a rogue or terrorist in the instant massive Cold War way.

Cohen, who has a political head, figures that things will go well enough in Russia's dusty Duma and that grand negotiations with Moscow will resume and march ahead. Even so, Bill Clinton by the end of his presidency will still have thousands of on-alert weapons in hand and a strategy that permits or even commits

him to make any nuclear launch he initiates totally devastating. DETERRENCE OF THE OLD SCHOOL LIVES.

Cohen, a student of nuclear matters since his Senate days, challenges "the premise that somehow we are still locked into a pro-war mentality." He is ready to list the lesser, though to him "significant and dramatic," de-alertings and dismantlings of Clinton's making. These are steps taken in the name of the familiar twin goals of crisis stability and deterrence.

Cohen is a terrier on maintaining crisis stability as negotiations take the numbers down. But he fears crisis stability would be diminished by de-alerting measures that require reversing in an actual crisis. I find this an argument that treats a theoretical problem and skips past the real one -- all those nukes out there that might get loose. Cohen finds it a telling consideration.

He entertains the hope of following Ronald Reagan's and Bill Clinton's sometime aspirations for zero nuclear weapons -- by negotiation with Russia, when new technology has produced a powerful NEW NON-NUCLEAR DETERRENT, in the "INDEFINITE FUTURE." In the here and now, however, he is deeply and personally engaged in pressing with Moscow a "nuclear surety program" to ensure on-site safeguards covering the two arsenals' personnel, physical security and oversight. The American and Russian strategic commands, hot after "transparency," have just agreed to an exchange of experts in this field.

Deterrence is much on his mind. He worries a bit abstractly that at lower numbers each warhead becomes a more attractive target: "you actually increase the hair on the trigger, put more tension on it." But he also believes that American nuclear "ambiguity" helped keep Saddam Hussein from using chemical and biological weapons on our troops. Had the United States embraced a doctrine of no first nuclear use -- it does have a policy precluding first nuclear attack -- it would have lost a useful deterrent in the gulf war.

Is not this American validation of nuclear arms a rationale that other countries could use for going nuclear? No "abolitionist" himself, Cohen says that "the way we maintain deterrence is that we have a very strong deterrent."

Could he imagine counseling the president to launch a nuclear attack? "It would depend on the scenario. If I found that there were 3,000 [ballistic missiles] on the way . . ." He would prefer, he says, to get the numbers down to deal with Russia-type threats and to hedge against "accidental limited types of launches" by the kind of BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE that will be coming up for decision in Washington after two more years of research and development.

Is there not a contradiction between hoping to eventually negotiate our way to zero level globally and permanently retaining an American nuclear deterrent? Not for Secretary Cohen. He wants "TO MAKE SURE WE HAVE SOMETHING TO DETER MASSIVE CONVENTIONAL WAR....HOPEFULLY...IN A VERY SHORT PERIOD OF TIME, TECHNOLOGY WILL BRING US TECHNIQUES AND TECHNOLOGIES

OTHER THAN NUCLEAR WEAPONS."

Don't imagine, he volunteers, that the Joint Chiefs are a barrier to the "national commitment to get lower and lower levels, to the point where we don't have them." Not so. "Their attitude has been one of, okay, let's see how we can make it work." Nor are the Chiefs pressing right now for theater missile defenses. "They're saying, wait a minute, let's see what the threat is."

I leave thinking that Cohen is not on all points persuasive but that the president's chief defense adviser is a responsible steward of this vital area of national policy.

(c) Copyright 1997 The Washington Post Company

\*\*\*\*\*

WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION

1440 Broadway, Suite 500

Oakland, CA USA 94612

Tel: (510)839-5877

Fax: (510)839-5397

[wslf@igc.apc.org](mailto:wslf@igc.apc.org)

\*\*\*\*\* Part of ABOLITION 2000 \*\*\*\*\*

Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Sat, 1 Nov 1997 18:37:35 -0500 (EST)  
From: LCNP@aol.com  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: UN resolution: Updated list of cosponsors  
To: disarmament@igc.apc.org  
cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Malaysian draft resolution to the UN

Cosponsors  
as at October 31

Algeria  
Bangladesh  
Bosnia and Herzegovina  
Brazil  
Brunei Darussalam  
Burundi  
Colombia  
Costa Rica  
Ecuador  
El Salvador  
Fiji  
Ghana  
Guyana  
Honduras  
India  
Indonesia  
Iran  
Iraq  
Jamaica  
Kenya  
Lao People=s Democratic Republic  
Malawi  
Malaysia  
Marshall Islands  
Mexico  
Mongolia  
Myanmar  
Namibia  
Niger  
Nigeria  
Panama  
Paraguay  
Peru  
Philippines  
Samoa  
San Marino  
Singapore  
Solomon Islands  
Sri Lanka  
Sudan

Tanzania  
Thailand  
Uruguay  
Viet NAM  
Zimbabwe

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Sat, 1 Nov 1997 18:37:25 -0500 (EST)  
From: LCNP@aol.com  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Corrected UN resolution; nuclear weapons convention  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
cc: disarmament@igc.apc.org

Delegation of Malaysia  
First Committee

Agenda Item 71 (k)

Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons.

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolutions 49/75 K of 15 December 1994 and 51/45 M of 10 December 1996,

Convinced that the continuing existence of nuclear weapons poses a threat to all humanity and that their use would have catastrophic consequences for all life on Earth and recognizing that the only defence against a nuclear catastrophe is the total elimination of nuclear weapons and the certainty that they will never be produced again,

Mindful of the solemn obligations of States Parties, undertaken in Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, particularly to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament;

Recalling the Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament adopted at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and in particular the objective of determined pursuit by the nuclear weapon States of systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goal of eliminating those weapons;

Recalling also the adoption of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty in its resolution 50/245 on 10 September 1996;

Recognizing with satisfaction that the Antarctic treaty and the treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Bangkok and Pelindaba are gradually freeing the entire southern hemisphere and adjacent areas covered by those treaties from nuclear weapons,

Noting the efforts by the States possessing the largest inventories of nuclear weapons to reduce their stockpiles of such weapons through bilateral and unilateral agreements or arrangements, and calling for the

intensification of such efforts to accelerate the significant reduction of nuclear weapons arsenals,

Recognizing the need for a multilaterally negotiated and legally binding instrument to assure non-nuclear weapon States against the threat or use of nuclear weapons,

Reaffirming the central role of the Conference on Disarmament as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum and regretting the lack of progress in disarmament negotiations, particularly nuclear disarmament in the Conference on Disarmament during its 1997 session,

Emphasizing the need for the Conference on Disarmament to commence negotiations on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time,

Desiring to achieve the objective of a legally binding prohibition of the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, threat or use of nuclear weapons and their destruction under effective international control,

Recalling the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, issued on 8 July 1996,

1. Underlines once again the unanimous decision of the Court that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control;
2. Calls upon once again all States to immediately fulfill that obligation by commencing multilateral negotiations in 1998 leading to an early conclusion of a Nuclear Weapons Convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination;
3. Requests all States to inform the Secretary-General of the efforts and measures they have taken on the implementation of this resolution and nuclear disarmament, and requests the Secretary-General to appraise the General Assembly of that information at its fifty-third session;
4. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its fifty-second session the item entitled AFollow up to the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons@.

29 October, 1997

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Date: Sun, 2 Nov 1997 07:32:32 -0500  
From: Dietrich Fischer <102464.1110@compuserve.com>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: nuclear terrorism  
To: abolition-caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.org>

In "Nuclear Terrorism: A Diversionary Alarm" ("The Hindu," October 27, 1997), Achin Vanaik argued that terrorists seek to inflict only limited damage, to win sympathy for their political cause, and would therefore not want to use nuclear weapons, even if available to them. The specter of nuclear terrorism is used as a smokescreen by the nuclear powers to perpetuate their possession of nuclear weapons as a deterrent, Vanaik argued.

It is true that so far only the US used nuclear weapons, and the nuclear weapons states bear the heaviest responsibility. But it is improdient to rule out nuclear terrorism. In a New York Times article "As Trade Center Smoldered, Suspect Watched, Jury Hears" (front page, Oct. 23, 1997), Ramzi Ahmed Yousef, the mastermind of the World Trade Center bombing, was reported to have said he "had hoped one tower would fall onto the other and kill 250,000 civilians" in retaliation for US aid to Israel. The Americans killed 250,000 civilians in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and if they suffered those types of casualties, they would realize that they were at war, he said. This suggests that some terrorists would not hesitate to use a nuclear bomb, if they can get one.

Suicide bombers are not deterred by "deterrence." The only way to prevent such future catastrophes is obviously to abolish all nuclear weapons while we still have time. As long as governments keep thousands of these weapons, it is only a matter of time before a terrorist organization gets one of them, or an accidental explosion occurs.

Dietrich Fischer

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Sun, 2 Nov 97 06:40:23 UT  
From: "Ron Gray" <r-grayle@classic.msn.com>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Letter to Oz Foreign Minister Downer  
To: "Sheila Suttner" <ssuttner@ons.com.au>,  
"Kate Dewes"  
<Katie@chch.planet.org.nz>,  
"Alyn Ware / LCNP" <LCNP@aol.com>,  
"Abolition  
Caucus" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>,  
"ausfem-polnet"  
<ausfem-polnet@postoffice.utas.edu.au>,  
"Left Link" <leftlink@vicnet.net.au>,  
"wilpf news" <wilpf-news@igc.apc.org>,  
"Greg Barber, MAPW"  
<mapw@ozemail.com.au>,  
"Anna Pha" <guardian@peg.apc.org>

Dear Friends,  
Herewith the letter we have today faxed and are posting to Foreign Minister  
Downer.

2 November 1997  
Hon. Alexander Downer  
Minister of Foreign Affairs  
Parliament House, Canberra

Dear Mr Downer

On 10 December 1996, by a vote of 115 in favour to 22 against, and with 32  
abstentions, the United Nations General Assembly adopted Resolution 51/45M,  
calling for the commencement of negotiations leading to the conclusion of a  
nuclear weapons convention.

Of the nuclear weapons states, only China voted in favour of the resolution,  
whilst the others voted against it.

Australia, whilst constantly claiming to be an ardent supporter of nuclear  
disarmament, abstained. This action (or lack of action) we find bewildering,  
if not hypocritical.

A new draft resolution has now been submitted by Malaysia, which takes on  
board some of the concerns expressed by some countries in 1996.

You will recall that on 8 August 1997 Senator Grant Chapman attended the  
Adelaide ceremony which commemorated the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki,  
and accepted on behalf of the Australian Government sixteen 'Abolition 2000  
Local Authorities Resolution' forms, and more than 1650 individual  
'Declarations of Public Concern', calling for negotiations to begin on nuclear  
disarmament.

One of the comments Senator Chapman made during his interesting address to the

ceremony was:

\* Today Australia is fully committed to the twin goals of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and working through progressive balanced steps towards complete nuclear disarmament - we can join in the outrage, felt by many, that nuclear weapons have yet to be banished from the face of the earth. Our common security requires the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons.

Since then we have continued to receive public support for the Abolition 2000 campaign, and to date the number of Australian councils who have endorsed the campaign is 85 (see enclosed sheet), with more arriving each day or so, along with many more 'Declarations of Public Concern' from individuals.

While sincerely applauding the many positive steps the Australian Government has so far taken towards nuclear disarmament, we believe that now is the time to take the strong further step of supporting the revised version of Resolution 51/45M when it comes before the United Nations Disarmament Committee and the United Nations General Assembly in November and December this year.

We therefore strongly urge you to instruct our representatives in the negotiations to support the clear wishes of the Australian people by not only voting in favour of the resolution when it is put to these two United Nations bodies, but by also becoming a co-sponsor of the resolution.

Yours sincerely,

Irene Gale A.M. Secretary, Australian Peace Committee (South Australian Branch) Inc.

11 South Terrace, Adelaide SA 5000, Australia Ph: (+61-8) 8212 7138

Fax: (+61-8) 8231 3822 Email: r-grayle@classic.msn.com

(n.b. Our letterhead has a brief description of Abolition 2000 printed across the bottom of the page)

(enclosed sheet)

LOCAL AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING ABOLITION 2000 - Oct.'97

Municipalities who have endorsed the Abolition 2000 Resolution for Local Authorities.

1. Local Government Association of South Australia
2. Adelaide City Council, South Australia
3. Alexandrina Council, South Australia
4. Ashburton Shire Council, Western Australia
5. Auburn Council, New South Wales
6. Bay Precinct, North Sydney Council, New South Wales
7. Bellingen Shire Council, New South Wales
8. Bennett Precinct, North Sydney Council, New South Wales
9. Blacktown City Council, New South Wales
10. Blue Mountains City Council, New South Wales
11. Borroloola Community Government Council, Northern Territory
12. Bowen Shire Council, Queensland
13. Brimbank City Council, Victoria
14. Brisbane City Council, Queensland
15. Broadsound Shire Council, Queensland
16. Broken Hill City Council, New South Wales

17. Burwood Council, New South Wales
18. Casey City Council, Victoria
19. Charles Sturt City Council, South Australia
20. Clifton Shire Council, Queensland
21. Concord City Council, New South Wales
22. Coolamon Shire Council, New South Wales
23. Crow's Nest Shire Council, Queensland
24. Cuballing Shire Council, Western Australia
25. Douglas Shire Council, Queensland
26. Edward Precinct, North Sydney Council, New South Wales
27. Elliston District Council, South Australia
28. Fairfield City Council, New South Wales
29. Gumeracha District Council, South Australia
30. Happy Valley, Noarlunga & Willunga City Council, South Australia
31. Holdfast Bay City Council, South Australia
32. Hornsby City Council, New South Wales
33. Johnstone Shire Council, Queensland
34. Jondaryan Shire Council, Queensland
35. Laidley Shire Council, Queensland
36. Leichhardt City Council, New South Wales
37. Livingston Shire Council, Queensland
38. Logan City Council, Queensland
39. Longreach Shire Council, Queensland
40. Mallala District Council, South Australia
41. Mandurah City Council, Western Australia
42. Manly City Council, New South Wales
43. Maryborough Shire Council, Queensland
44. Mitcham City Council, South Australia
45. Mount Remarkable District Council, South Australia
46. Murray Shire Council, New South Wales
47. Murweh Shire Council, Queensland
48. Naracoorte District Council, South Australia
49. Narromine Shire Council, New South Wales
50. Neutral Precinct, North Sydney Council, New South Wales
51. Nillumbik Shire Council, Victoria
52. Northern Areas Council, South Australia
53. Northern Midlands Council, Tasmania
54. Peak Downs Shire Council, Queensland
55. Pine Rivers Shire Council, Queensland
56. Playford City Council, South Australia
57. Port Adelaide Enfield City Council, South Australia
58. Prospect City Council, South Australia
59. Randwick City Council, New South Wales
60. Richmond River Shire Council, New South Wales
61. Salisbury City Council, South Australia
62. South Sydney City Council, New South Wales
63. Stanthorpe Shire Council, Queensland
64. Stanton Precinct, North Sydney Council, New South Wales
65. Thuringowa City Council, Queensland
66. Unley City Council, South Australia
67. Wakefield Regional Council, South Australia
68. Whyalla City Council, South Australia
69. Wirliyajarrayi Council, Willowra, Northern Territory
70. Wollongong City Council, New South Wales

71. Wyndham City Council, Werribee, Victoria
72. Wyndham-East Kimberley Shire Council, Western Australia
73. Yarra City Council, Victoria
74. Yuendumu Community Government Council, Northern Territory

Councils who endorsed the Abolition 2000 Statement in 1996:

1. \*Adelaide City Council, South Australia
2. Brighton City Council, South Australia
3. Cambelltown City Council, South Australia
4. Clare District Council, South Australia
5. East Torrens District Council, South Australia
6. Glenelg City Council, South Australia
7. Happy Valley City Council, South Australia
8. Hindmarsh Woodville City Council, South Australia
9. Marion City Council, South Australia
10. Munno Para City Council, South Australia
11. Noarlunga City Council, South Australia
12. \*Port Adelaide Enfield City Council, South Australia
13. Port Lincoln City Council, South Australia
14. \*Prospect City Council, South Australia
15. \*Salisbury City Council, South Australia
16. \*Unley City Council, South Australia

\* These councils have also endorsed the A2000 Resolution for Local Authorities, in 1997.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Sun, 2 Nov 1997 10:00:21 -0500  
From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: RE: nuclear terrorism  
To: "Dietrich Fischer" <102464.1110@compuserve.com>,  
abolition-caucus  
<abolition-caucus@igc.org>

There seem to be two usages of this word "terrorism."

This item mentions "terrorists who seek to inflict only limited damage" but does not seem to recognize the state terrorism and nuclear blackmail that has been an intrinsic part of the nuclear process from the beginning.

Is it not correct to observe now that the World Court Advisory Opinion on Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons has delegitimized such nuclear threat even by the UN Security Council itself.

The age old human problem has always been establishment power versus that of would be contenders.

The most fundamental issue is generally framed in Human Rights language as the rights of individuals and outsiders versus the rights of "The State". Human Rights documents generally offer some protection against "statism" in its various manifestations.

The most important question may be - has the capacity of global civil society yet developed in such a way as to give confidence that tensions, disagreements and challenges can be resolved by nonviolent methods. There is an onus on everybody to make this possible.

The current culture of violence at every level from media through small arms to nuclear weapons indicates the enormity of the challenge to turn these things around.

Anti-establishment actions seem to thrive under authoritarian regimes which are a breeding ground for anarchy. Powerful states invite dangerous consequences for themselves, as the evidence tells.

The problem of violence and terrorism is originally a psychological one that is only amendable to solution when all the factors are properly recognized and defused.

So perhaps it may be time to be honest about terrorism.

Ross Wilcock  
rwilcock@web.net  
<http://www.pgs.ca/>

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

From: Dietrich Fischer [SMTP:102464.1110@compuserve.com]  
Sent: Sunday, November 02, 1997 7:33 AM

To: abolition-caucus  
Subject: nuclear terrorism

In "Nuclear Terrorism: A Diversionary Alarm" ("The Hindu," October 27, 1997), Achin Vanaik argued that terrorists seek to inflict only limited damage, to win sympathy for their political cause, and would therefore not want to use nuclear weapons, even if available to them. The specter of nuclear terrorism is used as a smokescreen by the nuclear powers to perpetuate their possession of nuclear weapons as a deterrent, Vanaik argued.

It is true that so far only the US used nuclear weapons, and the nuclear weapons states bear the heaviest responsibility. But it is improdient to rule out nuclear terrorism. In a New York Times article "As Trade Center Smoldered, Suspect Watched, Jury Hears" (front page, Oct. 23, 1997), Ramzi Ahmed Yousef, the mastermind of the World Trade Center bombing, was reported to have said he "had hoped one tower would fall onto the other and kill 250,000 civilians" in retaliation for US aid to Israel. The Americans killed 250,000 civilians in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and if they suffered those types of casualties, they would realize that they were at war, he said. This suggests that some terrorists would not hesitate to use a nuclear bomb, if they can get one.

Suicide bombers are not deterred by "deterrence." The only way to prevent such future catastrophes is obviously to abolish all nuclear weapons while we still have time. As long as governments keep thousands of these weapons, it is only a matter of time before a terrorist organization gets one of them, or an accidental explosion occurs.

Dietrich Fischer

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: abolition-caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Date: Sun, 2 Nov 1997 20:18:31 -0500  
From: Dietrich Fischer <102464.1110@compuserve.com>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: nuclear terrorism  
To: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@web.net>

Dear Ross,

I entirely agree with you that we need methods to deal with conflicts nonviolently. Two approaches can reduce the risk of terrorism by non-state actors: remove the underlying grievances that drive people to violence against others and sometimes themselves. At the same time, create a more open society where it is not possible to build secretly weapons of mass destruction, as the Japanese cult did which released poison gas in the Tokyo subway system. Dismantling all nuclear weapons and diluting fissile materials seems to be an essential measure to prevent a possible future terrorist nuclear explosion, in addition to creating a more just world.

ANY threat or use of nuclear weapons is obviously an illegitimate, terrorist act, whether by states or non-state actors.

Dietrich Fischer

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 3 Nov 1997 08:34:41 -0500  
From: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: USA/Nuclear Weapons the Next Generation/news article & c  
To: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@igc.apc.org>,  
"Abolition 2000 List" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

Earlier Jackie Cabasso <wslf@igc.org> wrote:

> Happy Halloween. Below is an article from today's Washington Post  
> that confirms our worst suspicions.

Yes, Happy Halloween, but I think Jackie is seeking a few ghosts.

Jackie quoted from a recent interview with Defense Secretary Bill Cohen. The article states: "[Cohen] entertains the hope [...] for zero nuclear weapons -- by negotiation with Russia, when new technology has produced a powerful new non-nuclear deterrent, in the 'indefinite future.'"

The interview later states: "He wants 'to make sure we have something to deter massive conventional war.... Hopefully ... in a very short period of time, technology will bring us techniques and technologies other than nuclear weapons.'"

Jackie asks what Cohen means and provides a possible answer from a Swiss physicist, Andre Gsponer: "Fourth generation nuclear weapon [that] are based on atomic or nuclear processes that are not restricted by a CTBT."

According to Jackie, these new weapons can be developed in the new facilities being built for the stockpile stewardship program and, therefore, there must be "unflinching opposition" to DOE's program.

While there may be valid reasons to oppose stockpile stewardship, the Bill Cohen interview is not one of them. Yes, our Defense Secretary is dreaming up new, powerful weapons systems, which we should oppose. However, it is clear from the interview that he is talking \*non-nuclear\* weapons.

The Pentagon is only mildly supportive of DOE's stockpile stewardship program. The out-year funds for the National Ignition Facility (NIF) were just raided by the Pentagon's allies in Congress to fund traditional military hardware. The Defense Department has vigorously opposed having next year's budget increase for stockpile stewardship

come out of their budget.

If the stockpile stewardship program were able to produce fourth-generation nuclear weapons outside the CTBT, why are the defense hawks in Congress, who are clearly interested in new ways to blow up the planet, so ambivalent about the program? Both chairmen of the House and Senate defense committees have shown more interest in funding the older bomb production plants than the new stockpile stewardship facilities.

There are plenty of reasons to be scared, even after Halloween, but the Pentagon wanting to use NIF for new nuclear weapons is not of them. If it can be done, our military doesn't seem to know it.

Regards,

David Culp  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; name="RFC822 message headers"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part  
Content-Disposition: inline; filename="RFC822 message headers"

Received: from igc7.igc.org (192.82.108.35) by mail.nrdc.org with SMTP  
(IMA Internet Exchange 2.12 Enterprise) id 00043F0A; Sat, 1 Nov 97 00:37:38  
-0500

Received: from igc3.igc.apc.org (igc3.igc.org [192.82.108.33])  
by igc7.igc.org (8.8.7/8.8.7) with ESMTP id UAA05211;  
Fri, 31 Oct 1997 20:32:23 -0800 (PST)

Received: (from majordomo)  
by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.7/8.8.7) id UAA17027;  
Fri, 31 Oct 1997 20:31:58 -0800 (PST)

Received: from ppp4-18.igc.org (wslf@ppp4-18.igc.org)  
by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id UAA16792;  
Fri, 31 Oct 1997 20:25:36 -0800 (PST)

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

Date: Fri, 31 Oct 1997 20:25:36 -0800 (PST)

From: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@igc.apc.org>

Message-Id: <2.2.16.19971031202609.406f7dce@pop.igc.org>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Precedence: bulk

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: USA/Nuclear Weapons the Next Generation/news article & call to  
action

To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, rdtandempn+@igc.org

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (16)

X-Sender: wslf@pop.igc.org (Unverified)

Return-Path: <DCulp@nrdc.org>  
Date: Mon, 3 Nov 1997 09:14:17 -0500  
From: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)  
Subject: Sen. Kyle article against CTBT  
To: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)  
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

[Below is a forthcoming article by Senator Jon Kyle (R-Ariz.) opposing the CTBT and a no-first use policy. His article is accompanied by a counter article by Mort Halperin, Council on Foreign Relations. Halperin's article, which supports the CTBT and a no-first use policy, is not included.]

---

Insight Magazine  
November 17, 1997

Q: Is the White House's nuclear-arms policy on the wrong track?

Yes: Signing on to the nuclear test-ban treaty will degrade America's nuclear deterrent.

By Jon Kyle

Since the demise of the Soviet empire the statement, "The Cold War is over" has become one of the most used and abused phrases in discussions about U.S. defense policy. It is true that the world has changed and the United States should adapt its policies accordingly. But, unfortunately, some people have used the end of the Cold War as a means to downplay the new threats facing our nation and as a pretext for the adoption of policies that could endanger our security.

For example, some have argued that nuclear deterrence is an outdated Cold War concept, and the United States no longer needs to retain a robust nuclear-weapons capability. But the end of the Cold War does not mean national-security threats to the United States have evaporated. James Woolsey, President Clinton's first director of the Central Intelligence Agency, aptly described the current security environment when he said, "We have slain a large dragon [the Soviet Union]. But we live now in a jungle filled with a bewildering variety of poisonous snakes."

Russia has taken important steps on the path toward a free-market democracy, but its evolution is incomplete. Moscow retains formidable military capabilities, including more than 6,000 strategic nuclear warheads that still pose the greatest threat to the United States. In addition, although its economy remains troubled, Russia continues to modernize its nuclear forces and is continuing to build deep, underground bunkers to negate U.S. nuclear weapons.

The Washington Times reported that Russian spending on research and development of strategic weapons -- including funding for the development of new long-range missiles and nuclear weapons -- has soared nearly sixfold during the last three years. The Times had reported in April that a nuclear-survivable command post is under construction in the Ural mountains and that Russia is building or renovating four other underground complexes and subway lines near Moscow to shelter its leaders during a nuclear attack.

China is an emerging power, which already has the world's largest armed forces. At a time when most countries have slashed defense budgets, Beijing has embarked on a major modernization program and its defense spending has increased by double-digit percentages in the 1990s, according to East Asian Security magazine. China is estimated to have 17 nuclear-tipped intercontinental ballistic missiles that can strike the United States and reportedly is developing new land and sea-based strategic missiles with sufficient range to reach the entire West Coast and several Rocky Mountain states.

In addition to Russia and China, several rogue nations -- including North Korea, Iran and Iraq -- possess weapons of mass destruction, or WMD, and are improving their capabilities. For example, Iran's chemical- and biological-weapons programs already can produce a variety of lethal agents, and Tehran aggressively is pursuing the development of nuclear weapons.

Despite a general consensus among defense experts that these increasingly sophisticated WMD programs are a growing threat, some groups, including the National Academy of Sciences, have stated that the United States should adopt a "no-first-use" policy for nuclear weapons. Under this policy, the United States no longer would threaten to respond with nuclear weapons against attacks by conventional, chemical or biological weapons and would restrict the role of the U.S. nuclear arsenal to deterring or responding to nuclear attacks.

Although well-intentioned, the adoption of a no-first-use policy actually would increase the likelihood that chemical or biological weapons would be used against U.S. forces. Our experience in the Persian Gulf War is an excellent case study of how the current policy that allows for the possibility that the United States would use nuclear weapons to respond to a non-nuclear attack from chemical or biological weapons saved lives by deterring such an attack.

Prior to the gulf war, U.S. leaders practiced the art of deterrence by issuing clear warnings to Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein. Secretary of defense Dick Cheney stated, "He [Saddam Hussein] needs to be made aware that the president will have available the full spectrum of capabilities. And were Saddam Hussein foolish enough to use weapons of mass destruction, the U.S. response would be absolutely overwhelming and it would be devastating. He has to take that into consideration, it seems to me, before he embarks upon a course of using those kinds of capabilities."

President Bush also sent a strongly worded message to Hussein which

said, "Let me state, too, that the United States will not tolerate the use of chemical or biological weapons.... The American people would demand the strongest possible response. You and your country will pay a terrible price if you order unconscionable acts of this sort."

Iraqi officials have confirmed that these statements deterred Baghdad from using chemical and biological weapons. In 1995, foreign minister Tariq Aziz reported to Rolf Ekeus, chairman of the U.N. commission charged with inspecting Iraqi WMD facilities, that Iraq was deterred from using its arsenal of chemical and biological weapons because the Iraqi leadership had interpreted Washington's threats of devastating retaliation as meaning nuclear retaliation.

Aziz's explanation is corroborated by a senior defector, Gen. Wafic Al Sammarai, former head of Iraqi military intelligence, who stated, "Some of the Scud missiles were loaded with chemical warheads, but they were not used. We didn't use them because the other side had a deterrent force. I do not think Saddam was capable of taking a decision to use chemical weapons or biological weapons, or any other type of weapons against the allied troops, because the warning was quite severe and quite effective. The allied troops were certain to use nuclear arms and the price will be too dear and too high."

As Keith Payne noted in his book, *Deterrence in the Second Nuclear Age*, a nuclear deterrent is necessary because conventional threats alone may be inadequate to deter some potential foes, since they may believe they can withstand even the most devastating conventional punishment. For example, before the Gulf War, Secretary of State James Baker told Aziz of the "overwhelming" conventional power that would be brought to bear against Iraq. Aziz responded: "Mr. Secretary, Iraq is a very ancient nation. We have lived for 6,000 years. I have no doubts that you are a very powerful nation. I have no doubts that you have a very strong military machine and you will inflict on us heavy losses. But Iraq will survive and this leadership will decide the future of Iraq."

The United States needs to retain the first-use option not because we wish to use nuclear weapons in response to an attack involving chemical or biological weapons, but precisely because we do not want to be confronted with this decision. Effective deterrence reduces the likelihood of conflict and can allow us to achieve our goals without war. But, to practice effective deterrence, we must maintain a credible nuclear capability.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which may be submitted to the Senate this year for ratification, prohibits underground nuclear testing and substantially will undermine the safety and reliability of our nuclear arsenal. Over time, nuclear materials and high-explosive triggers in our weapons deteriorate and we do not have experience in predicting the effects of such degradation. The fact that America's nuclear weapons are the most sophisticated in the world, coupled with the need to maintain the highest safety standards, means that our arsenal requires frequent testing to ensure that our weapons operate reliably.

As former secretary of defense Caspar Weinberger said in 1986, "The irreducible fact is that nuclear testing is essential to providing for the safety and security of our warheads and weapons systems. It also is essential if we are to maintain their reliability. This is not a matter of conjecture, but a lesson learned through hard experience. For example, in the case of one nuclear system -- the warhead for the Polaris submarine-launched ballistic missile -- testing allowed us to fix defects that were suddenly discovered. Until corrected, these defects could have rendered the vast majority of weapons in our sea-based deterrent completely inoperable."

To maintain the U.S. nuclear stockpile, the Clinton administration has developed a program that relies on computer simulations in lieu of actual nuclear tests. This program faces enormous technical challenges, as confirmed by the director of Sandia National Laboratories in testimony before the House National Security Committee last year. "The commercially available and laboratory technologies of today," said C. Paul Robinson, "are inadequate for the stockpile stewardship tasks we will face in the future. Another hundred- to thousandfold increase in capability from hardware and software combined will be required. Furthermore, some aspects of nuclear-explosive design are still not understood at the level of physical principles."

Relying on untested, undeveloped computer technology as a substitute for real tests jeopardizes the value of our nuclear deterrent. I am very concerned that over time, the United States -- and, more importantly, our adversaries -- may begin to lose confidence in our nuclear weapons, particularly since the Clinton administration has not even fully supported its own stockpile-maintenance program, as noted in a recent Energy Department report to Congress that describes a \$4.5 billion funding shortfall during the next five fiscal years for the program.

Yes, the Cold War has ended. This statement of historical fact should not deter us from adapting our policies to meet the current threats to our nation's security. In doing so, we should resist the tendency in peacetime to adopt feel-good measures such as a ban against first use of nuclear weapons and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty that naively would jeopardize our security. Deterrence saves lives by making conflict less likely. As long as America retains a sound, credible arsenal of nuclear weapons, the Saddam Husseins and Muammar Qaddafis of the world will have to think twice before unleashing weapons of mass destruction against the United States or our allies. This is the value of nuclear deterrence, and it is why nuclear weapons still matter in the Post Cold War.

Copyright (c) 1997 News World Communications, Inc.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 03 Nov 1997 16:57:55 +0100  
From: Ak Malten <A.Malten@net.HCC.nl>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: the Model NWC can be found at GANA's Website.  
To: mapw@ozemail.com.au, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: amalten@pop4.inter.nl.net

Dear Greg and other Abolition 2000 Friends,

The Model Nuclear Weapons Convention can be found at GANA's website.  
The direct URL is:

<http://www.inter.nl.net/hcc/A.Malten/mnwc.html>

Of course other goodies can be found there too. For an overlook one  
best go for:

<http://www.inter.nl.net/hcc/A.Malten/welcome.html>

Glad to be of service,

Peace,  
or saved by  
the pigeon,

Ak Malten,

Global Anti-Nuclear Alliance

At 11:17 AM 11/3/97 -0800, you wrote:

>Dear Folks

>

>Can you please tell me where i can get a copy of the Model Nuclear Weapons  
>Convention on the web - or is it possible to get one emailed to me as an  
>attached file?

>

>Cheers

>Greg

>

>

>

>Greg Barber

>

>Abolition 2000 Project Officer

>Medical Association for Prevention of War

>

>+ 3 9480 6312 (phone/facs)

>+ 3 9625 1532 (pager)

>

>mapw@ozemail.com.au

><http://www.ozemail.com.au/~mapw>

>

>PO BOX 1045  
>CARLTON Vic 3053  
>AUSTRALIA  
>  
>XIII World Congress of the International Physicians for the Prevention of War  
>December 1998  
>Melbourne, Australia  
>

---

The Global Anti-Nuclear Alliance (GANA) -- is a member of  
The Abolition 2000 Network, A Global Network to Eliminate  
Nuclear Weapons

Address: c/o Ak Malten  
Irisstraat 134      Tel:+31.70.3608905  
2565TP The Hague      Fax:+31.70.3608905  
The Netherlands      E-Mail: A.Malten@net.HCC.nl

GANA's website:

<http://www.inter.nl.net/hcc/A.Malten/welcome.html>

The ICJ Advisory Opinion on Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons,  
\*\*including ALL the Separate Opinions of ALL the Judges\*\*,  
the Canberra Report, the CTBT Text and Protocol and  
the MODEL Nuclear Weapons Convention (\*new\*) can be found at:

<http://www.inter.nl.net/hcc/A.Malten/docs.html>

---

Return-Path: <DCulp@nrdc.org>  
Date: Mon, 3 Nov 1997 11:39:11 -0500  
From: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)  
Subject: Nuclear Calendar  
To: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)  
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

NUCLEAR CALENDAR  
November 3, 1997

Revised the first Monday of each month (and more frequently when warranted) by David Culp, Plutonium Challenge, (202) 289-2388, <dculp@nrdc.org>.

Changes from last month's calendar are marked with an asterisk (\*).

Note: Report deadlines from H.R. 1119, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999, are noted. However, the bill has only passed the House of Representatives and has not yet passed the Senate.

- Oct. 8-Nov. 12 U.S.-Russian Compliance and Inspection Commission (START I) meeting, Geneva
- Oct. 22-Nov. 12 U.S.-Russian Special Verification Commission (INF Treaty) meeting, Geneva
- \*November 2-6 Missile Technology Control Regime Plenary, Tokyo
- \*Week of Nov. 3 House-Senate conference committee on the Foreign Affairs Restructuring Act, S. 1757, continues
- \*Week of Nov. 3 House-Senate conference committee on the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill, H.R. 2267, continues
- November 3-7 Joint U.S.-Russian Plutonium Disposition Steering Committee meeting, United States
- \*November 4 House National Security Subcommittee on Research and Development, domestic preparedness for urban terrorism, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn
- \*November 4 Senate Budget Committee, hearing on affordability of NATO expansion, 10 a.m., 608 Dirksen
- November 4 Election day (Special election to fill the seat of former New York Rep. Susan Molinari, New Jersey and Virginia gubernatorial elections, and many city elections.)
- \*November 5 House Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on the Department of Energy's funding of Molten Metal Technology, 10:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn
- November 5 Senate Foreign Relations Committee, hearing with public witnesses on NATO expansion,

10 a.m., SD-419 Dirksen

- \*November 6 Senate floor action on the defense authorization conference report, H.R. 1119
- \*November 7 House Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on the Department of Energy's funding of Molten Metal Technology, 9:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn
- \*November 7 Congressional adjournment (tentative)
- \*November 10-13 U.N. General Assembly, First Committee (Disarmament and International Security), voting on resolutions
- \*November 12 House National Security Committee, hearing on NATO enlargement
- \*November 12 House Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, markup of Superfund reauthorization bill, H.R. 2727 [Boehlert bill], if Congress has not adjourned
- \*November 12 DOE Hanford Site (Wash.), solid (radioactive and hazardous) waste EIS, public hearing, Richland, Wash.
- \*November 13 DOE Hanford Site (Wash.), solid (radioactive and hazardous) waste EIS, public hearing, Pendleton, Ore.
- November 15 Denver Regional CTBT Summit
- \*November 20 International Chernobyl sarcophagus pledging conference, chaired by Vice President Al Gore and Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma, New York
- \*November 24 DOE Environmental Management Office, response to the report by the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research on DOE's cleanup program
- November 24-25 President Clinton attends the Asian Pacific Economic Cooperation summit, Vancouver, Canada
- \*November DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, draft request for proposals for MOX disposition for plutonium
- \*November DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor for tritium EIS, notice of intent
- \*November DOE INEEL (Idaho), Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment Project EIS, notice of intent
- \*November DOE Hanford Site (Wash.), draft remedial action EIS and land use plan
- \*November DOE Rocky Flats (Colo.), plutonium residues draft EIS
- \*November DOE Savannah River Site (S.C.), spent nuclear fuel management draft EIS
- November DOE WIPP (N.M.), supplemental EIS record of decision
- \*November DOE Environmental Management Office, waste management programmatic EIS, record of decision
- \*November U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit, decision on electric utilities suit over the Energy Department's 1998 commercial high-level nuclear waste contract date (estimate)

- November Secretary of State Madeleine Albright visits  
India and Pakistan
- December 1 National Defense Panel submits its final report  
on the Quadrennial Defense Review to Defense  
Secretary Bill Cohen (P.L. 104-201,  
sec. 924(e))
- December 2-3 NATO defense ministers meeting, Brussels,  
Belgium
- December 5 U.S.-European Union Summit, Washington
- December 8 Tenth anniversary of the signing of the INF  
Treaty by President Reagan and President  
Gorbachev
- \*December 9-10 Plenary session of the Wassenaar Arrangement  
(export controls to control proliferation of  
weapons of mass destruction), Vienna, Austria
- December 10 Nobel Peace Prize awarded to the International  
Campaign to Ban Landmines and to Jody Williams,  
Oslo, Norway
- December 15 National Defense Panel final report on the  
Quadrennial Review goes to Congress  
(P.L. 104-201, sec. 923(e)(2))
- Week of Dec. 15 United Kingdom Parliament completes  
ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban  
Treaty
- December 16-17 NATO foreign ministers meeting; NATO  
enlargement protocols to be signed, Brussels,  
Belgium
- \*December 17 NATO-Russia Joint Council meeting, Brussels,  
Belgium
- December 26 Russian Duma adjourns for winter recess  
(estimate)
- December DOE Arms Control and Nonproliferation Office,  
draft study on the nonproliferation impact of  
reprocessing research reactor fuel at the  
Savannah River Site (S.C.)
- December DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor  
for tritium EIS scoping meetings, Washington  
and other cities
- December DOE Savannah River Site (S.C.), accelerator for  
the production of tritium draft EIS
- December DOE Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.), site-  
wide draft EIS
- December DOE Savannah River Site (S.C.), spent nuclear  
fuel management final EIS
- \*December Russian Duma, possible ratification of START II

1998

- \*January 1 President reports to Congress on detargeting of  
Russian strategic missiles (H.R. 1119,  
sec. 1301)
- January 1 Russian Defense Council, completion of its new  
military doctrine

- January 3 5th anniversary of the signing of START II by Presidents Bush and Yeltsin
- \*January 5-7 Monday Lobby annual retreat, Coolfont Resort, Berkeley Springs, W.Va. (tentative)
- January 17 Pittsburgh Regional CTBT Summit
- January 19 Conference on Disarmament, first session begins, Geneva
- \*January 26 Congress convenes
- January 26 2nd anniversary of START II ratification by the U.S. Senate
- January 27 President Clinton delivers the State of the Union speech
- January 31 DOE takes title to the high-level nuclear waste at commercial nuclear power plants
- \*January House National Security Subcommittee on Research and Development, hearing on the security of Russian nuclear weapons, with Russian Gen. Alexander Lebed testifying (tentative)
- \*January DOE Rocky Flats (Colo.), plutonium residues final EIS
- January DOE Savannah River Site (S.C.), spent nuclear fuel management record of decision
- \*January EPA hearings on WIPP (N.M.) certification, Albuquerque, Carlsbad and Santa Fe, N.M.
- \*January Seattle Regional CTBT Summit (proposed)
- \*Jan. and Feb. Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, two days of hearings on DOE's stockpile stewardship program and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (one day open and one day closed)
- \*February 1 DOE Arms Control and Nonproliferation Office, report to Congress on nonproliferation science and technology (H.Rpt. 105-340, Conference Report on H.R. 1119)
- February 2 President Clinton submits the annual federal budget to Congress
- \*February 2 DOE Environmental Management Office, accelerated cleanup plan release
- \*February 13-23 Senate Presidents Day recess
- \*February 15 Defense Department, report to Congress on sustainment of strategic nuclear systems (H.R. 1119, sec. 1302(e))
- February 15 Central Intelligence Agency, report on congressional intelligence committees on National Intelligence Estimate on missile threats to the U.S. and on chemical, biological and nuclear weapon threats to the U.S. other than by missiles (Intelligence Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 1998, S. 858)
- \*February 28 DOE Environmental Management Program, report to Congress on privatization projects (H.R. 1119, sec. 3132 (e))
- \*February Senate Armed Services Committee, confirmation

hearing for Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety  
Board member-designate Jack Mansfield  
(estimate)

- \*February Senate Foreign Relations Committee, hearing on the nomination of Robert Grey to be the U.S. Representative to the Conference on Disarmament (estimate)
- \*February Senate Armed Services Committee, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senate Select Intelligence Committee, and House National Security Committee, possible hearings on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
- February Senate floor action on NATO expansion (tentative)
- February DOE Arms Control and Nonproliferation Office, meetings on the draft nonproliferation study on reprocessing research reactor fuel at the Savannah River Site (S.C.), Washington and near Aiken, S.C.
- February DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, final request for proposals for MOX disposition for plutonium
- \*February DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, surplus plutonium disposition draft EIS
- February DOE Hanford Site (Wash.), final remedial action EIS and land use plan
- \*February DOE Rocky Flats (Colo.), plutonium residues EIS, record of decision
- \*February DOE Environmental Management Office, waste management programmatic EIS, record of decision
- February President Clinton visits India and Pakistan (estimate)
- February United Kingdom completes its Strategic Defense Review
- \*Feb. or March Gore-Chernomydrin Commission meeting, Washington (estimate)
- March 1 DOE Defense Programs Office, selection of commercial nuclear power plant(s) for tritium production
- \*March 1 DOE Environmental Management Office, report to Congress on Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) (H.R. 1119, sec. 3170)
- \*March 15 DOE Defense Programs Office, report to Congress on nuclear weapons stockpile stewardship and management (H.R. 1119, sec. 3151)
- \*March 15 DOE Defense Programs Office, report to Congress on legislation needed for tritium production on commercial reactors (H.Rpt. 105-340, Conference Report on H.R. 1119)
- March 15 DOE Environmental Management Office, final land use plans for Hanford Site (Wash.), INEEL (Idaho), Rocky Flats (Colo.), and Savannah River Site (S.C.) (P.L. 104-201, sec. 3153(f))
- March 27 Conference on Disarmament, first session ends,

Geneva

- \*March 31 President report to Congress on implementation of the U.S.-Russian Helsinki Joint Statement issued in March 1997 (H.R. 1119, sec. 1229)
- \*March 31 DOE Worker and Community Transition Office, report to Congress on the effectiveness of workforce restructuring plans (H.R. 1119, sec. 3153)
- March DOE Hanford Site (Wash.), remedial action EIS and land use plan record of decision
- March National Academy of Sciences' Institute of Medicine, completion of review of radioactive fallout from nuclear testing (estimate)
- March or April G-8 Energy Ministers Conference, Moscow
- \*April 3-20 Congressional spring recess
- April 10-13 Spring Healing Global Wounds gathering, Nevada Test Site
- April 22 20th anniversary of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which created the Latin American nuclear-free zone, entering into force
- April 22 Earth Day
- April 26 Chernobyl commemoration day
- April 28 - May 8 Second PrepCom for the 2000 Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference, Geneva
- \*April 29 First anniversary of the Chemical Weapons Convention entering into force
- April DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor for tritium draft EIS
- \*April DOE Environmental Management Office, shipment of foreign research reactor fuel through the Concord Naval Weapons Station (Calif.) to INEEL (Idaho) may begin
- April DOE Environmental Management Advisory Board meeting, Washington (estimate)
- \*April CTBT Lobby Days, Washington (proposed)
- \*Spring DOE Nevada Test Site, subcritical test "Boomerang"
- Spring DOE Environmental Management Office, receives the first shipment of spent foreign research reactor fuel at the Concord Naval Weapons Station, (northeast of San Francisco, Calif.), to be transported to INEEL (Idaho)
- May 1-4 Physicians for Social Responsibility national meeting and lobby day, Crystal City Marriott, Arlington
- May 3-6 Military Production Network, D.C. Days
- May 11 Conference on Disarmament, second session begins, Geneva
- May 15 DOE Environmental Management Office, report to Congress on land use plans for Hanford Site (Wash.), INEEL (Idaho), Rocky Flats (Colo.), and Savannah River Site (S.C.) (P.L. 104-201, sec. 3153(g))
- May 15-17 G-8 Summit, Birmingham, United Kingdom

\*May 22-June 1 Congressional Memorial Day recess

May DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, proposals due for MOX disposition for plutonium

May DOE WIPP (N.M.), target date for opening the facility

\*May DOE Hanford Site (Wash.), solid (radioactive and hazardous) waste program draft EIS

Spring or Summer Senate floor action on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (estimate)

June 10 35th anniversary of President Kennedy's nuclear testing speech at American University

June 26 Conference on Disarmament, second session ends, Geneva

\*June 26-July 6 Congressional July 4th recess

\*June DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, surplus plutonium disposition final EIS

July 27 Conference on Disarmament, third session begins, Geneva

July DOE Sandia National Laboratory (N.M.), site-wide draft EIS

July DOE Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.), site-wide final EIS

July DOE Savannah River Site (S.C.), accelerator for the production of tritium final EIS

\*July DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, surplus plutonium disposition record of decision

\*July DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, contract awarded for MOX disposition for plutonium

\*Summer DOE Nevada Test Site, subcritical test "Bagpipe" (estimate)

\*Aug. 1 or Aug. 8 Congressional August recess begins

August 5 35th anniversary of the signing of the Limited Test Ban Treaty by the United States, Soviet Union and United Kingdom

\*August DOE Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.), site-wide EIS, record of decision

August DOE Savannah River Site (S.C.), accelerator for the production of tritium EIS, record of decision

\*September 1 Energy Department, reports to Congress on safeguards and security at domestic nuclear weapons facilities (H.R. 1119)

\*September 7 Congressional August recess ends

September 9 Conference on Disarmament, third session ends, Geneva

September DOE Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Office, viability assessment of the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste repository

October 1 Arms Control and Disarmament Agency merger into the State Department completed

October 9 Congressional adjournment target date

Copyright (c) 1997 by the Plutonium Challenge. Permission (and encouragement) is given to citizens groups to reproduce this calendar.

###

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 3 Nov 1997 16:40:47 GMT  
From: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org (George Farebrother)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Support for Malaysian Resolution  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org

GF/5686

Dear Abolitioners

World Court Project UK, working with Abolition 2000 UK, has written to 150 supporters asking them, as individuals, to write or fax to 20 state capitals or embassies requesting them to instruct their UN Missions to vote positively for Agenda Item 71(k) in the First Committee of the UN General Assembly. The item is the Malaysian resolution which refers to the ICJ advisory opinion on the threat or use of nuclear weapons, and calls for its implementation by the commencement of negotiations leading to the conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention. Supporters are encouraged to give their own personal reason for hoping that the resolution will receive even more support than it did last year.

In the recent briefing from Lawyers Committee for Nuclear Policy we were reminded that a similar resolution was adopted by the United Nations on 10 December 1996, by a vote of 115 in favour to 22 against and 32 abstentions. We hope to raise the number of YES votes. Looking at last year's voting pattern, we have singled out those who didn't vote affirmatively to all sections of the Resolution. After eliminating the Francophone states, those heavily influenced by, or part of, NATO, those hoping to join NATO, or who have strong A2000 activism, we were left with:

Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Croatia, Cyprus, Georgia, Kazakstan, Kyrgystan, Mauritania, Moldava, Palau, Sao T, Seychelles, Somalia, Tajikistan, T Macedonia, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, . Divided among 150 people, doing two each, yields 15 letters per state.

Ones to ask to cosponsor (ie supported last time but have not co-sponored):Afghanistan, Angola, Bhutan, China, Egypt, Jordan, Lesotho, Pakistan, Sierra, Leone, Yemen.

Please get in touch with LCNP ( LCNP@aol.com) if you want to write to states along the same lines.

George Farebrother

.....  
Many thanks to Alyn Ware for providing the relevant information so promptly.

Having wavered one way, and then the other, may I add my support to the netiquette solution of the List Server problem - clear titles, brevity, essence in the first two lines, not turning full messages around when replying, but just quoting the beginning, etc. In fact, it's rather like producing a press release. I have tried to follow these rules in the above message. I do find it fatally easy to turn

round a message addressed to the list, meaning to reply to the original sender and noting that I get it back - having forgotten to delete the Abolition caucus part. Must watch it.

George Farebrother UK Secretary, World Court Project UK  
67 Summerheath Rd, Hailsham, Sussex BN27 3DR, England  
Phone & Fax +44(0)1323 844 269 Email [geowcpuk@gn.apc.org](mailto:geowcpuk@gn.apc.org)

The World Court Project is an international citizens' network which is working to publicise and have implemented the 8 July 1996 Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legal status of the threat or use of nuclear weapons.

The World Court Project is a member of the Abolition 2000 Network, A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

>From ploughshares Mon Nov 3 15:59:30 1997  
Return-Path: <ploughshares@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Mon, 3 Nov 1997 15:59:28 -0800 (PST)  
X-Sender: ploughshares@pop.igc.org (Unverified)  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
From: Ploughshares Fund <ploughshares@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: proposal  
Sender: ploughshares@igc.org

November 3, 1997

Dear Mr. Hallman,

In beginning to research possible projects submitted for funding from Ploughshares at our next grants meeting early in December, I have been re-reading your proposal sent in July requesting funding for the Methodists United's grassroots organizing for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban. In all of our grants, the underlying question is: Will this program have the possibility of affecting public policy? How much leverage can it build? With this in mind, I have come up with this list of questions, as follows:

Overall: could you give any more specifics on how you would accomplish what you propose?

How many members do you have and how active are they? How many people do you contact with information and what do you ask them to do?

Describe the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition?

When you write that you have both a C-4 as well as a C-3 status, does that imply that the bishops actually lobby?

What are your plans for bringing in other denominations in 1998? What other churches are involved, and in what or any way further than the signing of letters to senators, members of congress and the President? What is your capacity for mobilizing other churches? The Southern Baptists? The Catholics? Both, in the past involved with the prevention of nuclear war. Are there not other established religious organizations organizing support for the CTB? How do you work with the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society on this project? What is it doing - is it duplicative? And what about the Mormons who largely live in the region where nuclear testing took place until recently?

Many years ago when different denominations promoted the Freeze, and took a major leadership role in doing so, sample sermons were written and circulated to be re-worked to be appropriate for different religious traditions and congregations. Does any church do this any more in working toward a CTB?

Thanks for getting back to me when you are able. We are very interested in exploring your program with you.

With best regards, Sally Lilienthal, President

Return-Path: <dave@paxchristiusa.org>  
From: Dave Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>  
To: "'mupj@igc.apc.org'" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: CTBT campaign  
Date: Mon, 3 Nov 1997 11:08:46 -0500  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igcb.igc.org id IAA10517

Dear Howard,

Greetings of peace! Thanks for the fax with the contact names and info, I just got it. Can you tell me, have you had any contact with the USCC on CTBT ratification? If so, who, when, where? Thanks.

In peace,  
Dave

Return-Path: <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Date: Mon, 3 Nov 1997 13:32:38 -0500  
From: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Treasury  
Sender: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igcb.igc.org id KAA14812

As might be expected your letter arrived today after I had earlier sent you word of a bill on the Peace Leaf mailing.

I'm working the election tomorrow so I won't be able to study your figures and assess where we're at until Wednesday. I still think it might be better to pay you the remaining \$600 and run the Rubin Grant into the red rather than have a partial payment come out of MUPJ.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Fri, 10 Oct 1997 10:29:33 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Ann Beier <abeier@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: catholic bishops visit llnl  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, tomatompn+@igc.org  
X-Sender: abeier@pop.igc.org

howdy,

following is a newspaper article by a local livermore paper called the valley times. it is a good story about the tour of lawrence livermore lab by pax christi and catholic bishops. the tour was organized by dave robinson of pax christi with marylia kelley and jackie cabasso attending, debriefing folks on stockpile stewardship and management.

Published on October 8, 1997

Bishops question lab morality

Policy of nuclear weapons as deterrent to war is bankrupt ethically, two clerics say after visit

BY PETER WEISS  
TIMES STAFF WRITER

LIVERMORE -- The moral fiber of Lawrence Livermore Laboratory is being stretched to the breaking point by the weight of its billion-dollar superlaser and other nuclear weapons projects, two Catholic bishops said Tuesday after visiting the lab.

Bishops Thomas Gumbleton and Walter Sullivan are longtime foes of U.S. nuclear weapons policies who have played key roles in shaping national Catholic views on nuclear arms.

They decided to tour the lab and chat with weapons scientists to help figure out if weapons labs are really ushering the nation toward disarmament, as the labs claim -- or if they are instead creating a new and more sophisticated arsenal, as the bishops suspected.

"One of the last remarks of the scientists was, 'Get real. We can't have a world without nuclear weapons,'" Gumbleton said after five hours behind the lab fences.

To him and his delegation, that symbolized the lab's undying commitment to nuclear might. A new \$4 billion-per-year program of nuclear weapons research for which the lab is building the \$1.2 billion National Ignition Facility superlaser is just the latest incarnation of the old ways, they said.

"I would reaffirm very strongly that it is wrong to do what we're doing

here," Gumbleton said.

Lab officials challenged the bishops' conclusions and Gumbleton's rendition of that particular scientist's words.

The problem with reaching total disarmament is that nuclear warhead know-how is already in human minds, but, "He said we should try to get as far as we can" toward disarmament, said Paul Brown, the head of arms control issues for the lab's weapons programs.

As for the superlaser and other new programs to replace nuclear testing, they are the way to assure that the arsenal stays in good shape as long as U.S. policy dictates that we have one, Brown said.

In 1983, Gumbleton played a key role in persuading American bishops to issue a historic "pastoral letter" that condemned the arms race and found the policy of nuclear deterrence to be morally acceptable only if it was linked to disarmament.

His visit to Livermore lab Tuesday convinced him that the link, if it ever existed, is gone, he said. So, it is time for American bishops to remove that moral prop to the lab's work, he said.

"The policy of nuclear deterrence is morally bankrupt," he said.

It's too late to win widespread support for a new Catholic position in time for the National Council of Catholic Bishops meeting next month, Gumbleton said. But he and Sullivan are hoping that, by spring, they might persuade their roughly 350 colleagues to come aboard. The drive will get a boost if their efforts now under way to get a strong condemnation of deterrence from the Pope succeeds, they said.

Gumbleton and Sullivan are leaders of the national Catholic peace movement known as Pax Christi. They said there are 147 U.S. bishops affiliated with their group.

Although there has been a shift in the church as a whole toward pacifism since the 1950s, Pax Christi still represents a minority, said the Rev. Richard McCafferty, S.J., pastor of St. Charles Borromeo Catholic Church in Livermore.

But the pacifists' influence could be tremendous if bishops nationally go along with it, he said.

Edition: VT, Section: A, Page: 3

Return-Path: <epp92@antenna.nl>  
Comments: Authenticated sender is <epp92@mail.antenna.nl>  
From: "D.J. Dullemond" <epp92@antenna.nl>  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Date: Thu, 9 Oct 1997 18:30:49 +0000  
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter to President Clinton  
Priority: normal

U can add us to the sign-on letter:

Nederlandse Kernstop Coalitie (Dutch Anti Nuclear Coalition), a Dutch network of 17 peace and justice groups.

Dirk Jan Dullemond, Secretary General

\*\*\*\*\*

|                      |                               |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Dirk Jan Dullemond   | Nederlandse Kernstop Coalitie |
| v Doesburglaan 124 G | Herenstraat 9                 |
| 6708 MD Wageningen   | 6701 DG Wageningen            |
| the Netherlands      | the Netherlands               |

Tel +31 317 423481 (Home)  
+31 317 422140 (Work)  
Fax +31 317 423588

Email [epp92@antenna.nl](mailto:epp92@antenna.nl)

\*\*\*\*\*

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Fri, 10 Oct 1997 17:05:44 -0700  
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: CLINTON AND DISARMAMENT: MISSING AN APPOINTMENT WITH HISTORY?  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

PRESIDENT CLINTON AND DISARMAMENT:  
MISSING AN APPOINTMENT WITH HISTORY?  
by David Krieger\*

At the outset of President Clinton's second term there was hope among those working for a more peaceful world that the new term would be different and more positive than the first term. Clinton has been a master at generating hope--and then dashing it with policies that fail to meet the expectations he has engendered. Sadly, by his lack of positive initiative in the area of disarmament, President Clinton may be missing his appointment with history.

Clinton began his first term as U.S. President by announcing support for gays in the military. The military opposition to this was so strong that Clinton has not challenged the military on any issue since. Even now in his second term, with no further elections facing him, Clinton appears to be incapable of challenging the military in any significant way, no matter how outrageous their appetite for armaments and other resources.

Most recently, under pressure from the military, Clinton refused to support the ban on landmines, which has now been signed by over 100 other countries. The reason given was that mines were needed to protect U.S. troops in Korea. Weighing the risks to U.S. troops from a near zero probability of attack by North Korea against the ongoing carnage of some 26,000 civilians annually caused by landmines, Clinton clearly made a short-sighted choice. It is a choice, however, which fits his pattern of supporting perceived military interests regardless of the values of human decency being trampled upon or the prospects of creating a more peaceful world.

Congressman Walter Capps responded to the President's refusal to support the landmine ban, stating, "I rise today in great dismay over the President's decision not to sign the Ottawa Treaty banning antipersonnel land mines. The administration's position defies reason. The only way that the United States can show leadership on this issue is to sign the comprehensive ban treaty on these deadly devices. One hundred nations courageously have changed their policy, but U.S. lawyers have simply changed the definition of a landmine.

"But a landmine by any other name is still a landmine, and landmines are immoral. People around the globe have come together to say, no more. No more killing, no more maiming, no more maiming of innocents. No more fear of leaving one's home to find food. No more social and economic dislocation to the world's neediest countries. I ask the President to sign the treaty to ban the antipersonnel landmines."

President Clinton has supported an unnecessarily high military budget in the post-Cold War period. The U.S. budget for "defense" of around \$265 billion per year exceeds the combined military expenditures of the next nine highest spending countries. It is more than 25 times greater than the combined military budgets of countries which might be perceived as potential enemies of the United States, such as Iran, Iraq, Libya, Syria, and North Korea. These huge military expenditures are expected to continue throughout Clinton's second term to the detriment of domestic programs for health and education and alleviation of poverty in the United States and abroad.

Under Clinton's leadership, the U.S. continues to be the world's largest arms dealer. Last year the U.S. sold some \$11.3 billion in armaments throughout the world. Recipients of U.S. arms included India with \$2.5 billion in purchases, Egypt (\$2.4 billion), Saudi Arabia (\$1.9 billion), South Korea (\$1.2 billion), and Indonesia (\$1 billion).

When the U.S. Congress passed an Arms Trade Code of Conduct as an amendment to the State Department

Authorization Act, which set limits on selling arms to dictators, including the most egregious violators of human rights, the Clinton Administration opposed the legislation. The Administration argued that the President needed the freedom to sell arms to whatever countries he chose, regardless of their human right records or whether or not they were democracies.

Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney, the principal sponsor of the Arms Trade Code of Conduct amendment, has pointed out, "In the past four years, 85 percent of U.S. arms sales to the Third World have gone to undemocratic governments. The United States is responsible for 44 percent of all weapons deliveries in the world. The United States is unqualifiedly the arms dealer to the world, and the merchant for death to the world's dictators." During Clinton's first term some \$36 billion in U.S. aid went to support the militaries of non-democratic governments.

In the area of nuclear disarmament, President Clinton has been a great disappointment. He has done virtually nothing to advance the process toward a nuclear weapons free world. In fact, he has taken steps which move us in the opposite direction. His strong advocacy of NATO expansion is viewed by the Russians as threatening and has been an impediment to the Russian Duma ratifying START II. George Kennan has called NATO expansion "the most fateful error of American policy in the entire post-Cold War era."

President Clinton has had preliminary discussions with Russian President Yeltsin about a START III agreement to reduce deployed strategic nuclear arsenals to 2,000-2,500 by the year 2007. This would be a reduction of some 1,000 nuclear warheads beyond START II levels in the four year period following the initial date set for completion of START II in 2003. While this is a welcome small step, it is a step of minimal significance which largely misses the unique opportunity now available to take larger strides.

While President Clinton did give leadership in achieving a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), the U.S. has already begun conducting "sub-critical" nuclear weapons tests in the first year of his new term. This testing, which may be used to improve the reliability and efficiency of nuclear weapons and even to test new weapons designs, is widely viewed by non-nuclear weapons states to be a sign of bad faith and to undermine the treaty. U.S. "sub-critical" tests may lead other nuclear weapons states to conduct similar tests, and could lead to a breakdown of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The U.S., under Clinton's leadership, is also embarking on a \$45 billion Stockpile Stewardship Program over the next ten years, a main feature of which is laboratory testing of nuclear weapons. The program includes the development of the National Ignition Facility (NIF) at Lawrence Livermore Laboratory for conducting thermonuclear tests with high powered lasers.

The most positive effort made by President Clinton on disarmament issues was his leadership in achieving Senate ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention. He has also indicated his intention to provide leadership for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It is unlikely that this treaty will ever enter into force, however, because India's ratification is also necessary for this to happen. India has stated that it will not ratify the treaty until the declared nuclear weapons states make a serious commitment to eliminate their nuclear arsenals, as they are required to do by Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The Clinton Administration has taken some positive steps to control the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Overall, however, the Administration's record on disarmament leaves considerable room for improvement. President Clinton's Administration has continued to feed the military's gargantuan appetite for resources, has been the major pusher of armaments throughout the world, has been largely indiscriminate in the sale of armaments, has been hypocritical in its approach to arms control and disarmament, has failed to seize the extraordinary opportunity now present for nuclear disarmament, and has opposed reasonable and needed measures such as the ban on landmines.

If Mr. Clinton wants to be remembered positively for his accomplishments in the area of controlling armaments and achieving disarmament in his second term, he will need to rethink most of his present policies and exercise more visionary and courageous leadership in approaching disarmament and the curtailment of arms transfers as a means to increase U.S. and global security. If he fails to exercise such leadership, he will almost certainly miss his appointment with history.

---

\* David Krieger is president of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation. He may be contacted at the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, 1187 Coast Village Road, Santa Barbara, CA 93108. Tel; 805 965-3443; Fax: 805 568-0466; E-mail: [wagingpeace@napf.org](mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org);  
Web Site: <http://www.wagingpeace.org>.

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

\*\*\*\*\*

A founding member of  
and global contact point for the  
Abolition 2000 Global Network for the  
Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

\*\*\*\*\*

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123  
Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794  
Phone (805) 965-3443 \* Fax (805) 568-0466  
E- mailto:[wagingpeace@napf.org](mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org)  
<http://www.wagingpeace.org>

\$\*\$\*\$\*\$\*\$ 14 LINES REFORMATTED BY POPPER AT [igc.apc.org](http://igc.apc.org) \$\*\$\*\$\*\$\*\$

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
CC: dkimball@clw.org  
Date: Mon, 28 Jul 1997 13:10:27 -0500  
From: "Bruce Hall" <Bruce.Hall@wdc.greenpeace.org>  
Organization: Greenpeace  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Important new disarmament analysis  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Dear Abolitionists:

The Washington Quarterly has just published a new issue devoted entirely to U.S. nuclear weapons policy. The theme of this piece is that after a hiatus of several years, nuclear weapons issues have once again risen to the top of the International Agenda and will gain further prominence in the next 12 months. This issue appears to be chock full of detailed analysis and opinion pieces. I've included a tiny bit of the highlights so you can get a sense of the issue.

Bruce

[]9 NEWS & ANALYSIS

Copyright 1997 The Center for Strategic and International  
Studies and the Massachusetts  
Institute of Technology  
The Washington Quarterly  
1997

Summer SECTION: SPECIAL ISSUE: NUCLEAR ARMS  
CONTROL --

NEW CONSENSUS, RENEWED DEBATE; Vol. 20, No. 3; Pg. 75  
LENGTH: 2971 words HEADLINE: Introduction

BYLINE: Michael J. Mazarr;

Michael J. Mazarr, editor of The Washington Quarterly, is director of the New Millennium Project at the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

HIGHLIGHT:

Long absent from the headlines, the subject of nuclear arms control has reemerged as an important issue on the U.S. defense and national security agenda. Partly this is the product of events, such as the arms control proposals that emerged at the recent U.S.-Russian summit in Helsinki. But more fundamentally, the new prominence of arms control stems from a growing consensus across the political spectrum in the United States that lower levels of nuclear weapons, if achieved through stable and verifiable means, would benefit U.S. and allied security. This section offers a handful of new essays along with reprinted articles and excerpts from recent studies to provide a comprehensive, balanced portrait of

the new consensus, and renewed debate, on nuclear arms control.

A number of objective facts made it inevitable that nuclear arms control, for several years relegated to the back pages of newspapers and to the status of an afterthought in U.S. national security policy, would return to its traditional position at or near the top of the U.S. and international agenda.

For one thing, U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals have not yet truly adjusted to the end of the Cold War. A host of Cold War-era nuclear practices continues in both countries, from keeping portions of both nuclear arsenals on hair-trigger alert to nuclear targeting strategies that persist in assuming that a nuclear war could in some way be fought and "won." Those who see nuclear weapons as a threat to world security -- as well as the nonnuclear members of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), aware of promises by the nuclear powers in that treaty to undertake steps in the direction of disarmament -- were bound to notice this mismatch.

Bruce Hall  
Greenpeace Nuclear Disarmament Campaign  
1436 U Street NW  
Washington, DC 20009  
202 319 2514  
Fax 202 462 4507  
<bruce.hall@wdc.greenpeace.org>

Return-Path: <jsmith@clw.org>  
Date: Tue, 22 Jul 1997 13:03:58 -0400  
X-Sender: jsmith@[204.245.159.2]  
To: jsmith@clw.org  
From: jsmith@clw.org (Jenny Smith)  
Subject: Gen. Habiger on deep cuts

Gen. Eugene Habiger, commander in chief of the U.S. Strategic Command says he supports further rational cuts in the nuclear weapons force, and thinks the Russian Duma will ratify START II before the end of the year because the US may negotiate terms for a START III treaty, gleaned in an interview with Jason Gertzen of the Omaha World-Herald newspaper from July 17.

To bolster the argument that the U.S. has a financial interest in cutting back its nuclear stockpile, Daryl Kimball stated, "Many people are coming to the conclusion that it would be more valuable to US security interest to spend money going toward maintaining the arsenal on other defense priorities."

The article is attached below.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

## StratCom Chief Says He Backs Cuts in U.S. Nuclear Arsenal

By Jason Gertzen  
WORLD-HERALD STAFF WRITER  
(OMAHA, NEBRASKA)

The nations nuclear weapons commander said he would gladly give up some of the long-range missiles and bombs in his arsenal. Just as soon as the Russians do.

"We need to get smaller, but we need to do it in a rational manner," said Gen. Eugene Habiger, commander in chief of the U.S. Strategic Command. "There is only one thing that can destroy the United States of America today and that is the 6,000 nuclear weapons deployed in Russia."

Habiger talked about a wide range of arms-control issues this week during an interview from his headquarters office at Offutt Air Force Base.

The four-star general reportedly was among the finalists considered for the new chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. President Clinton on Wednesday selected Army Gen. Henry Shelton to replace the current chairman, Gen. John Shalikashvili, who plans to retire this year.

Since he took his current job in February 1996, Habiger has been charged with overseeing the planning, targeting and if there were a war, command of the nation's long-range nuclear forces.

The nuclear weapons unit, which until 1992 was the strategic Air Command, used to have a high-profile role in the behind-the-scenes wrangling at the Pentagon that decided which airplanes and missiles the Defense Department would buy.

SAC was a major player in the debate over building the B-2 stealth bomber.

StratCom's role has changed now that the United States no longer is building new nuclear weapons. Habiger and his people now make frequent trips to Washington, D.C., to caution Pentagon planners against cutting too quickly or too deeply into the atomic arsenal.

The most recent example of this work occurred in the spring when some Pentagon officials made a run at cutting the number of nuclear-missile submarines in the fleet, Habiger said.

"We were able to turn that around," he said.

Overall, arms-control efforts appear to be gaining momentum. Some of the military's top retired officers, including a four-star general who once held Habiger's job, and Clinton administration officials have been talking openly of the need to trim the size of the nuclear arsenal sooner rather than later.

The United States has ratified an arms-reduction treaty, known commonly as START 2. Yet, it will not begin to take additional missiles out of service until the Russian parliament, known as the Duma, acts on it as well.

So far, Russian hard-liners opposed to the move have blocked ratification.

Numerous U.S. officials have said they are pessimistic that this situation soon will change.

It may not be a commonly held view, Habiger said, but he thinks the Russians will sign the treaty before the end of the year. Russian President Boris Yeltsin has said he would push for it.

"I think you will see a flurry of activity this fall," Habiger said.

Habiger said the United States may try to entice Russia into ratifying START 2 by offering a third arms-reduction treaty to follow almost immediately.

Such a prospect could be effective, Habiger said, because economic concerns will begin leading even the most ardent arms-control opponents in Russia to embrace nuclear weapons reductions.

Russia's long-range nuclear weapons are deteriorating as many of them are being used many years longer than designers ever intended. The Russian economy is so strained that the military cannot afford to upgrade or fix many of the weapons.

"They are flat wearing out," Habiger said.

By the year 2003, the Russian nuclear force will be at the levels called for in START 2 whether officials there want to be or not, Habiger said, pointing to a statement made last year by a Russian three-star general.

The United States also has a financial interest in trimming its nuclear arsenal.

The nation will have to spend about \$63 million in 1999 and then an additional \$1 billion annually to maintain current force levels, Habiger said.

Arms-control advocates said budget-balancing forces at work in Washington, DC will make it more difficult to justify not cutting the nation's nuclear force.

"Many people are coming to the conclusion that it would be more valuable to US security interest to spend money going toward maintaining the arsenal on other defense priorities," said Daryl Kimball, executive director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers in Washington, D.C.

Habiger said he and Pentagon officials have not been an obstacle to the cause of shrinking the nuclear arsenal.

In fact, Habiger said, he had StratCom planners last summer begin looking into the issue of trimming nuclear forces beyond the levels called for in any existing arms-reduction treaty.

"We are the ones who pushed that," Habiger said.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers  
Council for a Livable World Education Fund

110 Maryland Ave., NE, Suite 201  
Washington, DC 20002

~~~~~  
Ph: 202/546-0795

FAX: 202/546-5142

E-mail: [dkimball@clw.org](mailto:dkimball@clw.org) / [jsmith@clw.org](mailto:jsmith@clw.org)

Website: [www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/](http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/)

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 23 Jul 1997 07:40:52 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Joseph Gerson <afscamb@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Hiroshima/Nagasaki Commemoration Speech  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
X-Sender: afscamb@pop.igc.org (Unverified)

July 23,'97

Friends,

In a couple of weeks many of us will be marking the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and rededicating ourselves to the struggle for nuclear weapons abolition. I will be returning to Hiroshima and Nagasaki for the World Conference against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs and will give the speech that follows there. It speaks briefly - politically and philosophically - to questions of responsibility and authentic action, and to the necessity of engaging and transforming fundamental and dangerous structures of political and hegemonic power. This speech is shared here with the hope that others might find it helpful. For those of you who are curious about some of the history to which I refer in this talk, it is explored in considerable detail in my book WITH HEROSHIMA EYES.

Sincerely,  
Joseph Gerson

World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs  
Hiroshima & Nagasaki, August 1997  
Joseph Gerson, Ph.D.

Friends, permit me to frame my talk with a poem I wrote ten years ago, as I first returned to the World Conference. I called it "On the Road to Hiroshima."

Shall I speak  
of the loneliness  
of comrades, speeches and whiskey  
of forty-seven samurai whose spirits live  
behind twentieth-century walls,  
in twentieth century hearts  
of a woman  
who gave a stranger  
an umbrella in the Tokyo rain  
of a father and fireworks in a dirt dusty night park  
or the fisherman's wife weeping at his grave

Perhaps I should describe a Russian with integrity  
or his cousin the priest

who would serve Chaucer\* well  
A silent Swede, a young Indo-Fijian, and  
his Manila brothers  
whose dark skinned lives lie in the balance  
Japanese friends  
Marxists and Hibakusha who  
like Brecht and Jews  
cannot forget

I saw flowers in a shop  
what is joy  
if it cannot be shared

Maybe, i should explain  
a man cannot return to Hiroshima  
in innocence

It is difficult it is to return to Hiroshima - or Nagasaki - with integrity. Coming to Hiroshima or Nagasaki for the first time is to confront and be confronted by, the ashes, memories, shadows, the crimes against humanity, the incomprehensible and unnameable consequences of the atomic holocausts that structured the parameters of geopolitics and intimidated the terror. It is to confront Evil inherent in the Cold War era and, tragically, in the U.S. government and the governments of other nations that emulate its nuclear foreign and military policies. For a Gaigin, coming to Hiroshima or Nagasaki is also an exposure to, a glimpse of, what Oe Kenzaburo termed "the Hiroshima spirit": the loving will, determination, and vision of politically engaged Hibakusha conveyed through eyes, words, gestures, music, and art - especially the colors of life-affirming peace cranes. A person cannot return to this torturously profaned yet most sacred city without having done all that we can to rid our nations and the world of nuclear weapons and of the ideologies, ambitions, economic, political, ideological and social structures that create, maintain, profit from, and prepare to use nuclear weapons against human beings and against Nature .

Albert Camus, the French philosopher, put the question we face this way: "All I ask is that in the midst of a murderous world, we agree to reflect on murder and to make a choice." Choosing life, which in large measure means the abolition of nuclear weapons, there is the question of how we meaningfully live out that choice so that nuclear weapons are actually abolished. The question, then, for those of us who return is "What have I done to merit returning to Hiroshima or Nagasaki, to stand, to breathe, to be in this place?"

What are we called to do? The Jewish philosopher Martin Buber answered "Do not withhold yourself." Camus answered "There's no question of heroism in all this. It's a matter of common decency...the only means of fighting a plague is -- common decency." We must, Camus wrote, "set up a real barrier against the disease, otherwise we might just as well do nothing."

Before turning to the question of what must be done, permit me to summarize how some of us in the United States see the Post Post Cold War nuclear plague.

Despite the chauvinistic and destructive banality of much of the debate in the US on the 50th anniversary of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki atomic bombings, a near-consensus has emerged among US scholars: The atomic bombings were the first terrifying explosions of the Cold War. They had

little to do with ending the war against Japan, and much to do with creating the geopolitics and the psychological environment of the new era. Similarly, throughout the Cold War, US preparations for, and threats to initiate nuclear war, were related more to maintaining US empire and hegemony than to "nuclear deterrence." Thus the United States repeatedly threatened to initiate nuclear war during crises and wars in the Middle East, Vietnam, the Korean Peninsula, Latin America, and across the Strait of Taiwan. This "atomic diplomacy", really nuclear terrorism, has continued into the Post-Cold War era with US threats to initiate nuclear war against Iraq, Korea and China,

You know, the NPT and CTBT are more about maintaining the power and privileges of the nuclear hierarchy than abolishing them. Yet, the renewed commitments to article six of the NPT, extracted from the nuclear powers, provide valuable openings to press for a nuclear weapons abolition treaty. Similarly it should not be news that, despite the World Court decision (little known in the United States), preparations for nuclear war remain central to US foreign and military policy. When sixty generals and admirals from the United States and other nations around the world, including the former commander of the U.S. Strategic Command, called last year for the complete abolition of nuclear weapons, the Clinton Administration immediately responded that nuclear weapons remain the "cornerstone" of US military policy. Yet, like the so-called "good Germans" of the Nazi era, most Americans will say that they do not know. To "know" means to choose complicity or resistance, and resistance can be daunting in consumer society and in the world capitol of globalizing capitalism.

Recall that the Clinton Administration's "Nuclear Posture Review" opted for the status quo, that it has reaffirmed its first strike policy, and that during the 1996 confrontation across the Taiwan Strait, the United States and China exchanged nuclear threats. The ability to make these and future threats is facilitated by the continuation of the Navy's "neither confirm nor deny" policy and by the global infrastructure of U.S. military bases - particularly in Okinawa and elsewhere in Japan. The U.S. has recently added the B61-11 warhead to its nuclear arsenal. Forty billion dollars have been allocated to develop new nuclear weapons under the guise of the "stockpile management" program, and so-called "subcritical" nuclear weapons tests have begun below the Nevada desert. The launch of the Cassini space probe, with its plutonium power supply, is but a small element of the United States' incredibly dangerous campaign to establish nuclear mastery of space and thus of Earth. We learned from Isaac Newton and experiences like the Challenger accident that almost everything that up comes down. Even if these weapons are never used in war, millions of lives are at risk from accidents and as Star Wars' nuclear technology falls back to Earth.

To maintain and modernize the structures of US - and to a lesser extent Japanese - military and economic hegemony in the Asia-Pacific and as far as the Middle East, the Mutual Security Treaty (AMPO) has been transformed through the 1996 Japan-US Joint Declaration on Security Alliance For the 21st Century and the 1997 Review of the 1978 Defense Guidelines. In both the treaty redefinition and the heavy handed efforts to continue imposing military bases and AMPO on the Okinawan people, Washington and Tokyo have routinely subverted and violated democratic practices and constitutional guarantees -- all in the name of "freedom."

Although Washington enjoys so-called "nuclear superiority", the United States is not the only source of our nuclear insecurity. Russia now also has a "first strike" policy. The combination of its "launch on warning" policy

and its rotting technological and military infrastructures seriously increases the dangers of "accidental" nuclear war and proliferation. Further, China and Russia are major exporters of nuclear technology and capabilities, and as the European Community lurches to compete with the US and Japanese dominated trading zones, planning for a Euro-bomb continues apace. Finally, consciousness of the danger of attempting to maintain the discriminatory nuclear hierarchy was codified in the CTBT. Due to the nuclear weapons programs or potential of countries like Japan, Sweden, the Koreans and Iraq, in addition to the declared nuclear powers, thirty-nine countries must ratify the CTBT before it becomes effective.

So, what must we do to erect what Camus called "a real barrier" of abolition against the nuclear plague?

This spring, while anti-nuclear activists were on trial for civil disobedience actions in the state of Maine, I received a well-intentioned, but profoundly disturbing, message written as an expression of "common decency." The author wrote that President Clinton is a pragmatic idealist, and that we should reinforce the "idealist" in Clinton, by sending him monthly messages encouraging him to hold to his inaugural dream of a world without nuclear weapons. The author also wrote that we should encourage people with direct access to Clinton to "make the case for nuclear abolition."

I found myself angry that the writer was ignoring the realities and structures of power. I thought of Frederick Douglass, the former slave and leading abolitionist of the 1850s and '60s. Douglass was clear, "Power concedes nothing without a struggle." I also found myself thinking about Reinhold Niebuhr's descriptions from the Depression era of how power works: "the moral attitudes of dominant and privileged groups are characterized by universal self-deception and hypocrisy. The unconscious and conscious identification of their special interests with general interests and universal values...is equally obvious." These privileged classes, he wrote, will "be only partly conscious of the violence and coercion by which their privileges are preserved....The force they use is either the covert force of economic power or it is the police power of the state", to which I would add the threat of initiating nuclear war. Niebuhr also wrote that the privileged "will claim that it is dangerous to disturb a precarious equilibrium and will feign to fear anarchy." They will encourage the "peace" of injustice, which is neither peace, security, nor justice. So much for monthly missives to Clinton or seeking to influence his friends.

What must be done to transform the visions of Hibakusha, peace activists, and even admirals and generals into policies is to replace the power of the privileged with the power of the people. In the United States, the lessons of the Civil Rights and Vietnam-era peace movements, the women's movement, and the Nuclear Freeze movement are that the ultimate way to move the U.S. Congress is to threaten its members with electoral eviction. To create such people's power, requires popular education and popular organizing - different means in different cultures and political systems.

Individual actions can be powerful catalysts for profound change. In the US, it was Rosa Parks' refusal to ride at the back of the bus which launched the Civil Rights movement, Daniel Ellsberg's decision to release the Pentagon Papers which further weakened Nixon's ability to wage the genocidal war in Indochina, and Randall Forsberg's call for a nuclear weapons freeze that undermined Reagan's ability to intensify the Cold War. Each of these critical moments in our history, however, grew out of and required the continuing engagement of organized popular nonviolent efforts that first transformed and moved the nation and then the government.

Let me add a few words about fear and hesitancy. Most of us, I believe, hesitate to take risks. What will others think if we reveal ourselves by saying unpopular things or by proposing initiatives that might not succeed? There is an old revolutionary slogan "Dare to struggle. Dare to win." Frankly, I am continually surprised by the experience and lesson that movement builds movement. And, movement builds peoples' power: A young Hibakusha folds paper cranes, and they become a world-wide symbol of life, hope, and resistance. Women and land owners in Okinawa say "no more", and the foundations of a hegemonic alliance are shaken to its core. A few people in New Zealand have an idea, and several years later the World Court rules that the use and threatened use of nuclear weapons are violations of international law. In the midst of the defeatism that has recently plagued the anti-nuclear movement in the United States, someone proposed a regional conference to revitalize organizing for nuclear weapons abolition, and now forty organizations from six states are urging people across New England to join labor organizers, teachers, American Hibakusha and Nobel Peace Prize recipients to rebuild a movement to finally abolish nuclear weapons

Such disturbances of the so-called "equilibrium", of "the powers that be" are what I believe Camus had in mind when he wrote that "the only means of fighting a plague is -- common decency." Vision, resistance and organizing so that life will prevail is what I believe Hibakusha and all of us mean when we say "No More Hiroshimas. No More Nagasakis, No More Hibakusha."

\*Chaucer is credited as the first significant writer in modern English and lived from about 1340 to 1400. His Canterbury Tales are read by high school and college students across the U.S. and Britain.

Joseph Gerson, American Friends Service Committee, 2161 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, Mass. 02140 USA. Phone: 617-661-6130; Fax: 617-354-2832; Email [afscamb@igc.apc.org](mailto:afscamb@igc.apc.org)

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Fri, 25 Jul 1997 15:56:10 GMT  
From: acronym@gn.apc.org (Rebecca Johnson)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: name change  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: acronym@gn.apc.org

Dear friends,

this is to inform you that I am dropping the name Disarmament Intelligence Review and becoming reincarnated (as of today) as The Acronym Institute. The address remains the same. The telephone/fax numbers changed in April, and in case you didn't record the change, follow this message.

It appears that the name 'Disarmament Intelligence Review', picked when my work went independent after the ACRONYM Consortium dissolved, has been confusing to many people, especially since we also now publish Disarmament Diplomacy.

The purpose of the name change was to remove a confusion and provide consistency with the analysis and Acronym publications on the CTBT, CD and NPT which I wrote during my consultancy on behalf of the ACRONYM Consortium (January 1994 - October 1995). The ACRONYM Consortium was always intended as a short term project and was duly dissolved in October 1995.

PLEASE NOTE: The Acronym Institute is a separate, independent organisation with no direct links or connections with any of the four organisations which temporarily comprised the 'ACRONYM Consortium', i.e. BASIC, Dfax, ISIS, and VERTIC. The name has been assumed after a 21 month interval following the dissolution of the ACRONYM Consortium, with the knowledge and agreement of the four former members of the Consortium. The Acronym Institute will do the work and assume all the legal and financial responsibilities undertaken by the Disarmament Intelligence Review since November 1995.

I appreciate your cooperation and apologise for any inconvenience.  
Rebecca.

=====  
email: acronym@gn.apc.org  
The Acronym Institute  
24, Colvestone Crescent  
London E8 2LH  
England  
telephone (UK +44) (0) 171 503 8857  
fax (0) 171 503 9153  
=====

Return-Path: <DCulp@nrdc.org>  
Date: Mon, 28 Jul 1997 08:13:56 -0400  
From: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)  
Subject: Nuclear Calendar  
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part  
To: "undisclosed-recipients:;"  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igcb.igc.org id GAA13724

NUCLEAR CALENDAR  
July 28, 1997

Compiled by David Culp, Plutonium Challenge, (202) 289-2388,  
dculp@nrdc.org

- July 28 House Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing DOE's clean up of Pit 9 at the Idaho National Environmental and Engineering National Lab, 1 p.m., 2123 Rayburn
- July 28 Conference on Disarmament, third session of 1997 begins, Geneva
- Week of July 28 House floor action on the defense appropriations bill
- Week of July 28 House floor action on the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill (includes ACDA)
- Week of July 28 House-Senate conference committee on the defense authorization bill, H.R. 1119
- Week of July 28 House-Senate conference committee on the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1997, H.R. 1757
- Week of July 28 U.S. District Court, D.C. Circuit, NRDC vs. or Aug. 4 Peza, ruling on a temporary injunction on the DOE stockpile stewardship program
- July 29 House Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing DOE's clean up of Pit 9 at the Idaho National Environmental and Engineering National Lab, 10 p.m., 2322 Rayburn
- July 29 Senate completes floor action on the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill, S. 1022 (S. Rpt. 105-48) (includes ACEDA)
- July 31 House Commerce Subcommittee on Energy and Power, markup of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997, H.R. 1270
- July DOE spent fuel management at the Savannah River Site (S.C.) draft EIS
- July DOE Rocky Flats (Colo.) plutonium residues draft EIS
- Aug. 2-Sept. 1 Congressional August recess
- August 5-8 Four-party Korean peace talks begin between North and South Korea, the United States and China in New York
- August 6 Hiroshima Day

August 9 Nagasaki Day

August 11 Nuclear Regulatory Commission and DOE, public meeting on DOE's tritium production tests at the Watts Bar nuclear power plant, near Watts Bar, Tenn.

August 28 DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, workshop with the nuclear industry on MOX disposition for plutonium, Argonne, Ill.

August 29 State Department, reorganization implementation plan released

August DOE WIPP (N.M.) final supplemental EIS

August U.S.S. Louisiana, the 18th and last Trident submarine, is commissioned, New London, Conn.

Aug. or Sept. DOE Nevada Test Site, subcritical nuclear test Holog

Week of Sept. 2 Senate Environment and Public Works Subcommittee on Superfund, Waste Control and Risk Assessment, hearing on the Superfund authorization bill

Week of Sept. 8 Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, markup of the Superfund authorization bill

September 9 U.K. Prime Minister Tony Blair visits Washington

September 10 Conference on Disarmament, third session of 1997 ends, Geneva

Sept. 14-16 Women's Action for New Directions (WAND) and Women Legislators Lobby conference, Washington

September 15 DOE Defense Programs Office, deadline for proposals for the production of tritium in commercial light water reactors

September 16 U.N. General Assembly convenes, New York

September 22 First NATO-Russia Joint Council meeting, New York

September 24 Anniversary of the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

Sept. 25-27 International Peace Bureau and (Russian) Civic Peace Association, international peace conference, Moscow

September 27 8th anniversary of the end of the Cold War [On September 27, 1991, President Bush announced the first unilateral reduction of the nuclear weapons stockpile. It is the date used by the Energy Department as the close of the Cold War.]

Sept. 29-Oct. 3 International Atomic Energy Agency general conference, Vienna, Austria

September House Commerce Subcommittee on Finance and Hazardous Materials, markup of the Superfund reauthorization bill (tentative)

September House Commerce Committee, markup of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997, H.R. 1270 (tentative)

September House Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, markup of the Superfund

reauthorization bill (tentative)

- September Senate Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services, hearing on DOE's stockpile stewardship program
- September House-Senate conference committee on the defense authorization bill, H.R. 1119
- September House-Senate conference committee on the energy and water appropriations bill, H.R. 2203
- September President Clinton submits the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to the Senate for ratification approval (estimate)
- September DOE Environmental Management Office, report to Congress on operating the two canyons at the Savannah River Site (S.C.)
- September DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, decision on preferred immobilization form for plutonium disposition (glass or ceramic)
- September DOE Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.) sitewide draft EIS
- September DOE WIPP (N.M.) supplemental EIS record of decision
- September DOE Environmental Management Office, waste management programmatic EIS record of decision
- September International Chernobyl financing conference, chaired by Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma, Vice President Al Gore and European Bank for Reconstruction and Development president Jacques de Larosiere, London or Washington
- September Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission, Moscow
- October 1 Beginning of the federal budget year
- October 1 20th anniversary of the Energy Department
- October 1 DOE Environmental Management Office, draft future land use plans for Hanford Site (Wash.), INEEL (Idaho), Rocky Flats (Colo.), and Savannah River Site (S.C.) (P.L. 104-201, sec. 3153(f))
- October 1 Deadline for DOE implementing performance-based contracting for environmental remediation (P.L. 104-201, sec. 3176(d))
- October 6 International Atomic Energy Agency board of governors meeting, Vienna, Austria
- October 6-9 Australia Group (chemical and biological weapons nonproliferation regime) annual meeting, Paris
- October 11-19 Congressional fall recess
- October 12 Healing Global Wounds gathering at the Nevada Test Site
- October 12-17 President Clinton visits Brazil, Argentina and Venezuela
- Week of Oct. 20 NGO Committee on Disarmament, Disarmament Week conference, New York
- October DOE Defense Programs Office, begin tritium production tests at the Watts Bar nuclear power

- plant (Tenn.)
- October U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit, decision on utilities suit over the Energy Department's 1998 nuclear waste contract date
- October Chinese President Jiang Zemin meets with President Clinton in Washington
- October Russian State Duma, possible ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention
- October 15 Russian Defense Council, deadline for recommendations to President Yeltsin on plutonium disposition from committee chaired by E. Velikhov
- Fall DOE Environmental Management Office, draft accelerated cleanup plan released
- Fall DOE Environmental Management Office receives shipment of spent foreign research reactor fuel at the Concord Naval Weapons Station, (east of San Francisco, Calif.), to be transported to INEEL (Idaho)
- Fall DOE Arms Control and Nonproliferation Office, meetings on the draft study on the nonproliferation impact of reprocessing research reactor fuel at the Savannah River Site (S.C.), Washington and near Aiken, S.C.
- Fall EPA hearings on WIPP (N.M.) certification, Albuquerque, Carlsbad, and Santa Fe, N.M.
- Fall Espionage and treason trial of Russian environmental activist Alexandr Nikitin, St. Petersburg, Russia
- November 4 U.S. election day (New Jersey and Virginia gubernatorial elections and many city elections)
- November 4 Special election to fill the seat of former Rep. Susan Molinari (N.Y.-13)
- November 14 Congressional adjournment (target date)
- November 24-25 Asian Pacific Economic Cooperation summit, Vancouver, Canada
- November DOE Rocky Flats (Colo.) management of certain plutonium residues and scrub alloy final EIS
- November DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, draft request for proposals for MOX disposition for plutonium
- November G-8 conference on illicit nuclear trafficking, Vienna, Austria, chaired by the U.S.
- December 1 National Defense Panel submits its final report on the Quadrennial Defense Review to Defense Secretary Bill Cohen (P.L. 104-201, sec. 924(e))
- December 2-3 NATO defense ministers meeting, Brussels, Belgium
- December 8 10th anniversary of the signing of the INF Treaty by President Reagan and President Gorbachev
- December 8-10 International Atomic Energy Agency board of

- governors meeting, Vienna, Austria
- December 15 National Defense Panel final report on the Quadrennial Review goes to Congress (P.L. 104-201, sec. 923(e)(2))
- December 16-17 NATO foreign ministers meeting, Brussels, Belgium
- December 18 NATO-Russia Joint Council meeting, Brussels, Belgium (estimate)
- December DOE Environmental Management Office receives shipment of spent foreign research reactor fuel at Charleston, S.C., to be transported to the Savannah River Site (S.C.)
- December DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor for tritium EIS scoping meetings, Washington and other cities
- December DOE accelerator for the production of tritium at the Savannah River Site (S.C.) draft EIS
- December DOE Rocky Flats (Colo.) plutonium residues record of decision
- December DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office demonstrates plutonium pit disassembly and conversion system prototype

1998

- January 31 DOE takes title to the high-level nuclear waste at commercial nuclear power plants
- January DOE spent fuel at the Savannah River Site (S.C.) final EIS
- January DOE Environmental Management Office, waste management programmatic EIS record of decision
- February 2 President Clinton submits his budget to Congress
- February 2 DOE Environmental Management Office, final accelerated cleanup plan released
- February DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, final request for proposals for MOX disposition for plutonium
- February DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, siting of plutonium disposition facilities draft EIS
- February DOE Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.) sitewide final EIS
- February DOE spent fuel at the Savannah River Site (S.C.) record of decision
- March 1 DOE Defense Programs Office, selection of commercial nuclear power plants for tritium production
- March 15 DOE Environmental Management Office, final future land use plans for Hanford Site (Wash.), INEEL (Idaho), Rocky Flats (Colo.), and Savannah River Site (S.C.) (P.L. 104-201, sec. 3153(f))

March DOE Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.)  
 sitewide EIS record of decision

March or April G-8 Energy Ministers Conference, Moscow

April 22 20th anniversary of the Treaty of Tlatelolco,  
 which created the Latin American nuclear-  
 weapons-free zone, entering into force

April 26 Chernobyl commemoration day

April 28-May 8 Second PrepCom for the 2000 Non-Proliferation  
 Treaty Review Conference, Geneva

April Citizens for Alternatives to Radioactive  
 Dumping, National Conference on Communities  
 Contaminated by Nuclear Facilities, to be held  
 in southeastern New Mexico

May 1-3 Physicians for Social Responsibility national  
 conference, Arlington, Va.

May 15 DOE Environmental Management Office, report to  
 Congress on future land use plans for Hanford  
 Site (Wash.), INEEL (Idaho), Rocky Flats  
 (Colo.), and Savannah River Site (S.C.)  
 (P.L. 104-201, sec. 3153(g))

May 15-17 G-8 Summit, Birmingham, United Kingdom

May DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office,  
 proposals due for MOX disposition for plutonium

May DOE Environmental Management Office, target  
 date for opening WIPP (N.M.)

Spring or Summer Senate floor action on the Comprehensive Test  
 Ban Treaty (estimate)

June 10 35th anniversary of President Kennedy's nuclear  
 testing speech at American University

###

Return-Path: <DCulp@nrdc.org>  
Date: Mon, 28 Jul 1997 08:14:31 -0400  
From: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)  
Subject: Two Articles on New Nukes  
To: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)  
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR  
July 24, 1997

"Why US Lab Is Designing A Bomb No One Asked For: Plan could threaten nuclear nonproliferation"

by Jonathan Landay, Staff writer of The Christian Science Monitor  
WASHINGTON

No one in the government asked for it and the Air Force says it does not need it.

Yet the Sandia National Laboratory in New Mexico, one of America's nuclear-weapons research facilities, is working on an atomic bomb that would have capabilities beyond those in the current United States arsenal.

The bomb, carrying an "old" nuclear explosive device and a new guidance system, would soar on wings like a glider after its release from a radar-dodging B-2 bomber. It would drill deep into earth or concrete, its explosion crushing "hardened" bunkers hundreds of feet below ground while causing little surface damage.

The project symbolizes US determination to maintain the most-advanced arsenal possible absent global disarmament and amid rising concerns over a growth of deeply buried command-and-control and armsmaking complexes in Russia, Iran, Libya, Iraq, and North Korea. But it also comes as President Clinton is using American power and prestige to support global efforts to curb the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and reduce the number of nuclear warheads.

Caught between these contradictory goals, the project, known as the Bomb Impact Optimization System (BIOS), embodies a fierce debate over the direction of post-cold-war US nuclear-arms policy.

At issue is whether BIOS would breach a pledge not to design or build new warheads. If other countries perceive such a breach, they could be less willing to adhere to US-backed arms-control initiatives, some experts warn.

"It is not in the best interest of the US if the rest of the world thinks it is still business as usual, as this will undermine support for nonproliferation," warns Jeremiah Sullivan, a University of Illinois physicist and member of the JASONS, independent experts who advise the government on nuclear-arms policy. "We don't need better nuclear weapons."

BIOS raises other questions, including the accountability of the scientists, military officers, bureaucrats, and defense contractors who make up the nuclear-weapons complex. The complex is in the throes of a post-cold-war overhaul, and some experts have doubts about its willingness to stop after 50-plus years producing nuclear weapons. The way BIOS has been funded may fuel those concerns.

While Sandia has spent \$16 million since October 1995 on BIOS, the project has no separate listing in the budget of the Department of Energy (DOE), which runs the nuclear laboratories. Instead, the name of the account from which the funds have been drawn has been different for each of the past three fiscal years. The DOE is unable to say how much money it expects to spend on BIOS in the coming fiscal year.

The nuclear-weapons complex has had a "history of fiscal inattention" and absence of sufficient executive-branch and congressional oversight, says Stephen Schwartz of the Brookings Institution in Washington. He recently completed the most comprehensive study ever of the costs of the US nuclear program.

BIOS is still in the concept stage, although scientists have used a new computer-driven process to produce a prototype nose cone. That and other aspects of the program were briefly detailed by C. Paul Robinson, the head of Sandia, in a statement to a House subcommittee April 10.

"Sandia is investigating the feasibility of modifying a B61 payload," Dr. Robinson said. "This effort includes analysis, design, model fabrication and testing, and ground and flight testing of a functional prototype."

A safer version

BIOS would be a follow-up to the B61-11, a conventionally dropped bunker-buster that replaced the B53 in February. The B53 is a 9,000-pound behemoth that produces a blast equivalent to 9 million tons of TNT, according to Pentagon sources. The government decided the stockpile of these bombs had become unsafe after some 30 years in the armory.

By contrast, the B61-11 weighs 750 pounds. It is the atomic payload of an existing bomb "repackaged" inside a needle-nosed body made from depleted uranium, which is extremely hard and more dense than lead. Unlike the B53, the B61-11 is small enough to be carried by a B-2 stealth bomber.

The idea behind a gliding version of the B61-11 is to better protect the \$2.2 billion B-2 and its crew by allowing them to release the weapon a safe distance from anti-aircraft defenses around their target. The bomb would glide on its wings the rest of the way, guided by an on-board radar that would also activate the fuse of the nuclear payload.

"Standoff capability is something that people have wanted in weapons for years," says Heinz Schmitt, Sandia's vice president for weapons systems, in defending BIOS. "This is very much exploratory in nature."

But Pentagon and DOE officials say they have not asked for a modified version of the B61-11. Adds Capt. Leo Devine, an Air Force spokesman: "The Air Force has no requirement for it."

Still, DOE and Pentagon officials support the objectives of BIOS program. They say such work is not barred by any arms-control accords and is justified under a new nuclear-weapons program designed to allow the US to adhere to the 1996 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).

The CTBT bars for all time test blasts used to verify new warhead designs and spot defects in weapons. Seen as a way of preventing states like Iran from developing nuclear bombs, the US sought a means by which it could sign the CTBT while maintaining a reliable armory well beyond its design life span.

The result was the \$40 billion Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program. It requires labs to develop ways to simulate test explosions.

The labs are also charged with "maintaining" weapons-design skills without breaking the US pledge not to make new warheads. But therein lies the source of the dispute.

The government defines a new weapon as a new nuclear payload. It holds that repacking old payloads in new bodies or upgrading nonnuclear components does not result in new weapons, even if it adds capabilities to the stockpile.

In the case of BIOS, "we are looking at it from the point of view of what is the technology that it will take to put on wings and fly a current bomb," says Assistant Energy Secretary Victor Reis, head of the DOE's nuclear-weapons programs.

To ensure it does not cross the line between a simple modification and a new weapon, he explains, BIOS will not move beyond the concept stage unless cleared by the Nuclear Weapons Council, a multiagency body that sets US nuclear requirements.

A 'new' bomb?

Still, Dr. Reis, a former council chairman, says the panel sees BIOS as "a maintenance of our capability for nonnuclear devices" and thus "not a new weapon." That is not how many arms-control experts see BIOS. To them, the US went too far already by deploying the B61-11. BIOS, they say, takes the country further down that dangerous path.

"There is certainly no need for us to do this with our enormous superiority in conventional weaponry," says Frank von Hippel, former assistant director of national security in the White House Office of Science and Technology. He and other arms-control experts contend that

how the US defines a new weapon is of no concern to Russia and China. They say these countries see the US trying to enhance its nuclear capabilities, giving them incentive to continue improving their own.

These experts also agree that states like Iran would likely seek weapons of mass destruction no matter what the US was doing. But by continuing to upgrade its stockpile, they say, the US could hurt international support for its counterproliferation policies.

Enhancements to US nuclear capabilities could also stiffen the Russian parliament's refusal to ratify the long-delayed START II treaty, which mandates further cuts in Russian and US atomic warheads, some experts say.

Critics also question Sandia's pursuit of BIOS without a formal directive or a military requirement. Some are concerned that laboratory scientists are trying to create a formal program where one did not exist. If the viability of BIOS is shown, they say, the Air Force is unlikely to turn it down.

"The purpose of the laboratories has always been to make new types of nuclear weapons, and this indicates that this has not changed," says Mr. Schwartz of the Brookings Institution. "Why are we still on a cold-war footing? Why are they masquerading behind stockpile stewardship?"

Officials deny such allegations. They say there is no guarantee the US can maintain a reliable stockpile beyond the life span it was designed for without test blasts. Given the post-cold-war uncertainties, they say, it is only prudent to ensure that the current arsenal is as effective as possible.

If there are policy contradictions, they say, those are for Mr. Clinton to sort out. "This is decided at the very top," Reis says, adding that BIOS does bring up "new questions to answer."

-----  
Friday July 25 7:07 AM EDT

#### U.S. Labs Redesigning Nuclear Warheads

ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. (Reuter) - New Mexico's nuclear weapons laboratories are designing a possible replacement for nuclear warheads on U.S. Navy Trident submarines, the first design change since the end of the Cold War.

Heinz Schmitt, a vice president at Albuquerque's Sandia National Laboratories, said Thursday no decision had been made to build any newly designed warheads, but the U.S. military wanted to be prepared should the existing W88 warheads develop problems as they age.

Similar redesign efforts will be required over the next few decades

for  
the five other nuclear weapons that will remain in the U.S. nuclear  
arsenal, Schmitt said.

Arms control groups said the design work undermined the 1970  
non-proliferation treaty signed by the United States and other nuclear  
powers.

A worldwide nuclear test ban in place since President Clinton signed  
the  
Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty last September also could short-circuit  
design efforts because test blasts would have to be conducted with the  
new warheads.

"The United States agreed to enter into negotiations to accomplish  
nuclear disarmament," said Greg Mello of the Los Alamos Study Group, a  
Santa Fe, N.M., arms control organization that revealed details of the  
new design work earlier this week.

"This design work shows a commitment to build new nuclear weapons ...  
and optimize the arsenal for post Cold War conditions," he said.

Schmitt countered that the work on the navy missile warhead did not  
constitute a "new nuclear weapon."

"The pressure on this effort is to see how we can replace it and meet  
the same requirements," he said. "This is not an attempt to bring in a  
new system."

Since the end of the Cold War, the United States has dismantled many  
of  
its nuclear weapons. But the military still retains a stockpile, and  
Congress and the White House have charged New Mexico's nuclear weapons  
labs with the job of ensuring it remains safe and reliable.

---

To: majordomo  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject:  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

config abolition-religious trust\*2  
info abolition-religious trust\*2  
subscribe abolition religious  
end

Return-Path: <owner-newscope%ecunet.org@pcusa01.ecunet.org>  
To: newscope@ecunet.org (Newscope subscribers list)  
From: owner-newscope@ecunet.org (Newscope subscribers list)  
Reply-to: owner-newscope@ecunet.org (Newscope subscribers list)  
X-send-unsubscribe-to: newscope-request@ecunet.org  
X-Disclaimer: Views are those of the author, not necessarily Ecunet  
Subject: [newscope] note 336  
Date: Tue, 29 Jul 97 12:37:28 EDT

"NEWSCOPE" by NEWSCOPE OFFICE on July 21, 1993 at 21:36 Eastern, about  
SUBSCRIPTION-ONLY WEEKLY NEWS SOURCE (336 notes).

Note 336 by NEWSCOPE OFFICE on July 29, 1997 at 10:46 Eastern (15999  
characters).

Newscope

A Newsletter for United Methodist Leaders

Vol. 25, No. 31/August 1, 1997

### Pension Assets Pass \$9 Billion Mark

The General Board of Pension and Health Benefits announced that for the first time, board-managed assets have passed \$9 billion, up \$3.3 billion in slightly less than three years.

Meeting July 21-22, the board also noted that it owns 202,000 shares of Disney stock valued at \$16.5 million. Board members asked staff to contact Southern Baptist officials to inquire what prompted their recent boycott against the Disney corporation. The board also asked Disney for responses to complaints brought by the American Family Association of negative treatment of family values in Disney films and programs and to providing spousal benefits to gay and lesbian partners of employees.

In other business, the board: 1) learned that shareholder resolutions filed with Delta Airlines and Nike corporations resulted in meetings with officials of those companies to discuss Delta's refusal to provide equal opportunity data to shareholders and Nike's labor policies; 2) responded to complaints by Native Americans by urging nine retailers to discontinue use of the "Chief Wahoo" logo of the Cleveland Indians baseball team and to contact team officials to express the agency's concern about use of the logo; 3) commended Archer-Daniels-Midland Corporation for their election of former U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young to their board of directors in response to calls for a more inclusive board of directors; 4) learned that shareholder actions with the Texaco Corporation resulted in the appointment of a task force to monitor inclusiveness; and 5) made a managed-care dental program available to annual conferences at less cost than other current dental coverage. -- UM News Service

## President Yeltsin Rejects Religion Bill

Russian President Yeltsin vetoed a bill that would have made life difficult for the UMC and other non-Orthodox Christian groups.

Bishop Ruediger R. Minor (Eurasia) said that Yeltsin's rejection of the Law on "Freedom of Conscience and Religious Associations" was a major relief. "I would like to commend the President for his wisdom and statesmanship and his determination to defend the Russian Constitution, human rights, and Russia's international obligations," said Minor. "I would like to thank many Christian sisters and brothers, among them UMs, who in Russia and abroad have been praying for Russia and its Christian community, who wrote letters to politicians, and church leaders who raised the public awareness of the situation in Russia.

The law would have enshrined the Russian Orthodox Church as Russia's dominant religion and also protected Judaism, Islam, and Buddhism. Other "foreign" religions, including Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, would have to register with local governments. Registration would be granted only if the group demonstrates a continuous local presence for 15 years, and it would be forbidden from seeking converts or holding public worship until registration. The bill now goes back to Parliament, or Duma, to see if it has enough votes to override Yeltsin's veto. The Duma meets in September.

## 'Blended' Worship Provides Solution for Worship Leaders Caught Between 'Boomers' and 'Busters'

"Blended" worship is providing a solution for worship leaders caught between "boomers" who say, "I own the church" and "busters" who say "change or I'm out of here." That observation was made by Robert Webber, a leading authority on worship renewal, during the biennial convocation of the Fellowship of UMs in Music and Worship Arts, meeting July 14-19 in Houston.

Webber, a professor of theology at Wheaton (Ill.) College for 28 years, said that since the late 1980s, there has been a convergence of those seeking relevance and those seeking substance. Now, he observed, there is growing awareness that both are needed and that "blended" worship is not only possible but desirable. For blended worship to flourish, Webber said, it must be "firmly rooted in biblical tradition and radically committed to contemporary relevance."

Worship, he continued, must provide theater -- "an encounter with the transcendence of God"; intimacy -- "an experience of God who became incarnate and dwelled among us"; and participation -- "taking place within a hospitable community." In worship renewal, Webber said there is wide agreement related to content and structure. But for style, he said "everything is up for grabs."

There is wide agreement that worship is "a celebration of God's mighty deeds of salvation," Webber said. In structure, he said there is also wide

agreement on the four-fold pattern of entrance, word, table, and dismissal. "Worship, remembers, gathers, proclaims, gives thanks, and sends forth," he explained.

But for worship style, there is no agreement because it so conditioned by culture, he said. "Style is related to the ethos of a particular group of people." -- UM News Service

#### Correction for Book of Resolutions

The resolution on "Teens at Risk" (the 1996 Book of Resolutions; page 414) was printed as it appeared in the original petition in the advance edition of the Daily Christian Advocate; it does not incorporate the amendments made by the legislative committee or those made on the floor of the General Conference. The resolution should read as follows: Youth at Risk

WHEREAS, we recognize that youths dealing with questions about sexual orientation are at a greater risk of suicide; and

WHEREAS, an individual of any age confronting his or her own sexual orientation and/or that of a close family member, friend, or associate often experiences isolation, confusion, and fear when he or she needs information, guidance, and support; and

WHEREAS, UM Women and other church agencies have many effective channels for disseminating information;

Therefore, be it resolved, that the Women's Division, as well as other appropriate agencies, be directed to use all available channels to provide factual information, program ideas, and resources on this topic that are consistent with the Social Principles of our Church. These materials could include books; guides for developing support groups; and suggestions for ways to find counselors/therapists, supportive clergy and/or congregations, and organizations in a particular area. ADOPTED 1996

#### Short Takes

Members of the UM Genetic Science Task Force, meeting July 17 in Washington, D.C., agreed to explore the possibility of conducting a forum of persons who have a stake in genetic research.

Lawrence M. Livingston, pastor of Ezion-Mount Carmel UMC in Wilmington, Del., entered a guilty plea July 18 on disorderly conduct charges in exchange for all other charges being dropped. The African-American pastor was charged last March with disregarding a traffic light and stop sign and resisting arrest. Livingston said the arresting officer hit him with his baton, pulled his

weapon, and maced him during a traffic stop. Protests followed. The officer was placed on administrative leave, the police chief resigned and a civil rights investigation was ordered. -- UM News Service

Clarification: 20Newscope (July 23) says it is legal for any UM congregation "to reproduce one hymn or worship aid from the UM Hymnal for a single event or service." That is true only if the item bears a UM Publishing House or Abingdon Press copyright notice. For use of other hymns, you must contact the copyright owner.

After Oct. 1, the General Board of Pension and Health Benefits will no longer accept personal checks for personal or salary-reduction pension contributions. Church treasurers will need to withhold the amount from the pastor's compensation and send it to the board. The action brings the board into compliance with industry standards and clarifies the source of the money for the Internal Revenue Service. Electronic fund transfers will be available for "plan-sponsor contributions" no later than January 1998.

General Board of Pension and Health Benefits participant investment funds will be: 1) Domestic Bond Fund; 2) Domestic Stock Fund; 3) Money Market Plus Fund, primarily consisting of government securities, certificates of deposit, corporate notes and commercial paper; 4) Balanced Social Values Plus Fund; and 5) International Stock Fund

Irma Clark, a UM and a breast cancer screener for the Chicago Department of Health, is warning people about possible links between environmental toxins and breast cancer. Representing UM Women, Clark attended a mid-July conference on breast cancer, held in Ontario, Canada. She said women of color from poor neighborhoods where environmental hazards and dump sites are commonplace have higher risks of breast cancer. -- UM News Service

One of the persons killed by gunman Andrew Cunanan before his suicide was William Reese, 45, a devoted family man, civil war buff, and a Sunday school teacher at 350-member West Park UMC in Hopewell Township, N.J. Reese, a cemetery caretaker, was found May 9, shot in the head. He was apparently a victim of circumstance when Cunanan, who was driving another stolen car, apparently turned off the interstate and found the cemetery, then decided to kill Reese to obtain his pick-up truck.

Hurricane Danny traveled through Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Northern Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina leaving anywhere from several to 30 inches of rain in its wake. Hardest hit was the Alabama/West

Florida Conference. The UM Committee on Relief has sent cleaning supplies, generators, and power washers (Advance No. 982515-0, Hurricanes '97).

A total of 1,362 relief boxes for North Korean families suffering the effects of famine were shipped July 22 by the UM Committee on Relief. Each box contains enough food -- rice, powdered milk, canned meat, shortening, and chocolate bars -- to feed a family of five for a week. A small rake, a trowel and a comb-and-brush set are also included (Advance No. 226435-0). For information, call 800-814-8765. For instructions in Korean call 800-636-0905.

Caution: *Children at Work*, a six-page study/action guide, is available for 30 cents a copy (four for a dollar) (prepaid) from Church World Service, P.O. Box 968, Elkhart, IN 46515-0968. *People, Places and Partnerships: A Workbook for Your Mission Trip Abroad*, a 45-page book of tips on cultural sensitivity and gift giving, ideas on what to pack, suggestions for staying healthy, ways to tell your story, ideas for staying connected to your host community and resources for more in-depth study, is available from the National Council of Churches, Room 626, Att'n: Faye Wine, 475 Riverside Dr., New York, NY 10115 (\$1 each, plus postage).

A proposal to extend Church Pension Fund benefits to surviving partners of lesbian and gay clergy and lay employees was defeated by the General Convention of the Episcopal Church. However, meeting mid-July in Philadelphia, delegates agreed to apologize to gay and lesbian members of the church for "years of rejection and maltreatment by the church." The convention also voted to: 1) back efforts to make Jerusalem the capital of two independent states, Israel and Palestine; 2) called for a review of all military training programs such as the School of the Americas; 3) called for a study of the ordination of practicing homosexuals; 4) defeated efforts to develop liturgies for same-sex blessings; and 5) mandated that women be given access to the ordination process and acceptance as priests in all dioceses of the church, at the same time protecting the rights of those who disagree.

Gail Ford Smith, a clergy member of the Texas Conference, has been appointed lead pastor of a church with 3,218 members. Therefore the statistic "that of 81 churches with a membership of 3,000 or more, none is served by female senior pastors" (Newscope, July 18) is no longer true.

A camera-ready bulletin-sized litany and a message for the denomination for Labor Day is available from Linda Nettles at the General Board of Church and Society (202-488-5641). The message was prepared by a UM Concern for Workers Task Force.

Addendum -- North Central New York Conference 1996 attendance averaged 27,828, up 282. Membership stands at 90,327, down 1,374. -- Debbie Burnett

Having received UM Volunteer-in Mission (VIM) teams in the past, the Zimbabwe Annual Conference is now in process of creating their own group of volunteers who will serve in Mozambique and South Africa. Forty-one volunteers recently engaged in a training experience led by Jeanie Blankenbaker and Sandra Lacefield of the Southeastern Jurisdiction VIMs.

#### Positions Available

Director of children's ministry. Contact Harriet Garland, First UMC, 431 Eldridge Rd. Sugar Land, TX 77478 (281-491-6041) .....Director of youth ministries. Contact Asbury UMC, Youth Director Search Committee, 6690 Cahaba Valley Rd., Birmingham, AL 35242 (205-995-1700).....Director of youth and adult ministries. Contact First UMC, 422 Chestnut, Leavenworth, KS 66048.....Short-term volunteer physicians needed for Mutumbara Hospital in Zimbabwe. Call UM Volunteers in Mission (404-659-5060).....Executive director of NEJ Multi-Ethnic Center. Contact Marcus Matthews, 9720 Patuxent Woods Dr., Suite 100, Columbia, MD 21046-1526.

#### Personalia

L. Steve Horswill-Johnston, 37, director of video production and media resources for the California-Pacific Conference, has been chosen associate general secretary of UM Communications. He will head a new Conference Resourcing Team.....George McClain, a clergy member of New York Conference, says he plans to step down next year as executive director of the Methodist Federation for Social Action, a post he's held for 24 years.....Jane Marshall, a UM author of 22 hymns in the UM Hymnal, was given the Roger N. Deschner Award by the Fellowship of UMs in Music and Worship Arts. Fred Lewis, pastor of the Clear Lake (Iowa) UMC, has been elected president of the fellowship. He succeeds Brad Kisner of Houston..... Deborah A. Knowles, a consultant to the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry in Nashville, Tenn., has been named manager of the Upper Room Fellowship, which provides copies of the devotional booklet to prisoners, youth offenders, and chaplains.....Bette Prestwood, former Newscope editor, will return to the U.S. July 28 after a five-year stint as a missionary school teacher in Taiwan. ....Leora Elizabeth Trice, 81, former director of the North Texas Conference Resource Center and popular teacher in summer Schools of Christian Mission, died July 20 of cancer.....George Wylie, a 38-year veteran broadcaster, has been named director of communications for the Iowa Conference.....Bishop Frank Griswold, 59, of the Diocese of Chicago has been elected presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church, effective Jan 1, 1998..... Mac Charles Jones, recently deceased National Council of churches staffer who was a leader of efforts to rebuild burned African-American churches, will be honored posthumously in September with a 1997 Letelier-Moffitt Human Rights Award, presented by the

Institute for Policy Studies.....L. Edward Phillips, a clergy member of Memphis Conference and professor of religion at UM-related Union College in Barbourville, Ky., has been named associate professor at Garrett-Evangelical Seminary in Evanston, Ill. ....Joy J. Moore, pastor of Trinity UMC in Battle Creek, Mich., has been named director of women and ethnic ministries at Asbury Seminary in Wilmore, Ky.

Permission is granted to electronically download this newsletter. UM publications may also quote Newscope with credit without special permission. Any other electronic or mechanical reproduction and/or distribution of the entire newsletter requires prior permission from the UM Publishing House; Rights and Permissions Office, 201 Eighth Ave. South; Nashville, TN 27202. Rich Peck, Editor (615-749-6007).

~~~~~

This note sent to subscribers of the newscope list.  
To unsubscribe DO NOT REPLY TO THIS NOTE! Instead,  
create a new note to [newscope-request@ecunet.org](mailto:newscope-request@ecunet.org)  
containing just the word

unsubscribe

If you have trouble with the automated routine there, please send copies of error messages and other notes to [owner-newscope@ecunet.org](mailto:owner-newscope@ecunet.org) and a real person will assist. Here are links if your mailer supports that sort of thing.

unsubscribe notices: <mailto:newscope-request@ecunet.org>

human intervention: <mailto:owner-newscope@ecunet.org>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 30 Jul 1997 19:00:58  
From: achin@avk.unv.ernet.in  
Organization: Achin Vanaik, Trustee INREP, N.Delhi  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject:  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, brucehall@igc.org, dculp@nrdc.org,  
johnpike@fas.org, disarmament@igc.apc.org, wagingpeace@napf.org,  
Acronym@gn.apc.org

## NUCLEAR NOTEBOOK

### Three Misrepresentations

### FMCT

Three important developments took place recently. The Indian government became the first anywhere to reject the Fissiles Materials Cut-off Treaty (FMCT) even before the negotiations have begun! To be precise, New Delhi has said it will not be a party to a FMCT unless it is part of a time-bound schedule for global disarmament. Secondly, the U.S. decision to go in for sub-critical tests was seized upon (as was to be expected) by the nuclear elite in India as a vindication of India's stand on the CTBT, which of course, it is not. Third, recent reports of Chinese updating of its medium range missiles and of its nuclear-related collaboration with Pakistan were again made an excuse for nuclear tub-thumping by our hawks.

On the FMCT, India's position was anticipated. But by announcing it even before negotiations have started, the Indian government also indicated its contempt for those negotiations itself, and indeed for the concerns and efforts of a whole host of non-nuclear weapons states (NNWSs) which do take the FMCT seriously. New Delhi's call for a time-bound schedule for global disarmament is simply to provide (as in the case of the CTBT) an excuse and a justification in advance to cover up its real reasons for not acceding to the FMCT. It is because it fears that abiding by this would greatly devalue its nuclear option by preventing it from accumulating over the coming years an adequate stockpile of weapons-grade fuel.

The difference between the CTBT and the FMCT is a real and significant one. The former is a powerful restraint measure on the nuclear weapons states (NWSs) including the USA and involves a genuine sacrifice on their part. But merely cutting off future production of fissile materials does not entail a sacrifice by NWSs, especially the USA and Russia. They have huge stockpiles already and there is also the additional weapons-grade fuel available from dismantling some of their warheads as they are now having to do under existing START II agreements, with the possibility of more disarming to come. That is why a meaningful FMCT must not simply address the issue of cutting off production but aim at systematically and progressively reducing existing stockpiles by, say, an agreed percentage yearly. This is exactly what most NNWSs especially outside

Europe (including Pakistan) want, and rightly so. Incidentally, one of the countries adamantly opposed to stockpile reduction being brought within the aegis of the FMCT is -- guess which? India!

Since the NWSs are strongly opposed to stockpiles being brought in, and since merely cutting off production, while necessary, does not impose a sacrifice on the NWSs, it is vital that the FMCT issue be linked to other concerns. Not in the way India wants, but a linkage nonetheless. What kind of linkage? India's call for a time-bound schedule for global disarmament is really putting the cart before the horse. Before you can hope to even put effective pressure for achieving such a measure, you first have to institutionalise some multilateral body empowered to negotiate and carry out global nuclear disarmament. The body must be multilateral and not just confined to the nuclear weapons states or nuclear capable states. All states must be party to the process of such disarmament because this is a genuinely global issue on which the voices of non-nuclear states must be heard and must carry weight.

There are two realistic candidates for such a body -- setting up a nuclear abolition convention, or the setting up of an Ad Hoc Committee to discuss and negotiate global disarmament. Both avenues can be pursued simultaneously but the chances of having the first is much slimmer than of getting the second. Indeed, NNWSs have pushed for setting up just such a Committee in the CTBT negotiations, and if India had been interested in playing a leading role among the NNWSs it could have pressed for such a body during those negotiations as the price to be paid for its accession. Of course, it was never interested in making such an effort and didn't. But with regard to the FMCT, many NNWSs are insisting on linkage between such a treaty and the setting up of such a Committee, and rightly so. While some NNWSs would settle, as a first step, for an Ad Hoc Committee with simply a discussion (but not a negotiating) mandate because they want above all, to get such a body into existence for the first time ever (itself a major advance); other NNWSs are pressing for a Committee with a negotiating mandate. The NWSs are more amenable to the first which could come about if enough pressure is brought upon them through hard bargaining. Again, India could have played a leading role in pushing for this but is not interested in making any genuine efforts in this regard. At the same time, India's nuclear elite and the members of its so-called strategic community carry on with the pretentious posturing that their negative and obstructive stand against such restraint measures as the CTBT and FMCT are really sincere and courageous contributions to the struggle for greater nuclear sanity and against nuclear hegemony.

### Sub-critical Tests

With regard to the issue of sub-critical testing, the claims by the Indian government and by the country's nuclear elite that India's stand on the CTBT was vindicated, is simply fraudulent. Do these tests violate the letter and text of the CTBT? No they don't. Do these tests violate or go against the larger spirit and wider intention of the CTBT? They certainly do. Does the carrying out of

these sub-critical tests render the CTBT worthless and pointless? Of course, they don't. There have been any number of anti-nuclear activists and groups in the USA, Europe and Japan which have publicly protested these sub-critical tests but which have supported (and continue to do so) the CTBT. By contrast, the general reaction of the Indian nuclear elite was of the "I told you so" type -- a response which is both narrow and dishonest.

Much has been made by our hawks of how sub-critical testing, inertial confinement fusion, computer simulation make the need for explosive testing in which a nuclear chain reaction takes place (which is banned by the CTBT) redundant. France's Laser Megajoule Project (LMJ) and the USA's National Ignition Facility (NIF) Project (both under planned construction) are seen as the institutional embodiments guaranteeing this redundancy. They are mistaken. There are three aspects when it comes to producing and deploying nuclear weapons even assuming that the issue of having a carrier for the weapon in question is resolved. These three aspects are certification, weaponisation and development. A bomb may be developed but neither weaponised nor certified. Or it can be both developed and weaponised but not certified which makes its deployment highly unlikely but not impossible. What then does the CTBT do and not do?

It rules out all possibility of certification. It does not rule out the production of new weapons within (*`within'* in italics) the existing generation of nuclear weapons although it makes it difficult to make more than marginal improvements in the existing level of technology. So the USA has produced a new B-61 earth penetrating bomb to attack facilities deep underground. But the CTBT does rule out not only the certification and weaponisation but even the development of new third generation warheads!

The USA and Russia today operate with second generation nuclear weapons. But even here, within the range of second generation weapons, the CTBT prevents weaponisation of low-yield warheads by the USA. In the case of Russia, the CTBT prevents both the development as well as the weaponisation of second generation low yield warheads. Neither the Laser Megajoule nor the NIF can alter the basic restraint on developing third generation nuclear weapons imposed by the CTBT.

So what do these facilities do? They can play a key role in the designing of new types of weapons since such designing advances are not prevented by the CTBT. But for third generation weapons there is an impassable barrier between laboratory designing and engineering accuracy which can only be resolved through a series of actual tests which provide the actual data on which crucial corrections can then be made. No amount of simulated or sub-critical testing can replace the need for actual testing of such weapons. Amidst all the *`technical'* waffle which the Indian hawks throw at the Indian public, this is the hard-core scientific and technical reality. So the LMJ and NIF can help the nuclear elites of France and USA position themselves much better in the future to make the final leap to producing third generation weapons provided (*`provided'* in italics) the CTBT is at some point repealed or flagrantly violated. The

weapons labs and the hawks in the USA recognised fully the restraining impact of a CTBT and that is why they opposed it. They were partially appeased by the promise of these facilities which even others who support a CTBT can also want because it makes a future "break-out" from the CTBT to a qualitatively higher level of weapons development and deployment that much easier. But a "break-out" there has to be. What this shows is not the irrelevance or redundancy of the CTBT but its enduring relevance and importance and the necessity that it always (*'always'* in italics) remain in place.

Too many of our hawks are not people who are genuinely committed to the integrity of argument but to salesmanship. They make their case for India going nuclear or for not signing the CTBT not only on the basis of arguments which they believe to be better and stronger than those of their opponents but also in a much more cavalier way. They will use whatever arguments they feel can help 'sell' their case and accuracy or integrity of argument be damned. Anti-nuclearists should not mimic this style but argue with complete honesty. That is why, while anti-nuclearists oppose the arguments of those who say India in its 'national interest' should not sign the CTBT because of China or prestige or whatever, and would say these arguments are wrong, they would nonetheless not say that such arguments are disgraceful or dishonest. But what has been thoroughly dishonest is the way the genuine restraining effects of the CTBT were denied by the Indian nuclear elite!

This genuine restraining effect has already been pointed out in the case of third generation weapons. Indian hawks, however, are shamefully cavalier not only in regard to their claims about what sub-critical testing, laboratory simulation and the LMJ and NIF can do in regard to third generation weapons, they are also so in the claims they make for how these activities and facilities can be relied upon to produce fourth generation weapons. The real truth is that the distance in basic physics between third and fourth generation weapons is much greater than that between even first generation and third generation weapons technologies. It is a leap into the unknown and nobody knows what is required for their development, weaponisation and certification. Therefore, no one can say what the precise relationship of the CTBT to such fourth generation weapons is because no one can say with confidence today and for a long time to come what the problems and difficulties will actually be, presuming the effort to produce them carries on. It is not impossible that these might be produced without explosive testing of the kind prevented by the CTBT. But there is no warrant for saying either that these can be produced or will be produced or that the CTBT cannot prevent this. Indeed, the most intelligent and sober technical evaluation is that having a CTBT may or may not make it impossible to develop such weapons but in any case will certainly make their emergence very difficult, which is a good enough reason for having it. In any case the emergence of fourth generation weapons is an issue of great uncertainty and the effort is fraught with immense obstacles because of the paucity of existing knowledge.

China

Recent reports in the U.S. American press about Chinese deployments of new medium range missiles were picked up by their Indian counterpart and used by hawks to promote their standard "see what China is doing to us" syndrome. China is alleged to have replaced its CSS-2s by an upgraded CSS-5 version and this was made out to be a matter of great concern to India. China is engaged in modernising its nuclear forces. This means replacing liquid fuel missiles with solid fuel ones which makes such missiles more mobile because of various technical restraints concerning transport and fuelling of liquid-based missiles. Specifically, missiles cannot be placed horizontally for transporting purposes if full of liquid fuel because of fears that this will rupture the missile owing to the weight and the instability of such fuel. So missiles have to be transported empty, then placed in a vertical and completely still position before liquid fuel can be injected. This takes time, involves a cumbersome set of back-up facilities for fuelling to accompany launching procedures. Thus preparing for launching in case of enemy attack is a 'dangerously' time consuming affair. Solid fuel eliminates these difficulties. But the more mobile and solid fuel CSS-5s that are replacing the older CSS-2s also have a range which is shorter by a third, which makes them less useful than ever for targeting major Indian cities and not just the more easily reached but outlying parts of India which are nearer the bases from which such CSS-5s can be launched. Thus these new deployments, ironically, show less preoccupation with, or 'hostile' capacities and intentions towards, India, than before.

One member of the Institute of Defence Studies and Analysis, Swaran Singh, in a *Times of India* ('Times of India' in italics) article ("US Cries Wolf to Scare India", July 26, 1997) did in fact make this point in an indirect way. He correctly pointed out that China considers India irrelevant to its nuclear planning and does not make preparations or deployment with India in mind. What neither he nor anyone else has pointed out, is that the U.S. American reports of what the Chinese are doing are not the only ones that emerged in recent times. A few months ago, a small paragraph appeared even in Indian national (English Language) newspapers reporting that the Chinese are alleged to have abandoned production of those missiles most dangerous to India because of their range. But this brief news item was buried in the inside pages. It was not highlighted in articles or editorials or even picked up for critical dissection by the members of our "strategic community". It was as if, giving any kind of credence to such a report would highlight the possible lack of Chinese nuclear danger to India, which in turn would undermine the whole elaborate edifice of arguments justifying the keeping or exercising of the Indian option on the grounds of the "Chinese threat"; which of course it does.

Eric Arnett of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) in an article "What Threat" in the March/April 1997 issue of *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* ('The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists' in italics) stated that the Chinese have cancelled production of the Dong Feng 25, a missile with a 1,700 km. range,

which had been intended to replace its outdated Dong Feng 3A, the first of its missiles deployed in 1972) capable of striking India but which were actually targeted on U.S. bases in the Philippines. This cancellation, he argued, once again revealed how irrelevant India was to China's nuclear preparations. Moreover, if the report is correct then it meant China has no missiles capable of reaching important targets in India. How does this square with the reports emanating from the U.S. press? Are they compatible? Are the U.S. press reports more motivated and therefore likely to be inaccurate in part or whole?

In any case, both reports as they stand and when properly evaluated, do not indicate hostile intentions or preparations by China towards India. Incidentally, has any Indian hawk emphasised publicly that China has deactivated its nuclear bomber force since 1984? It has finally closed down its Xian Aircraft Corporation, the production centre for such bombers. It no longer has any bombers capable of reaching India. By way of contrast, India's Soviet-supplied Tupolev bombers are capable of flying anywhere in China and dropping its currently available crude bombs. This doesn't indicate Indian intentions, and the Tupolevs are assigned to fly patrols over the Indian Ocean. But it does indicate Indian capacities. Should the Chinese counter-prepare according to these capacities as sensible military thinking would presumably tell them to do, or are they wiser not to?

Since neither Chinese nuclear preparations today within its territory nor its past history of nuclear behaviour indicate hostility of a nuclear kind to India, a much greater burden of argument is then imposed on the Chinese nuclear collaboration with Pakistan to provide proof of China's hostile intentions or 'calculated' planning to potentially or actually undermine Indian nuclear security. None of our Indian ambiguists or hawks are prepared to point out that if it is this Chinese-Pakistani nuclear-related relationship that most worries India, then the best way to eliminate this potential or actual danger is to go along with a South Asian Nuclear Weapons Free Zone since that takes care of all dangers of a nuclear threat from Pakistan "aided or abetted" by China. No, such a course, we are repeatedly told, is disastrous because of the potential Chinese threat from within its own territory, although evidence of such a threat can only be based on an assertion of China's capacities in the abstract, and on nothing else.

But let us put this Chinese collaboration with Pakistan on nuclear-related matters (i.e. with regard to missiles, and with regard to civilian nuclear facilities which can also produce weapons grade fuel as a by-product of its civilian power production) into proper perspective. This, of course, our hawks will mostly not do because of their vested interest in crying wolf in order to push India into exercising its option, or failing that, to further develop the quantitative and qualitative level of its bomb option. There have historically, been three kinds of nuclear relationships between countries.

First, there are those relationships which come closest to being characterised as "nuclear alliance" relationships. The two historical examples of this type have been the USA-Britain relationship and the China-Soviet nuclear relationship of the fifties. In both cases, the senior partner has been adamant in not sharing its most important nuclear secrets and technologies. Britain has been kept as a lapdog, dependent on latest U.S. weapons, e.g. today on the Trident. The former USSR refused to help China produce the bomb, which became a major factor in promoting the subsequent Sino-Soviet split.

The second type of relationship has been a nuclear patron-client relationship. The closest approximation to this is the USA-Israel nuclear relationship. Neither the Chinese-Pakistan nor the USA-Pakistan nuclear-related relationship has been of this kind. It is truly amazing how so many ex-diplomats, ex-soldiers and ex-bureaucrats who should know the importance of language and nuance have not had the slightest hesitation in trying to make out that the China-Pakistan relationship has been of an alliance or near-alliance type. Even the general political relationship between these two countries has changed greatly after the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the former Soviet Union. It made sense for China to pursue a closer relationship with Pakistan when the USSR was seeking a closer relationship with India as a counter-weight to China. That era is gone and no such political weight of the older level can now be put on the current China-Pakistan connection.

The third and most common type of nuclear-related association is one simply of nuclear cooperation and mutual trade and technology benefits, with at most, minor political spin-offs. It is of a kind that many countries engage in, be it Germany and Argentina, India and Russia, China and Russia, etc. Should Russian-Indian collaboration to set up nuclear reactors and to have the latest Sukhoi-30s be seen by Islamabad as evidence of a near nuclear alliance between the two countries directed against Pakistan? Does the fact that the Russians are today supplying SS-18 ballistic missiles and Cruise missiles to China indicate a near alliance relationship? The simple reality is that China has long been prepared to sell its nuclear related expertise (for setting up nuclear power generation or for supplying parts) and its missiles and general armaments to any number of countries that are willing to buy them. It has sold missiles to Saudi Arabia and Iran. It has nuclearly cooperated with not only Pakistan but Algeria and other countries keen on expanding nuclear energy production.

One extraordinary argument put forward by a well known Indian hawk, who best exemplifies the point about the concern for salesmanship repeatedly overcoming the scruples for sound and sober argument, is the claim that China is engaged along with Pakistan in an effort to improve its political-strategic connection with key West Asian countries and that this has a political-strategic consequence for India. Unfortunately for such irresponsible speculation (and conventional Realist thinking or so-called strategic thinking is invariably of a highly speculative and superficial type) the country with which the Chinese have the strongest military relationship of

buying and selling arms is Israel! One might as well equally and irresponsible speculate that China is pursuing a political-strategic relationship with Israel implicitly aimed at other Islamic West Asian states!

The basic point is that far too much of what passes for as sensible strategic evaluation of Chinese nuclear behaviour with India's neighbours is nothing of the kind. It is neither objective nor balanced evaluation but is unbalanced and irresponsible speculation of a strongly motivated kind; motivated by the need to paint a picture of "strategic threats" so as to justify a more hawkish stand on India's part in regard to the nuclear issue.

3673 words

Return-Path: <jsmith@clw.org>  
Date: Wed, 30 Jul 1997 14:49:43 -0400  
X-Sender: jsmith@[204.245.159.2]  
To: jsmith@clw.org  
From: jsmith@clw.org (Jenny Smith)  
Subject: July 23 Deep Cuts Working Group meeting update

TO: Deep Cuts Working Group and Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers members  
FR: Jenny Smith

RE: July 23 meeting notes; remarks by Rodney Jones on START II and III

Ambassador Jonathan Dean, working group chair, has prepared the following notes from the July 23 meeting outlining the decisions and discussion of activities to move the START process and de-alerting initiative forward. Following the meeting notes below is a comprehensive assessment of the START process, as presented by Rodney Jones of Policy Architects International to the working group.

For further information, please contact Ambassador Dean at 332-0900, or Jenny Smith (jsmith@clw.org) at 546-0795. Daryl Kimball will be out of the country until August 12, so please direct Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers inquiries to Jenny until then.

Thank you.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Jonathan Dean  
Adviser on International Security Issues  
Union of Concerned Scientists  
Suite 310, 1616 P St., NW  
202/332-0900  
FAX 202/332-0905  
E-Mail jdean@ucsusa.org

July 30, 1997

**NEXT MEETING: 10:00 AM ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1997 AT UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS**

## 1. SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION AND ACTION STEPS

>From the July 23, 1997 meeting of the Deep Cuts Working Group, Rodney Jones presented his forecast that Duma ratification of START II remains possible if certain specified conditions are fulfilled. (An outline of Rodney's comments is attached.) From the discussion, it would appear that Yeltsin's personal engagement for START II ratification is essential, but that both Yeltsin and the Clinton administration are now giving priority to resolving economic issues in Russia.

## 2. MOVING THE START PROCESS FORWARD

a. The group discussed actions that it might take to advance prospects of action by Russia. It was agreed that individual members should urge administration officials they contact to accelerate preparations for START III negotiations and to pass on some details of these preparations to Russian officials in order to bolster the impression of strong administration support for START III as discussed at Helsinki.

b. David Culp proposed that a small group of NGOs be sent to Moscow to document strong and continuing U.S. NGO interest in START II and III. Daryl Kimball will develop a cost estimate for submission to the full Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers in its next meeting. The Coalition will decide on whether to carry out David's suggestion, how, and at what cost.

c. It was reported that Michael Krepon believes it would be best to wait with a coalition letter to Yeltsin until after some agreement has been reached on TMD demarcation (the current phase of negotiation in Geneva is expected to end on August 25).

d. The idea of Duma ratification of START II and of a START III agreement as a single package was discussed. Rodney Jones said this approach might be useful, but only if the Russian government took the initiative to push it.

e. It was agreed that the Working Group would organize a briefing on the status of the START negotiations for Senate staff and media in October.

### 3. DE-ALERTING

a. The Working Group discussed a draft letter to the Foreign Ministers of the three nuclear powers and Russia urging a joint effort to pursue Yeltsin's initiative on de- alerting at the Paris summit. It was agreed that the draft should be further developed by Aaron Tovish and Daryl Kimball and should take into account Foreign Minister Primakov's comments on this topic at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament following the Paris meeting.

b. It was suggested that Working Group members contact administration officials in order to persuade them to incorporate a statement of support for de-alerting into the President's September speech to the General Assembly.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

July 22, 1997

### START II AND START III ISSUES IN RUSSIA

Rodney W. Jones

Note: These remarks were prepared at Ambassador Jonathan Dean's request to share views on the START II ratification outlook in Russia with the Coalition on Nuclear Dangers, and structured somewhat to follow questions set forth by Daryl Kimball in the agenda for the Coalition's July 23 meeting. A few modifications have been made in this version to clarify and take account of comments and reactions at that meeting.

Prospects for START II ratification in Russia:

Questions on most of our minds: --

1. Why is Russia so slow to ratify START II? Will it happen? When?
2. Would it help consolidate START II and the reductions process to begin negotiating START III? Or are there major risks in doing that?
3. Will a push for "unilateral" measures like "de-alerting" be helpful to reductions, or even have a meaningful effect in their own right?

Helsinki definitely improved the prospects for Russian ratification of START II.

It did so by addressing the primary Russian complaints about the financial "costs" of the treaty: (a) by the joint commitment to postpone START II deadline by 5 years; and (b) by unveiling lower START III ceilings. There is wide, though not universal, consensus on this point among experts in Moscow.

In essence, Helsinki alleviated the main bureaucratic objections in Russia to START II. Provided the Yeltsin Administration firmly supports START II, no bureaucratic official need fear now that he can be accused, because of supporting START II, of selling out Russian interests. The Duma opposition, arguably, had created the basis for such a bureaucratic mind set.

Helsinki made it plausible that a middle ground can be established in the Duma, and that diehard Duma opposition can be overcome. Ratifying START II requires only a simple majority is required in each house of the Federal Assembly, the Duma and the Federation Council.

START II ratification will happen in Russia, this fall or this winter, if three (or four) conditions are met. These are possibly big ifs:

-- a defensible TMD demarcation agreement is concluded, defensible in the Duma and defensible in the Senate;

-- Yeltsin engages the Duma personally, actively, and with conviction, to push for START II ratification (the appointment of Sergeyev as Defense Minister strengthens Yeltsin's hand, once he is prepared to get out in front); and

-- Yeltsin shares enough information with the Duma leadership about how START II will be implemented and paid for, how START III will fit in, and the nature of Russia's strategic arms modernization path. (On modernization, the Duma "defense leaders" want to know what the modernization will consist of, how much it will cost, and why it should be sufficient for Russia's security under START II and START III, bearing in mind that Helsinki clarified that the two treaties are intended to apply concurrently.)

-- The Yeltsin Administration also might have to make log-rolling deals with leaders of factions and parties that have a pivotal role in the Duma and that have been opposed or unenthusiastic about START II in order to get a solid vote for START II.

Why hasn't Yeltsin engaged the Duma actively before now?

His 1996 illness and the 1996 presidential election apart, and assuming that Russia's interests in START II on its merits are distinct from the NATO controversy, the main explanation is three-fold:

(a) Yeltsin is not a "white knight" on arms control and doesn't personally care about the substance of START II (or START III for that matter), only about its utility as a means to other ends (and Foreign Minister Primakov has no vested interest in START II per se); and

(b) Yeltsin's team believes other issues on the domestic political agenda take overriding precedence -- the budget, subsidies, the crisis of economy, military reform, and internal unrest. START II does nothing measurable, nothing tangible, for Yeltsin domestically -- unless it were to fail in such a way as to cause an external crisis with the United States and the West; and

(c) Yeltsin really does not respect most of the Duma membership; he doesn't like to have to stoop to get their consent. He will have to overcome a psychological hurdle to do this. Or, alternately, he will have to use intimidation (such as a credible threat to dismiss the Duma, which, if he has to carry out the threat, would only postpone action on START II until after new elections, and possibly result in a new Duma worse than the first).

What is the Yeltsin administration moved by, then, and how does it relate to START II/III?

START II and III, like START I, are connected with Russia's domestic needs, the downsized economy and unaffordability of former Soviet strategic forces and infrastructure. But there is no specific economic compulsion to reduce strategic (as opposed to conventional) forces rapidly. Natural aging -- muddling through -- is more convenient and financially easier. (Bear in mind that opponents of START II have gained some respectability for arguments that it is cheaper to refurbish and preserve MIRVed ICBMs than to junk and replace them with new production.)

The external connections are twofold: (a) to keep the United States on a reduction path and preserve the political symbolism of bilateral parity; and (b) keep the West happy enough to stay committed to integrate Russia in the Western economic structure and support Russia's reform efforts, however uneven or halting they may be. Yeltsin knows Russia needs a soft landing, and Western cooperation and tolerance, to get its house in order. (NATO enlargement complicates these objectives, but probably not fatally.) The START agreements are important parts of this umbilical cord.

But from Yeltsin's point of view, there is no compelling reason for haste with START II. The Clinton administration has no inclination (and rightly so) to punish Russia for delay. His team may also believe that a "realistic" Republican administration could not walk away from the START agreements merely because of delays. Yeltsin can afford delays on START without compromising other external objectives because START matters a lot to the West.

Furthermore, delaying the conclusion of START II and III has had some "linkage" utility for Russia in bargaining for concessions, both in the missile defense area and in the modalities of NATO expansion, as we have all witnessed.

Would intensive START III negotiations expedite START II ratification?

Probably not. The Clinton administration's reticence here is prudent.

To be strictly logical, there is no reason to expect that a Duma that is already heavily prejudiced against START II will suddenly become enthusiastic about (or hasten to approve) START II because START III is being negotiated. More likely, the act of opening negotiations on START III will trigger intense interest among Duma defense experts in the outcome of START III and delay action on START II until the follow-on agreement is concluded. It may, as the Clinton administration has feared, cause the Duma to seek to reopen important provisions of START II. Reopening START II probably would incite efforts to undo the total ban on MIRVed ICBMs -- along with reductions, the central purpose of START II. This certainly would provoke a U.S. legislative backlash.

A categorical answer is not available, however.

The final answer would depend partly on whether the Yeltsin administration itself will insist on negotiating the content of START III first, and whether in that case it would leave intact START II's central accomplishments (elimination of MIRVed ICBMs) in its position on the terms of START III, and whether it would commit Russia to commence, from a date certain, moving down a smooth START II reductions path ending in the year 2007 -- so that the Duma does not have another pretext for charging unfairness (or unaffordability) in the way scheduled reductions affect Russia financially.

If the U.S. administration were to adopt this approach (possibly entailing reciprocal unilateral reductions before START II has become binding), it would have to take the U.S. Senate into confidence. This could open up new internal problems for the Clinton administration.

There is no evidence that the Yeltsin administration prefers, let alone insists, that START III be negotiated first. If this catches on among influential Americans as a viable option, however, the Yeltsin administration might join the bandwagon. It is perfectly well aware that there is budgetary pressure in the United States to move on to planned START II forces, to save money, even if START II has not been ratified and entered into force.

Leap-frogging to START III should be viewed as an option of last resort, to be considered only if START II appears by 1998 to be bogging down fatally in Russia, if Yeltsin insists, and if it can be ensured that START II's principal objectives will not be undone.

What about the push for fresh unilateral measures, e.g., "de-alerting," that could be implemented in parallel?

The desirability of pushing unilaterally for operational arms control measures depends on one's premises on two issues, first, whether there is a compelling security or political reason for parallel delivery system or warhead disabling measures (e.g., de-alerting) outside formal agreements, and second, whether non-government discussions of such measures help or hinder the objectives of getting START II (and other formal arms control treaties) ratified and reductions implemented, and the value one places on the latter.

The postulated urgency of the campaign for "de-alerting" presupposes launch on warning (hair-trigger) postures, or high risk of accidental launch or unauthorized launch. Despite some degradation in Russian strategic early warning and the 1993 and 1997 declaratory statements of potential nuclear first-use against strategic attack, it is arguably doubtful that "hair trigger" accurately depicts the current (or preferred) operational posture, or the command and control reliability, of the Russian strategic forces.

This is not to deny that technical capacities (options) to implement such a posture inherently exist. Nor does this judgment overlook the fact that Russia's general purpose forces are undergoing extraordinary trauma and suffering from downsizing and interruptions in financial support. But it assumes that the general purpose military disruptions are not essentially representative of, and should not be confused with, the situation in the strategic forces. (Deferred maintenance of strategic support infrastructure, if perpetuated for many years, eventually could have crisis stability consequences, but that does not mean that Russia will continue to neglect that sector or that infusions are urgent now.)

Off-setting temptation to fall back to "hair trigger" posture, more than ten years of formal arms negotiations and informal military to military talks have led the senior military leaders on both sides to understand that there is no overarching, active hostility today, the political-psychological situation militates against return to confrontation, and there is no expectation of crises that could lead to serious consideration of initiating strategic attack. This climate cannot be guaranteed as permanent. But it would take a lot to reverse it politically and militarily.

A more plausible way to view the "de-alerting" proposals is to see them not as an end unto themselves or as a substitute for formal arms control but as a means of supporting the START treaties, especially by facilitating information-sharing and concept-formation in informal group discussions on what is technically viable and meaningful. The Helsinki joint statements introduced commitments to "deactivation" of systems slated for elimination under START II (and potentially under START III). While the terminology and procedures are not synonymous, discussion of de-alerting techniques could clarify acceptable deactivation methods. Work in this area could also lead to informal clarification of viable procedures for transparency and irreversibility, with respect to removal of warheads -- the most important new, concrete objective in strategic arms control and disarmament.

Whether serious consideration of new, unilateral measures this will lead to "accelerating" the START II/III process or, better yet, strengthening it intrinsically, remains to be seen. While these ideas have considerable resonance in Russia in a small community that follows nuclear arms control, they are not by themselves likely to have a decisive effect in overcoming Duma resistance to existing nuclear arms agreements. The potential problem with ideas that "outrun" agreements is the creation of expectations and proliferation of controversies that undercut the agreements. It is hard to see how broad public support could be engendered by either side for unilateral disablement of the lion's share of its strategic nuclear arsenal (albeit reversible) if it becomes manifest that the existing bilateral agreements obligating and verifying deep reductions and elimination of strategic arms will not be put into force.

What can be done as a practical matter surely depends on what the Russian defense establishment and, in particular, the Russian strategic forces can be persuaded is worthwhile, and what Yeltsin and his team will actively engage to make happen. As Russia's recent position on the NATO Founding Act makes clear, Russia infinitely prefers legally binding instruments for constraints on military capability.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers  
Council for a Livable World Education Fund  
110 Maryland Ave., NE, Suite 201  
Washington, DC 20002

~~~~~

Ph: 202/546-0795  
FAX: 202/546-5142  
E-mail: [dkimball@clw.org](mailto:dkimball@clw.org) / [jsmith@clw.org](mailto:jsmith@clw.org)  
Website: [www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/](http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/)

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Wed, 30 Jul 1997 18:18:13 -0400  
From: disarmament@igc.org  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Avoid Gloom  
To: ctb-followers@igc.org

Dear Folks:

I have been away for about a week, in the beautiful Pacific Northwest (Portland, OR) with fabulous Peace Action activists and others - where we were far from "Stygian gloom".

So here are some of the news stories that you may have missed. Some should make you recognize irony and hypocrisy and feel outrage - but I urge you to avoid gloom.

Also, stay tuned for news out of Seattle, WA where (and like Dave Barry, I swear I'm not making this up) Trident missile submarines are scheduled to arrive in Seattle's Elliott Bay on August 6.

Rtw 07/29 1220 UK envoy fed up with gloomy U.N. disarmament talks  
GENEVA, July 29 (Reuter) - Britain's outgoing envoy to Geneva's deadlocked disarmament talks said on Tuesday he would make a lucky escape from the gloom of the arduous negotiations when he retires in a couple of months.

"We have been unable to start any substantive work," Michael Weston told the body as it embarked on its final seven-week session of the year after which he will end a 36-year diplomatic career, including five in Geneva.

He said the impasse had deepened at the talks, stalled amid a row between Western states eager to negotiate global bans on landmines and production of bomb-making fissile material, and non-aligned states seeking a greater elimination of nuclear arms.

"1997 has been pretty horrid," Weston said.

The United Nations-sponsored talks are unlikely to produce a landmine ban for some time although a special coordinator on the issue was named in June to detach it from deadlocked nuclear topics.

"We conduct our business in Stygian gloom," Weston said after admitting he never liked the austere murals hanging over the talks at the United Nations European headquarters in Geneva.

"I am beginning to believe I have had a lucky escape." REUTER

\*\*\*\*\*  
PA 07/24 2026 MINISTER'S TEST BAN PLEA

By Andrew Evans, Lords Staff, PA News

Britain tonight renewed its appeal to India, Pakistan and North Korea to sign the 1996 Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, as peers backed legislation for the UK to ratify it.

Junior Foreign Office Minister Baroness Symons of Vernham Dean said

those countries were among those that had yet to sign the treaty. "We are doing what we can to encourage all three states, and indeed all other non-signatories, to sign and ratify the treaty quickly."

She described the treaty as a "significant step forward in nonproliferation, and it brings the world closer to the goal of the global elimination of nuclear weapons".

Lord Moynihan, for the Opposition, welcomed the Nuclear Explosions (Prohibition and Inspections) Bill which gained an unopposed second reading.

\*\*\*\*\*

RTw 07/24 1436 U.S. labs redesigning nuclear warheads

ALBUQUERQUE, N.M., July 24 (Reuter) - New Mexico's nuclear weapons laboratories are designing a possible replacement for nuclear warheads on U.S. Navy Trident submarines, the first design change since the end of the Cold War, lab officials said on Thursday.

Heinz Schmitt, a vice president at Albuquerque's Sandia National Laboratories, said no decision had been made to build any newly designed warheads, but the U.S. military wanted to be prepared should the existing W88 warheads develop problems as they age.

Similar redesign efforts will be required over the next few decades for the five other nuclear weapons that will remain in the U.S. nuclear arsenal, Schmitt said.

Arms control groups said the design work undermined the 1970 non-proliferation treaty signed by the United States and other nuclear powers.

A worldwide nuclear test ban in place since President Bill Clinton signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty last September also could short-circuit design efforts because test blasts would have to be conducted with the new warheads.

"The United States agreed to enter into negotiations to accomplish nuclear disarmament," said Greg Mello of the Los Alamos Study Group, a Santa Fe, N.M., arms control organisation that revealed details of the new design work earlier this week.

"This design work shows a commitment to build new nuclear weapons ... and optimize the arsenal for post Cold War conditions," he said.

Schmitt countered that the work on the navy missile warhead did not constitute a "new nuclear weapon."

"The pressure on this effort is to see how we can replace it and meet the same requirements," he said. "This is not an attempt to bring in a new system."

Since the end of the Cold War, the United States has dismantled many of its nuclear weapons. But the military still retains a stockpile, and Congress and the White House have charged New Mexico's nuclear weapons labs with the job of ensuring it remains safe and reliable.

REUTER

\*\*\*\*\*

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

July 24, 1997

"Why US Lab Is Designing A Bomb No One Asked For: Plan could threaten nuclear nonproliferation"

by Jonathan Landay, Staff writer of The Christian Science Monitor

WASHINGTON

No one in the government asked for it and the Air Force says it does not need it.

Yet the Sandia National Laboratory in New Mexico, one of America's nuclear-weapons research facilities, is working on an atomic bomb that would have capabilities beyond those in the current United States arsenal.

The bomb, carrying an "old" nuclear explosive device and a new guidance system, would soar on wings like a glider after its release from a radar-dodging B-2 bomber. It would drill deep into earth or concrete, its explosion crushing "hardened" bunkers hundreds of feet below ground while causing little surface damage.

The project symbolizes US determination to maintain the most-advanced arsenal possible absent global disarmament and amid rising concerns over a growth of deeply buried command-and-control and armsmaking complexes in Russia, Iran, Libya, Iraq, and North Korea. But it also comes as President Clinton is using American power and prestige to support global efforts to curb the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and reduce the number of nuclear warheads.

Caught between these contradictory goals, the project, known as the Bomb Impact Optimization System (BIOS), embodies a fierce debate over the direction of post-cold-war US nuclear-arms policy.

At issue is whether BIOS would breach a pledge not to design or build new warheads. If other countries perceive such a breach, they could be less willing to adhere to US-backed arms-control initiatives, some experts warn.

"It is not in the best interest of the US if the rest of the world thinks it is still business as usual, as this will undermine support for nonproliferation," warns Jeremiah Sullivan, a University of Illinois physicist and member of the JASONS, independent experts who advise the government on nuclear-arms policy. "We don't need better nuclear weapons."

BIOS raises other questions, including the accountability of the scientists, military officers, bureaucrats, and defense contractors who make up the nuclear-weapons complex. The complex is in the throes of a post-cold-war overhaul, and some experts have doubts about its willingness to stop after 50-plus years producing nuclear weapons. The way BIOS has been funded may fuel those concerns.

While Sandia has spent \$16 million since October 1995 on BIOS, the project has no separate listing in the budget of the Department of Energy (DOE), which runs the nuclear laboratories. Instead, the name of the account from which the funds have been drawn has been different for each of the past three fiscal years. The DOE is unable to say how much money it expects to spend on BIOS in the coming fiscal year.

The nuclear-weapons complex has had a "history of fiscal inattention"

and absence of sufficient executive-branch and congressional oversight, says Stephen Schwartz of the Brookings Institution in Washington. He recently completed the most comprehensive study ever of the costs of the US nuclear program.

BIOS is still in the concept stage, although scientists have used a new computer-driven process to produce a prototype nose cone. That and other aspects of the program were briefly detailed by C. Paul Robinson, the head of Sandia, in a statement to a House subcommittee April 10.

"Sandia is investigating the feasibility of modifying a B61 payload," Dr. Robinson said. "This effort includes analysis, design, model fabrication and testing, and ground and flight testing of a functional prototype."

A safer version

BIOS would be a follow-up to the B61-11, a conventionally dropped bunker-buster that replaced the B53 in February. The B53 is a 9,000-pound behemoth that produces a blast equivalent to 9 million tons of TNT, according to Pentagon sources. The government decided the stockpile of these bombs had become unsafe after some 30 years in the armory.

By contrast, the B61-11 weighs 750 pounds. It is the atomic payload of an existing bomb "repackaged" inside a needle-nosed body made from depleted uranium, which is extremely hard and more dense than lead. Unlike the B53, the B61-11 is small enough to be carried by a B-2 stealth bomber.

The idea behind a gliding version of the B61-11 is to better protect the \$2.2 billion B-2 and its crew by allowing them to release the weapon a safe distance from anti-aircraft defenses around their target. The bomb would glide on its wings the rest of the way, guided by an on-board radar that would also activate the fuse of the nuclear payload.

"Standoff capability is something that people have wanted in weapons for years," says Heinz Schmitt, Sandia's vice president for weapons systems, in defending BIOS. "This is very much exploratory in nature."

But Pentagon and DOE officials say they have not asked for a modified version of the B61-11. Adds Capt. Leo Devine, an Air Force spokesman: "The Air Force has no requirement for it."

Still, DOE and Pentagon officials support the objectives of BIOS program. They say such work is not barred by any arms-control accords and is justified under a new nuclear-weapons program designed to allow the US to adhere to the 1996 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).

The CTBT bars for all time test blasts used to verify new warhead designs and spot defects in weapons. Seen as a way of preventing states like Iran from developing nuclear bombs, the US sought a means by which it could sign the CTBT while maintaining a reliable armory well beyond its design life span.

The result was the \$40 billion Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program. It requires labs to develop ways to simulate test explosions.

The labs are also charged with "maintaining" weapons-design skills without breaking the US pledge not to make new warheads. But therein lies the source of the dispute.

The government defines a new weapon as a new nuclear payload. It holds that repacking old payloads in new bodies or upgrading nonnuclear components does not result in new weapons, even if it adds capabilities to the stockpile.

In the case of BIOS, "we are looking at it from the point of view of what is the technology that it will take to put on wings and fly a current bomb," says Assistant Energy Secretary Victor Reis, head of the DOE's nuclear-weapons programs.

To ensure it does not cross the line between a simple modification and a new weapon, he explains, BIOS will not move beyond the concept stage unless cleared by the Nuclear Weapons Council, a multiagency body that sets US nuclear requirements.

A 'new' bomb?

Still, Dr. Reis, a former council chairman, says the panel sees BIOS as "a maintenance of our capability for nonnuclear devices" and thus "not a new weapon." That is not how many arms-control experts see BIOS. To them, the US went too far already by deploying the B61-11. BIOS, they say, takes the country further down that dangerous path.

"There is certainly no need for us to do this with our enormous superiority in conventional weaponry," says Frank von Hippel, former assistant director of national security in the White House Office of Science and Technology. He and other arms-control experts contend that how the US defines a new weapon is of no concern to Russia and China. They say these countries see the US trying to enhance its nuclear capabilities, giving them incentive to continue improving their own.

These experts also agree that states like Iran would likely seek weapons of mass destruction no matter what the US was doing. But by continuing to upgrade its stockpile, they say, the US could hurt international support for its counterproliferation policies.

Enhancements to US nuclear capabilities could also stiffen the Russian parliament's refusal to ratify the long-delayed START II treaty, which mandates further cuts in Russian and US atomic warheads, some experts say.

Critics also question Sandia's pursuit of BIOS without a formal directive or a military requirement. Some are concerned that laboratory scientists are trying to create a formal program where one did not exist. If the viability of BIOS is shown, they say, the Air Force is unlikely to turn it down.

"The purpose of the laboratories has always been to make new types of nuclear weapons, and this indicates that this has not changed," says Mr. Schwartz of the Brookings Institution. "Why are we still on a cold-war footing? Why are they masquerading behind stockpile stewardship?"

Officials deny such allegations. They say there is no guarantee the US can maintain a reliable stockpile beyond the life span it was designed for without test blasts. Given the post-cold-war uncertainties, they say, it is only prudent to ensure that the current arsenal is as effective as possible.

If there are policy contradictions, they say, those are for Mr. Clinton to sort out. "This is decided at the very top," Reis says, adding that BIOS does bring up "new questions to answer."

\*\*\*\*\*

(For up-to-date information on this story, contact Bob Tiller or Lisa Ledwidge at Physicians for Social Responsibility, -(202) 898 0150

## 50'S NUKE TEST FALLOUT WIDESPREAD

by The Associated Press

Filed at 7:58 p.m. EDT

July 25, 1997

WASHINGTON (AP) -- People as far away as the East Coast may have been exposed to as much radiation fallout from nuclear tests in the 1950s as residents directly downwind from the Nevada blasts, according to preliminary information from a National Cancer Institute study.

Young children's exposures may have been 10 times the average in the worst hot spots, mostly because they drank contaminated milk, the government said Friday.

But no one knows whether the exposures were enough to cause thyroid cancer. The NCI refused Friday to unveil its list of the 24 U.S. counties that had the most fallout. Nuclear watchdog groups derided the delay, saying the government has an obligation to test and, if necessary, treat those exposed.

Sources familiar with portions of the secret report say areas with the highest fallout include Albany, N.Y., and parts of Massachusetts, Missouri, Tennessee, North and South Dakota, Idaho and Montana.

The NCI plans to release some fallout maps with a summary of the 100,000-page report on Wednesday. The full report won't be available until September.

One independent expert cautioned that people cannot draw a line between the possible fallout doses and cancer, especially 40 years later.

"I would not be greatly concerned," said Dr. Clark Heath of the American Cancer Society, who said previous studies of radioactive iodine-131 have suggested a cancer link but not proved it. He said small doses over time, as the Nevada blasts appeared to cause, are less worrisome than one-time big doses.

"There's a lot of uncertainty about how one translates this kind of dose information into actual risk," Heath said.

But children exposed to iodine fallout from the Chernobyl nuclear plant accident in the former Soviet Union in 1986 have higher rates of

thyroid cancer, according to studies.

People who lived directly downwind of the government's atomic bomb tests, especially in southwest Utah, already were known to be exposed heavily. The government has paid compensation to some.

But wind and rain can carry radiation far afield, so President Reagan 14 years ago ordered the NCI to examine fallout in each of the 3,071 counties in the 48 contiguous states between 1951 and 1958.

The result: All 160 million residents at the time received some fallout, study author Bruce Wachholz, NCI's radiation effects chief, said in an interview.

Reseachers did not actually test any people. But based on mathematical models, they hypothesized that the average thyroid dose nationally was 2 rads, about the same amount of radiation a person absorbed from a common medical test of that era.

But people in the two dozen counties with greatest concentration of fallout may have received an average 16 rads, the study found.

As part of an ongoing study of fallout at the Hanford, Wash., nuclear plant, doctors have recommended anyone exposed to 10 rads or more be monitored for health effects.

And children ages 3 months to 5 years who lived in those hot spots could have received up to 160 rads, because they drank more contaminated milk and their thyroids were smaller, Wachholz said.

Especially at risk were people who drank goats' milk, which appeared more tainted than milk from cows.

``If you were a child that lived in those counties throughout the testing period, when you have your annual physical, ask your physician to check your thyroid," Wachholz advised.

But Wachholz declined to name the hot spots, saying maps pointing them out will be released next week.

Bob Schaeffer of the watchdog Military Production Group, complained that the cancer institute has had that data for as long as five years and is still refusing to release it.

``We want this data out, we want this studied, we want them to tell the truth," he said. ``It should be a public responsibility to locate and monitor those people, and if they turn out to be at risk, to care for them."

The NCI report is a mathematical model -- scientists' best estimate -- of the fallout. For 90 nuclear tests that emitted iodine-131, NCI researchers dug out 1950s weather data to track each day of each test in every county, following wind and rain patterns.

Then they went through dairy records to determine if herds grazed where nthe fallout was deposited and where their milk was shipped, and compare that with population records.

Contaminated milk was the highest risk, but smaller exposures came from other dairy products, vegetables and inhalation -- although iodine-131 dissipates within two months.

\*\*\*\*\*

Rtna 07/24 1404 Yeltsin sets up working group on plutonium

MOSCOW (Reuter) - President Boris Yeltsin Thursday ordered the creation of a working group to consider what to do with Russia's surplus weapons-grade plutonium.

Yeltsin told Yevgeny Velikhov, a member of Russia's advisory Defense Council, to head the group and prepare a report by Oct. 15, the presidential press service said.

The decree, issued by Yeltsin at the resort in central Russia where he is on vacation, coincides with international efforts to negotiate an end to the production of plutonium which is used to make nuclear weapons.

The United States announced plans last December for scrapping 50 tons of plutonium left over from its nuclear weapons program, but a senior official said the plans hinged on talks with Russia on reducing stockpiles of the substance.

Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov said in Geneva last month that Moscow supported calls to start talks on banning production of fissionable materials for nuclear weapons.

Under Yeltsin's decree, the working group must work out a plan for what to do with surplus weapons-grade plutonium and prepare a framework agreement on the matter.

It must also draw up a declaration setting out quantities of surplus weapons-grade plutonium in Russia and consider ways for Russia to take part in international projects on the use of plutonium.

Western governments have been worried since the breakup of the Soviet Union in 1991 that nuclear materials could be stolen in the former Soviet bloc and put nuclear arms within reach of non-nuclear states.

A nuclear expert told Reuters in April the only known theft of enough weapons-grade nuclear material to make a bomb was in August 1994, when German police seized 12.8 ounces of plutonium-239 from couriers on a flight to Munich from Moscow.

REUTER

\*\*\*\*\*

RTw 07/29 0609 Russia focuses on mobile missile launch-pads

MOSCOW, July 29 (Reuter) - Rail-mounted launchers and mobile SS-25 missiles will provide the cornerstone of Russia's nuclear shield after far-reaching military reforms, a senior Kremlin official said on Tuesday.

Yuri Baturin, secretary of President Boris Yeltsin's Defence Council, told Interfax news agency Russia needed moveable and easily concealed missile complexes, such as the Topol (Poplar), known under NATO classifications as the SS-25.

Baturin added, however, that Russia would also develop its traditional silo-based missile complexes, strategic bomber fleet and nuclear submarines. The latter formed the main nuclear strike force in Soviet times.

Earlier this month, Yeltsin formally announced long-planned reforms, including cutting troop numbers by 500,000 to 1.2 million by the end of 1998. Last year he promised to create a fully professional, non-conscript army by 2000, though that deadline appears to have been quietly dropped.

The reform, putting the stress on combat readiness and new weapons, will also restructure the strategic command.

Yeltsin wants to turn the armed forces into a smaller and more efficient fighting force after years of declining standards which culminated in humiliation at the hands of separatists in Chechnya last

year. REUTER

\*\*\*\*\*

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005  
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232  
FAX: 202 898 0172  
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 30 Jul 1997 20:02:33 -0400  
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: U P D A T E !  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, tomatompn+@igc.org

U P D A T E !

\*\*\*\*\*

A bulletin of nuclear disarmament news, activities, and resources

\*\*\*\*\*

July 30, 1997

\*\*\*\*\*

Fifty-two Years After Trinity . . .

It's Time for Nuclear Disarmament

\*\*\*\*\*

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse

A Project Of: Greenpeace, Peace Action, Physicians for Social  
Responsibility, Plutonium Challenge, Women's Action for New Directions.

To receive a FREE hard copy of the U P D A T E! with enclosures  
including press materials, flyers, can wrappers and fact sheets please  
contact:

Kathy Crandall at the Disarmament Clearinghouse  
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington, DC 20005  
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232  
FAX: 202 898 0172  
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

This U P D A T E!

START Moving

More Experts Agree  
Letter to the President

Ratify the CTBT

CTBT Ratification Steps &  
Senators Speak on CTBT

CAN the Subcriticals Action Kit

July 2- Rebound &  
Full Court Press Response  
WHAT YOU CAN DO  
Sample Letter-to-the-Editor  
Sample Press Release

Resources

Calendar

The first nuclear weapons test, "Trinity," was an 18.6 kiloton atmospheric test detonated on July 16, 1945 at Alamogordo, New Mexico. Fifty-two years later activists are still working to completely end nuclear weapons testing and the nuclear arms race. This summer and fall nuclear disarmament advocates nationwide will call upon President Clinton to make ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban a priority as a key step on the path to a nuclear weapons-free 21st century.

\*\*\*\*\*

More Experts Agree - It's Time To START Moving!

#### NAS STUDY

The Committee on International Security and Arms Control (CISAC), a standing committee of the National Academy of Sciences, recently published a report entitled "The Future of Nuclear Weapons Policy".

The report outlines a two-phase plan to move toward nuclear disarmament. Phase one would include a set of reductions in nuclear arms, changes in operations and policies, and measures to increase the security of nuclear weapons and materials. The second phase calls for "examining how the continuing changes in international relations could make it both desirable and possible to prohibit the possession of nuclear weapons." (NAS press release, "Changes in U.S. Policy Needed To Reduce Risks Posed By Nuclear Weapons," June 17, 1997.).

For more information on the Web: <http://www.nas.edu/new>

#### CBO - START MOVING TO SAVE \$\$

At the request of Senator John Glenn (D-OH), ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) produced a report entitled "Preserving the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Under a Comprehensive Test Ban."

Perhaps the most important finding of the report is that the United States could save taxpayers more than \$22 billion through the year 2010 if it pursues "deep cuts" in the nuclear stockpile to 1,000 strategic warheads. The savings would come from the Department of Defense, which would save about \$16 billion due to the reduction of costs in maintaining the additional bombers, missiles and subs, and the Department of Energy which could postpone building a new tritium production facility, saving 6.5 billion.

The CBO breaks down their recommendations into four different alternatives. The first two focus on the actual number of weapons while alternatives 3 and 4 concentrate on reducing the size and scope of the Department of Energy's proposed Stockpile Stewardship Program.

\*\*\*\*\*

"The report I'm releasing today illustrates an often overlooked benefit of nuclear arms control - it saves money. . . Ratification of START II is an essential step to pursue further nuclear arms reductions and I urge the Duma to act quickly. I also strongly urge President Clinton and President Yeltsin to continue their efforts to develop a START III treaty, further reducing the number of nuclear weapons."

Senator Glenn, (D-OH), May 14, 1997.

\*\*\*\*\*

(Please note: This letter has been sent, so we are not accepting further sign-ons. However, there is plenty of work to do to START Moving! - contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse)

Over 100 Organizations Nationwide Ask for  
Progress on Nuclear Disarmament  
It's Time to START Moving!

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton  
President of the United States of America  
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20500

Attention: Samuel Berger, National Security Advisor

Dear Mr. President:  
June 19, 1997

As leaders of organizations representing millions of American citizens, we thank you for initiating a new round of bilateral nuclear disarmament talks with Russia. We especially welcome the inclusion of tactical or "battlefield" nuclear bombs and sea-launched cruise missiles, as well as the actual destruction of nuclear warheads in the scope of these talks. Their inclusion signifies a new and important step toward eliminating the world's nuclear arsenals.

We urge you to build on the success of the recent Helsinki Summit with Russian President Yeltsin by working with Russia to ensure the Duma's ratification of START II and the immediate commencement of negotiations on a third round of Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START III). We hope that START III will be a stepping stone to even deeper cuts in world nuclear arsenals leading to their elimination. Your personal leadership in continuing and expediting the pace of global nuclear disarmament is essential to making this goal a reality.

The majority of the American public supports the abolition of nuclear weapons. An April 1997 poll (attached) found that 84% of those polled would feel safer knowing for sure that no country, including the United States, had nuclear weapons. Additionally, a growing number of experts favors the elimination of nuclear weapons. In December 1996, retired admirals and generals from around the world issued a statement calling for the phased elimination of the global nuclear stockpile.

On September 24, 1996 you stated that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty "points us toward a century in which the roles and risks of nuclear weapons can be further reduced and eliminated." We call upon you to act on the will of the American majority and lead us into a nuclear weapons-free 21st century. Please take the first step now. This summer make it a priority to work with Russia on its START II ratification and immediately begin the process for START III negotiations to implement the Helsinki agreement.

Thank you for your personal attention to furthering the nuclear

disarmament agenda.

Sincerely,

(FOR A COMPLETE LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS THAT SIGNED, CONTACT THE  
DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE)

\*\*\*\*\*

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

\*\*\*\*\*

## COMPLETING & SIGNING THE CTBT

On September 10, 1996 the United Nations General Assembly adopted the long-sought Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) by an overwhelming margin - 158 to 3 with 5 abstentions. President Clinton was the first to sign the CTBT on September 24, 1996. Since then, 144 countries have signed, including the five declared nuclear weapons states (China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States).

\*\*\*\*\*

"This week in this place we make a giant step forward. By overwhelming consensus we will make a solemn commitment to end all nuclear tests for all time. . . It points us toward a century in which the roles and risks of nuclear weapons can be further reduced and eliminated."

President Clinton while signing the CTBT at the United Nations in New York, September 24, 1996.

\*\*\*\*\*

## RATIFICATION & ENTRY-INTO-FORCE

In order for the CTBT to take effect, or enter into force, 44 named countries must ratify the CTBT. The list of 44 countries is comprised of countries that were part of the Conference on Disarmament in 1996, and have nuclear power or research reactors. All declared and undeclared nuclear weapons states are on the list of 44.

The earliest date that the CTBT could enter into force is September 24, 1998. All 44 countries would have to have ratified the CTBT by that time. If all 44 countries do not ratify by September 1999, a conference may be convened by those countries that have ratified the treaty to explore ways to accelerate the CTBT's Entry-Into-Force.

To date 144 countries have signed the CTBT and 4 have ratified the treaty. Only one country (Japan) on the list of 44 has ratified the treaty.

Japan is the first country on the list of 44 (these 44 countries must ratify the CTBT in order for it to take effect) to have ratified the CTBT (July 8, 1997).

Three countries not on the list of 44 have ratified the CTBT: Fiji (the first to ratify the CTBT in October, 1996), Uzbekistan, and Qatar.

The United Kingdom is leading the way on ratification among the nuclear weapons states. The U.K. parliament is beginning debate on the CTBT now and may have it ratified by the end of this year.

Three countries on the list of 44 have not yet signed the treaty — India, Pakistan and North Korea.

\*\*\*\*\* CTBT

### Ratification Steps in the United States

\*\*\*\*\*

Probably in September, the Clinton administration will formally submit the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) to the Senate for ratification.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee could hold hearings this fall. The Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Select Intelligence Committee may also hold CTBT hearings. The Senate will be in session most of September and October and at least the first half of November.

After concluding hearings, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee could decide to report the Treaty out of committee, undoubtedly with a series of conditions. However given the opposition of the Chairman Jesse Helms to arms control in general, it will take a fight to get the committee to take action. They could bottle up the Treaty for years.

If the Foreign Relations Committee reports out the Treaty, it then goes to the Senate floor for debate. Additional conditions can be adopted at that time. Final approval of a treaty requires a two-thirds vote (67 Senators).

The final steps are the President's signature on the Treaty and its submission to the United Nations.

The timing of each of these steps is uncertain. Treaties can sail through the Senate in weeks or can be stuck for years. The Clinton administration hopes for a spring or early summer vote next year on the CTBT. All observers agree it will take a major effort at each step in the ratification process.

David Culp  
Legislative Coordinator  
Plutonium Challenge

\*\*\*\*\*

### Senators Speak On the CTBT

\*\*\*\*\*

On June 10, 1997 six U.S. Senators called for CTBT ratification, and marked the 34th anniversary of President Kennedy's historic address announcing a U.S. moratorium on atmospheric testing and calling for an end to all nuclear testing. Senators Harkin (D-IA), Durbin (D-IL), Reed (D- RI), Feingold (D-WI), Jeffords (R -VT), Kohl (D- WI) all spoke

for the CTBT on the floor of the Senate. For further excerpts, or the complete transcripts contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse.

\*\*\*\*\*

Now, we . . . must ensure that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is ratified here in the Senate and by 43 other nuclear capable countries so that it formally enters into force. . . I call upon President Clinton to make this a priority of his administration this year. I call upon the . . . Senate [leadership] to make it a priority for the U.S. Senate this year that we debate and vote on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.  
Senator Harkin, (D-IA) on the Senate Floor June 10, 1997.

\*\*\*\*\*

Without the support of leading Republican Senators it will be impossible to ratify the CTBT. Recently, Senator Domenici, (R-NM), a key Republican on nuclear weapons issues stated that he would likely support the CTBT. Domenici, however, is also a strong supporter of the nuclear weapons labs.

Realizing that ratifying the CTBT will be challenging, citizens nationwide are beginning now to discuss with their Senators the importance of a permanent end to nuclear testing - supported by an overwhelming majority of Americans.

As the budget debate proceeds in Congress, activists will continue to oppose the nuclear "Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program," for example, demanding cancellation of the subcritical tests in order to preserve the full integrity of the CTBT.

\*\*\*\*\*

## MOMENTUM TO "CAN" THE SUBCRITICALS BUILDS

On

July 2 1997, The Department of Energy (DOE) conducted a subcritical nuclear weapons experiment at the Nevada Test Site. Named "Rebound" this is a first in a planned series of such tests. Nuclear disarmament advocates worldwide are opposed to subcritical tests and advocate their cancellation.

In response to DOE's first subcritical nuclear weapons test at the Nevada Test Site, activists will now galvanize our opposition to these tests to cancel the future planned subcriticals. Another subcritical test, "Holog" is planned for later this summer or early fall, and 4 more subcriticals are planned in fiscal year 1998 (begins in October 1997).

Nuclear Disarmament Advocates Worldwide Oppose these Tests:

Citizens nationwide have been sending cans calling for the President to "can the subcriticals" to their Senators and the President. 44 national and local organizations sent letters to the Senate opposing the subcriticals.

International organizations have also protested the subcriticals, Japanese citizens sent a letter signed by 850 opposing the subcriticals, and letters and protests at U.S. embassies are also happening throughout Europe. The governments of China, Iran, India, Indonesia, and Libya, and

Norway have denounced the subcriticals, as well as the opposition government in Germany and the Mayors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan.

44 Members of Congress sent a letter to the President in opposition to the subcriticals. After Rebound, Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney (D-GA) released a statement titled "Clinton Administration Celebrates Fourth of July with Nuclear Explosion." Ron Dellums, (D-CA and Ranking Minority Member of the House National Security Committee) released a statement "Dellums Bemoans Plan to Proceed with "Subcritical" Nuclear Tests."

Upon the announcement of the July 2nd test, many organizations responded with demonstrations. Here are some reported examples:

In Austin, TX: 15 from Peace Action Austin and the Foundation for a Compassionate Society protested at the Federal Building. Three people were arrested.

In Chicago, IL: 20 people protested at the Federal Building. A coalition of Greenpeace, Peace Action and other activists will gather today at the Chicago Federal Plaza in mock radiation suits to demonstrate opposition to Rebound.

In Las Vegas, NV: A coalition of local organizations and activists blockaded the main entrance to the DOE headquarters in Las Vegas for 11 hours on July 1, and gathered again to protest Rebound on July 2.

\* In Princeton, NJ: "Ducktor" Strangelove made an appearance. Coalition for Peace Action demonstrated against subcriticals. In a duck costume activists referenced the adage "if it walks like a duck and talks like a duck it must be a duck." Thus, "if it acts like a nuclear test and looks like a nuclear test . . ."

At the Nevada Test Site protesters chained themselves a media bus and some were arrested near ground zero.

In San Francisco, CA: A coalition of disarmament organizations protested at Bechtel Corporations headquarters. (The Nevada Test Site is managed by Bechtel)

In Syracuse, NY: A funeral procession at the town plaza will include a casket filled with "can the subcritical" cans.

Tokyo, Japan - The Network to Stop Subcritical Nuclear Tests conducted a march in Tokyo on June 29, and plans to organize at protest in front of the U.S. Embassy in Tokyo with a message that reads "Our Fury Has Gone to Critical." More protests are planned

(For more on opposition to subcriticals in Georgia, New Jersey, New Hampshire and Washington, DC, see the enclosed photos, press clips and letters.)

## WHAT YOU CAN DO

1.) Gather Cans:. Nationwide, everyone will be urged to send as many cans as you have gathered on Wednesday. August 6, 1997, HIROSHIMA DAY to the White House. (You can also do this on August 9 (NAGASAKI DAY) or another day that has meaning in your local area.)

2.) Set a Goal. How many cans can your organization gather.

3.) Hold a Press Conference on August 6: Participate in nationwide day of local press conferences/demonstrations that the Disarmament Clearinghouse will help to coordinate. In Washington, DC we will deliver cans to the White House Mail Room, and tell them . . . and the media how many cans they can expect.. Enclosed is a sample press release.(You can also do this on August 9 (NAGASAKI DAY) or another day that has meaning in your local area.)

\*\*Please also call Kathy at the Disarmament Clearinghouse to let her know how you are participating\*\*

4.) Send News of Your Activities To The Disarmament Clearinghouse: We will accumulate local, national, and international press coverage, letters, press releases, etc. to deliver to the White House (and other key policymakers) with our MASSIVE collection of cans.

5.) Write Letters-to-the-Editor: Enclosed is a sample letter-to-the-editor. August 6 (Hiroshima Day) and August 9 (Nagasaki Day) will be good hooks. For help with your media work contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse.

6.) Call Your Senators: Try to arrange meetings with your Senators during the August Recess - Contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse, for more briefing information, and tips for successful meetings \*\*Call immediately to book your appointment - schedules are likely to be crowded\*\*

ORDER/RESPONSE FORM:

YES, I WILL COLLECT CAN THE SUBCRITICAL CANS TO SEND TO THE WHITE HOUSE ON AUGUST 6 !

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ ORGANIZATION \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

PHONE \_\_\_\_\_ FAX \_\_\_\_\_

E-MAIL \_\_\_\_\_

MY ORGANIZATION WILL SET A GOAL TO SEND \_\_\_# of CANS.

ALREADY WE HAVE DONE THESE THINGS IN OPPOSITION TO SUBCRITICALS:  
(DEMONSTRATIONS, SENT CANS, LETTERS-TO-THE-EDITOR, ETC. PLEASE ENCLOSE  
COPIES)

WE PLAN THESE ACTIVITIES IN OPPOSITION TO SUBCRITICALS:  
(DEMOS, LETTERS-TO-THE-EDITOR)

RETURN TO: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005  
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232  
FAX: 202 898 0172  
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

CALL: Kathy Crandall, Disarmament Clearinghouse Coordinator 202 898  
0150 ext. 232. for assistance in planning the details of your can  
gathering, your August 6 event and your media work.

#### SAMPLE LETTER TO-THE-EDITOR

Everyone knows the Cold War is over, everyone that is but the U.S.  
Department of Energy(DOE). The DOE continues to act as if the United  
States were in the midst of another global arms race. It proved this  
once again Wednesday, July 2 when it conducted a nuclear weapons test in  
the Nevada desert. By conducting what the DOE calls a "subcritical  
nuclear weapons experiment," an explosion with nuclear materials that is  
designed not to create a self-sustained chain reaction, the DOE has  
avoided a direct violation of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

But by continuing to test nuclear weapons, the United States is

setting a dangerous precedent. Conducting subcriticals tests encourages other nuclear and non-nuclear countries to conduct similar tests. Further, the DOE's argument that these tests are necessary to maintain the "safety and reliability" of current nuclear stockpiles is without merit as there is currently no available evidence which suggests reliability of the weapons has degraded over the years.

With the 52nd anniversary of Hiroshima upon us as a reminder of what nuclear weapons can do, the United States should start looking forward to a safe, nuclear-free world rather than backward to old Cold War tactics. [ Your organization] is joining with nuclear disarmament advocates nationwide asking President Clinton to cancel the subcriticals, seek an agreement with Russia and China to close the world's remaining test sites (The Nevada Test Site, Novaya Zemlya in Russia and Lop Nor in China), and make the ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty his top priority this year.[One sentence description of what your organization has done in opposition to subcriticals].

## SAMPLE PRESS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

CONTACT: August 6, 1997

Local Citizens Call Upon President Clinton  
To CAN the Subcritical Nuclear Weapons Tests

Today citizens from [your organization/ coalition] joined with nuclear disarmament advocates across the country who are sending cans wrapped with a protest letter calling upon President Clinton to CAN the Subcritical nuclear weapons tests.

Subcritical nuclear weapons tests are underground experiments at the Nevada Test Site which couple high explosives and nuclear weapons plutonium. They are designed to not produce a self- sustaining chain reaction hence the name "subcritical." Subcriticals will be used by scientists to continue gathering data about nuclear weapons performance in the absence of full scale nuclear blasts. They are also part of the U.S. effort to maintain an ability to "break out" of the test ban treaty and resume nuclear testing.

One subcritical test has taken place at the Nevada Test Site on July 2, 1997. Another is scheduled for late summer or early fall. Four more are scheduled in fiscal year 1998 (begins October 1997).

"We are sending \_\_\_ [number of] cans to President Clinton, telling him to can these tests that are completely out of step with the growing momentum toward nuclear disarmament," said [a local spokesperson].

" Today we mark the 52nd anniversary of the United State's use of a nuclear weapon on Hiroshima. President Clinton should do everything he can to end the nuclear threat and move toward a nuclear weapons-free

21st century; but these tests send the message that the U.S. is more interested in advancing nuclear weapons design than in advancing nuclear disarmament," said [a local spokesperson.]

"I am especially disappointed that the President, a strong supporter of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty(CTBT) is allowing these subcriticals which undermine the intent of the CTBT. President Clinton should cancel the subcriticals and submit the CTBT to the Senate for ratification. The United States should take the lead to permanently end all nuclear testing and move toward a nuclear weapons-free 21st century, said [a local spokesperson].

[Two sentences about your organization or coalition]

## RESOURCES

. . . . Here is a partial list of recommended resources

CTBT ACTION KIT - Available September 2, 1997 (order your copy now)

PSR Monitor "The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty -Debate Moves to the Senate"

CBO Report Congressional Budget Office report entitled "Preserving the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Under A Comprehensive Test Ban."

NAS Study "The Future of U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy,"  
National Academy of Sciences  
Website: <http://www.nas.edu/new>

NATO & A new e-mail group and conference.  
Nuclear Weapons For more information and to join the discussion,  
contact Karina Wood at Peace Action. <panukes@igc.apc.org>

START Moving! Activist Packet Latest news, tools and action ideas  
to Start Moving to a Nuclear Weapons- Free 21st Century

## WEBSITES:

<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/> The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers' site is an especially good resource for CTBT information

<http://www.greenpeaceusa.org/>  
Greenpeace (look for great photos)

<http://www.webcom.com/peaceact/>  
Peace Action

[http:// www.psr.org](http://www.psr.org)  
Physicians for Social Responsibility  
<http://clark.net/pub/gen/wand/>  
Women's Action for New Directions

For these resources and more information on related nuclear disarmament issues, please contact:

Kathy Crandall, Disarmament Clearinghouse Coordinator  
1101 14th Street NW #700, Washington DC 20005  
fax: 202 898 0172  
E-Mail <disarmament@igc.apc.org>  
202 898 0150 ext. 232

\*\*\*\*\*

Disarmament Clearinghouse Internet Conferences & E-mail Lists:

alt.activism.nuclear-test.news read only conference  
alt.activism.nuclear-test.news.d interactive conference

ctb-news receive materials posted to  
alt.activism.nuclear-test.news directly to your  
e-mail - contact <disarmament@igc.apc.org>

ctb-followers receive the latest news on disarmament issues directly to  
your e-mail - contactdisarmament@igc.apc.org>

## CALENDAR

August 1997

August 2 - Sep. 2 Congressional Summer Recess

August 6 Hiroshima Commemoration, CAN Subcriticals Day  
August 9 Nagasaki Commemoration

\*In August or in the fall subcritical experiment, "Holog" at the Nevada  
Test Site\*

September 1997

\*Expected: Clinton submits CTBT to Senate for ratification\*

Sept. 24 One Year Anniversary of The CTB Signing

\*\*\*\*\*

Use and distribution of the Disarmament Clearinghouse U P D A T E!  
materials is encouraged.

\*\*\*\*\*

contact: Kathy Crandall, Disarmament Clearinghouse Coordinator  
1101 14th Street #700, Washington DC 20005  
Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 Fax: 202 898 0172  
e-mail: disarmament@igc.apc.org

The Disarmament Clearinghouse is a project of : Greenpeace, Peace  
Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Plutonium Challenge, and

Women's Action for New Directions.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
CC: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, fme@agoranet.be  
Date: Wed, 30 Jul 1997 14:43:59  
From: int@fme.agoranet.be (For Mother Earth Int'l)  
Reply-To: int@fme.agoranet.be (For Mother Earth Int'l)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Update endorsements Citizen's Summons  
To: a-days@agoranet.be

Dear friends,

Please find attached a latest update with endorsements for the Citizens' Summons.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
This document and list might be useful in any media work for the  
upcoming action campaign.  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Groups and politicians continue to sent us their support for which we are very thankful. We couldn't do what we are doing with all the words of encouragement. New endorsers are welcomed.

In Peace,  
  
Pol D'Huyvetter

P.S. We also decided to add all groups who are planning NVDA on August 6th or 9th within the a-days campaign to the list of endorsers.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days 1997  
part of Abolition 2000 network

\*\*\*\*\*  
Endorsements Citizens' Summons (July 29 1997)  
\*\*\*\*\*

TO (HEAD OF STATE) REPRESENTING (STATE) AT THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANISATION (NATO) MEETING IN MADRID: 8 JULY 1997

A CITIZENS' SUMMONS  
TO NATO LEADERS TO COMPLY WITH INTERNATIONAL LAW  
ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Whereas on 8 July 1996 the International Court of Justice (ICJ), or World Court, drawing on international agreements such as The Hague Conventions, Geneva Conventions, and Genocide Convention, issued its Advisory Opinion on the legal status of the threat or use of nuclear weapons which concluded that:

- \* the threat or use of nuclear weapons is generally contrary to international humanitarian law;
- \* no circumstance had been identified in which the use of nuclear weapons would not violate humanitarian law;
- \* there is no distinction in law between threat and use of nuclear weapons; the limited use of low yield nuclear weapons would tend to escalate to all-out use of high yield nuclear weapons;
- \* the Nuremberg Charter of 1945 applies to nuclear weapons. Thus it is the duty of citizens to uphold the law relating to nuclear weapons and of military personnel to obey it even if given a contrary order by a superior or by his or her national government;
- \* there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion (our emphasis) negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control;

And whereas on 10 December 1996 the United Nations General Assembly, in response to the ICJ Advisory Opinion, called for negotiations in 1997 leading to the early conclusion of a Nuclear Weapons Convention; And whereas NATO is therefore acting illegally by:

- \* retaining the option to use nuclear weapons first in future conflicts;
- \* compounding its violation of international law by a stated intention to incorporate new member States into its nuclear alliance;
- \* issuing orders to its military personnel to prepare for the illegal use of nuclear weapons;
- \* making conditional plans to use, through its member nuclear weapon States, a stockpile of nuclear weapons which, because of their yield, would necessarily violate international humanitarian law;
- \* condoning the consistent opposition by its member nuclear weapon States of moves towards the global elimination of nuclear weapons.

We, as citizens of a planet under threat of irreparable damage from the illegal threat of nuclear weapons, and acting in accordance with our obligation under the Nuremberg Charter to uphold the law, hereby give you notice that unless you take immediate action to review NATO's illegal nuclear policy we shall use all non-violent means in our power to intervene against all preparations for nuclear war at all the places where they are carried out. This could include organising and taking part in non-violent direct action, or support of such. As NATO, after one year, has given no indication of

complying with the ICJ Advisory Opinion, such action will commence after the meeting of the NATO Heads of State in Madrid.

Endorsed by (July 29th 1997)

International organisations:

-----

For Mother Earth International (Belgium)  
International Association of Educators for World Peace (Tanzania)  
International Network of Engineers and Scientists for Global Responsibility (Germany)  
International Peace Bureau (Switzerland)  
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (Switzerland)

National organisations:

-----

Article Nine Hiroshima (Japan)  
Australian Anti-Bases Campaign Coalition (Australia)  
Belais 19 (France)  
Brandywine Peace Community (USA)  
Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (UK)  
Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament Cymru (Wales)  
the Ceasefire Campaign (South Africa)  
Center for Encounter and Active Non-violence (Austria)  
Center of Research and Action on Peace (Greece)  
Citizens Awareness Network (USA)  
Coalition for Peace Action (USA)  
Committee of 100 (Finland)  
Council Of Women to End the Nuclear Age (USA)  
Earth First! (the Netherlands)  
EUCOMmunity (Germany)  
Finnish Peace Committee (Finland)  
For Mother Earth France (France)  
For Mother Earth Romania (Romania)  
For Mother Earth USA (USA)  
Forum voor Vredesactie (Belgium)  
Gewaltfreie Action Atowaffen Abshaffen (Germany)  
Global Anti-Nuclear Alliance (The Netherlands)  
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment (USA)  
Golden Bay Peace Group (New Zealand)  
Groupe de Reserche et l'Action Non-Violente (France)  
Healing Global Wounds (USA)  
IANUS (Germany)  
Information for Peace (Norway)  
Israeli Council for Israeli - Palestinian Peace (Israel)  
Jeugdbond voor Natuurstudie en Milieubescherming (Belgium)  
Kawika Liu (Hawai'i USA)  
Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy (USA)  
LETS groep Antwerpen-stad (Belgium)  
Los Alamos Action Network (USA)  
Manitoba Peace Council (Canada)  
Mouvement Chrétien pour la Paix (Belgium)  
Nederlandse Kernstop Coalitie (the Netherlands)

Nevada Desert Experience (USA)  
Norwegian Alliance of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms (Norway)  
Norwegian Peace Alliance (Norway)  
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation (USA)  
Nuclear Guardianship Project (USA)  
the Nuclear Resister (USA)  
NZ Foundation for Peace Studies (New Zealand)  
Oxfam Wereldwinkel Gent-centrum (Belgium)  
Oxfam Wereldwinkel Hasselt (Belgium)  
Pacific Concerns Resource Centre (Fiji)  
PAIS (the Netherlands)  
Pax Christi Sydney Secretary (Australia)  
Paz Ahora (Spain)  
Peace Action (USA)  
Peace Farm (USA)  
Peace Movement Aotearoa (New Zealand)  
Peace Union of Finland (Finland)  
People for Nuclear Disarmament (Australia)  
People for an End of the Nuclear Cycle (USA)  
Ploughshares Ottawa (Canada)  
Plutonium Free Future (USA)  
Prague International Anti-Nuclear Office (Czech Republic)  
Project Peacemakers (Canada)  
Project Ploughshares (Canada)  
Quakers of New Zealand (New Zealand)  
Scottish CND (Scotland)  
Socialistische Arbeiders Partij (Belgium)  
Southampton CND (UK)  
Transnational Perspectives (Switzerland)  
Tribunaal voor de Vrede (the Netherlands)  
Union of Conscientious Objectors (Finland)  
Veterans Against Nuclear Arms (USA)  
War Resisters League (USA)  
Western States Legal Foundation (USA)  
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom -US Section (USA)  
WoMenwith Women's Peace Camp (UK)  
Youth CND (UK)

Politicians:

-----

AGALEV (Green Party, Belgium)  
Labour Action for Peace (UK)  
representing several Labour Party MP's and MEP's

Angeles Maestro (Izquierda Unida, Spain)  
Audrey Wise MP (Labour Party, UK)  
Bill Etherington MP (Labour Party, UK)  
Cecile Verwimp-Sillis (AGALEV, Belgium)  
Frans Lozie (AGALEV, Belgium)  
Hugo van Dieneren (AGALEV, Belgium)  
Joos Wauters (AGALEV, Belgium)  
Ken Livingstone MEP (Labour Party, UK)  
Patricia McKenna MEP (Green Party, Ireland)

Eric Grijp (ex-Senator AGALEV, Belgium)

end

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Thu, 31 Jul 1997 12:56:32 -0400  
From: disarmament@igc.org  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org  
Subject: NATO Hogwash  
To: ctb-followers@igc.org

NEW YORK TIMES  
July 31, 1997

FOREIGN AFFAIRS / By THOMAS L. FRIEDMAN

Clinton's Folly

Now that the Madrid NATO summit meeting is over, and Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic have been invited to join the alliance, the Clinton team is again peddling the notion that it's all O.K.: NATO can be expanded, Russia won't care, the costs will be minimal and anyone who opposes it is a Yalta-loving, umbrella-carrying, Munich-leaning isolationist.

Hogwash. NATO expansion is quietly eating away at what really matters: the U.S.-Russia strategic relationship. When you ask Clinton officials how NATO expansion will affect Russian implementation of the most far-reaching nuclear arms reduction treaty ever signed -- Start 2 -- they mumble that Boris tells them it will all be O.K., but they can't say for sure. They can say for sure that Poland has to be in NATO, because there are votes in that, but they can't say for sure how this will affect nuclear missiles pointed at us. What a way to run a railroad.

Well, someone who can tell you was in Washington last week: Aleksei Arbatov, deputy chairman of the Russian Parliament's Defense Committee. Mr. Arbatov is a democrat and a strong advocate of U.S.-Russian cooperation and arms control treaties, and here's what he had to say:

First, there remains "a widespread feeling of betrayal among Russian democrats" in the wake of Madrid, said Mr. Arbatov. The way in which NATO expansion was forced on Russia, after all the talk about cooperation, was "a shock for those trying to improve relations."

Second, after the Soviet Union collapsed the general consensus in the Russian foreign policy elite was that the major threats to Russian security would come from the south (the Muslim world) and eventually the East (China), said Mr. Arbatov. NATO expansion has shifted

Russian thinking to the view that there will also be a long-term threat from the West. "The consensus now is that, at best, the West will be neutral and may even be hostile. But for sure we will not be strategic partners. We will be rivals."

Third, Russia is now embarking on a major debate about how much to downsize its conventional armed forces, and "NATO expansion will figure into every discussion and paper written on the military reform question," said Mr. Arbatov. Hard-liners are already using it to embarrass advocates of sweeping reform. Moreover, even centrist Russian strategists now argue that with NATO expanding, and Russia's army shrinking, Russia will have to rely more heavily on nuclear deterrence and a doctrine of first use of nuclear weapons, said Mr. Arbatov. He said that even with a smaller defense budget he expected appropriations for Russian long-range nuclear weapons would grow by 100 to 150 percent over the next two years.

Fourth, in the wake of the NATO expansion there is "no chance whatsoever" that Russia's Parliament will ratify Start 2 by this fall, said Mr. Arbatov, a supporter of the treaty. If Start 2, which calls for the U.S. and Russia to slash their long-range nuclear weapons from 7,500 to 3,500 each, is not ratified before NATO expansion is ratified by the Western parliaments, the treaty will probably remain in limbo. "Yeltsin promised [the Americans] at Helsinki that he would move quickly on Start 2," said Mr. Arbatov, "and when he came back to Moscow he immediately 'forgot' about it."

What Mr. Arbatov is telling us is that we are already paying a price for NATO expansion: America's allies in Russia are already feeling less room to maneuver. And those U.S.-Russian strategic accords already signed, but not implemented, are even less likely to be. The only reason things are not worse is because the West has Boris Yeltsin. Mr. Yeltsin is a huge, unique, historic figure, who has singlehandedly suppressed and absorbed the simmering U.S.-Russian tensions over NATO. But we are living in a fool's paradise. Boris is sicker than people think. And when he goes, these tensions will come roaring to the surface.

I can understand the Poles or the anti-Russian cold warriors not worrying about this. But I can't understand those U.S. officials who value the U.S.-Russia relationship -- like Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott or Senators Joe Biden and Dick Lugar -- selling it out for NATO expansion. Oh, they say, it won't damage U.S.-Russian relations. Sure. Tell it to Aleksei Arbatov.

\*\*\*\*\*

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
1101 14th Street NW # 700 Washington, DC 20005  
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232  
FAX: 202 898 0172  
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>



all over the world. The Foundation inaugurated Sadako Peace Garden on the 50th anniversary in Santa Barbara, CA, and will be holding a commemorative event this year on August 6th. Sadako Sasaki was a young girl from Hiroshima who died of radiation induced leukemia as a result of the bombing. In her attempt to get well, she began folding paper (origami) cranes. Japanese legend holds that one's wish will be granted by folding 1000 of these cranes. Sadako died with 646 folded, and her classmates finished the task for her. The paper crane has become an international symbol of peace because of her story. <http://www.napf.org/Sadako97.html>

#### \*ARMS CONTROL CODE OF CONDUCT BILL PASSES IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Because more weapons have been sold by the U.S. to non-democratic and human-rights abusing nations than by all other nations combined, the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation believes that this Code is a much-needed guideline to prevent arms from being sold to repressive or aggressive nations. If passed, Congressional approval would be needed to sell weapons to dictators and human rights violators. President Clinton has stated his opposition to the Bill based on its infringement of executive privilege in foreign policy. On July 28, 1997, Britain banned arms sales to countries that might use them for internal repression. The United States, and other arms exporters, should follow suit and place human rights above the economic profit of the arms industry. The Bill is currently in Conference Committee. Please voice your support for the Bill by taking the actions recommended in the Foundation's July Action Alert.

[http://www.napf.org/Alert7\\_97.html](http://www.napf.org/Alert7_97.html)

<http://www.napf.org/senateletter.html>

#### \*UPDATE ON INTERNATIONAL WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL

One of the goals of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation is to establish a permanent International Criminal Court (ICC). The ICC will investigate and bring to justice individuals who commit the most serious international crimes, such as genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. In addition, its jurisdiction will not be limited by time or geographic area. Once established, the ICC will be able to indict and prosecute war criminals who have overseen genocidal reigns of terror such as occurred in Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge, in the former Yugoslavia, and in Rwanda. Between now and June 1998, a series of high-level meetings will take place to decide exactly what powers the Court should have. Unfortunately, some governments are doing their best to cripple the Court before it is even born. To uphold and ensure justice and peace worldwide, please see Action You Can Take to support the International Criminal Court.

<http://www.igc.apc.org/icc>

+-----  
DID YOU KNOW?

-----+

\*The bomb, Little Boy, dropped over Hiroshima delivered an explosive yield equal to 15,000 tons of dynamite. Today's MX "Peacekeeper" missile, carrying 10 warheads, can deliver an explosive yield equal to 3 million tons of dynamite or 300,000 tons per warhead. Each of the 10 warheads has 20 times the explosive power of Little Boy.

\*"57,000 Americans could have 2 years of college for one B-2 bomber."

--A quote from Congressman Walter Capps speaking on the opening night of

the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation's Annual Peace Retreat on July 6, 1997.

\*Nuclear fallout from tests conducted in the 1950's may have hit 48 states. The highest doses of radioactive fallout from the tests conducted in Nevada were received by milk-drinking children in the Farm Belt and the Northwest. The National Cancer Institute (NCI) began examining the effects of the fallout fourteen years ago, and found that 160 million residents between 1951 and 1958 were affected by the fallout. The NCI plans to release fallout maps and a summary of the 100,000 page report this September.

<http://www.napf.org/fallout.html>

<http://rex.nci.nih.gov/>

\*Each subcritical nuclear test costs approximately \$20 million. In July of 1997, a subcritical test was exploded at the Nevada Test Site, despite protests from 44 members of Congress. The Department of Energy plans to conduct another test in September. Many feel that these tests violate the spirit of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, despite the Government's claims that the tests are necessary for national security.

\*The U.S. spends \$265 billion on the military budget and only \$17 billion on all primary and secondary education for the nation's youth.

+-----  
HAVE YOU READ...?  
-----+

"Captain Cousteau's Legacy: Rising to our Full Stature as Human Beings"  
By David Krieger

This article is a tribute to the late Jacques Cousteau, a recipient of the Foundation's Distinguished Peace Leadership Award. Cousteau's eloquence and reverence for life should be an inspiration to us all. He said, "There are no boundaries in the real Planet Earth. No United States, no Soviet Union, no China, no Taiwan, East Germany or West-- Rivers flow unimpeded across the swaths of continents. The persistent tides-- the pulse of the sea-- do not discriminate; they push against all the varied shores on Earth."

<http://www.napf.org/cousteau.html>

"On the Arms Trade Code of Conduct"  
By Oscar Arias

In this speech by Oscar Arias, 1987 Nobel Peace Prize Laureate and former President of Costa Rica, a strong case is made that the international community can no longer ignore the repercussions of irresponsible arms transfers. Arias states that indiscriminate arms sales foster political instability and human rights violations, and weaken peaceful diplomatic efforts.

<http://www.napf.org/arias.html>

"Letter from Nobel Peace Laureates for the Children of the World"

In this letter to Heads of State of all member countries of the General Assembly of the United Nations, recipients of the Nobel Peace Prize appeal for non-violence and an end to human injustice. You can also sign the letter and return the form to demonstrate your support. This letter declares that the first decade of the new millennium should be the "Decade for a Culture of Non-Violence".  
<http://www.napf.org/nobel.html>

"To Be Human Against All Odds"  
By Frederick Franck

In this extraordinary book, Frederick Franck examines what it means to be human. Franck describes his encounters with three men who exemplify humanness in its truest form: a Protestant doctor (Albert Schweitzer), a Catholic Pope (John XXIII), and a Buddhist sage (D.T. Suzuki). Franck uses his personal journey and the wisdom of these three men to establish criteria for being human. Franck aided Albert Schweitzer for many years in his quest to alleviate human suffering in Africa. The book is illustrated with the author's sketches and photographs, and is a compassionate and thought-provoking book.  
<http://www.ic.nanzan-u.ac.jp/SHUBUNKEN/jhuman.html>

+-----  
ACTION YOU CAN TAKE

-----+  
\*From August 4th-15th, our government will attend meetings to determine the powers and workings of an International Criminal Court. Now is a crucial time to make your voice heard. Please write to President Clinton and one or more of your members of Congress. Ask them to take a stand at these meetings in support of a strong International Criminal Court. Contact the President <mailto:president@whitehouse.gov>

\*On Wednesday, August 6th, the 52nd anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima, there will be a rally and nonviolent direct action at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in Northern California. The rally will feature Dr. Theodore Taylor, a former nuclear weapons designer who now advocates the abolition of nuclear weapons. Contact Jackie Cabasso at the Western States Legal Foundation in Oakland for more information <mailto:wslf@igc.apc.org> or (510) 839-5877.

\* From August 8th-10th, Nevada Desert Experience will host its annual August Desert Witness in Las Vegas at the Nevada Test Site. Participants will meet to share information, plan strategies, and pray. Contact Nevada Desert Experience <mailto:nde@igc.apc.org> or (702) 646-4814.

+-----  
CALENDAR OF EVENTS

-----+  
August 6th.....Hiroshima Day  
August 9th.....Nagasaki Day  
September 16th.....International Day of Peace

+-----

## ON THE WEB

-----+  
Hiroshima and Nagasaki Page

[http://www.tcom.ohiou.edu/OU\\_Language/project/Hiroshima.html](http://www.tcom.ohiou.edu/OU_Language/project/Hiroshima.html)

Human Rights Watch

<http://www.hrw.org/home.html>

Greenpeace

<http://www.greenpeace.org/>

Friends for a Non-violent World

<http://www.mm.com/fnvw/>

## +----- NUCLEAR REFLECTION

-----+  
The Cold War has ended. Taking into consideration global terrorism, regional conflicts, and the loose control over nuclear materials in the former Soviet Union, do you believe nuclear weapons will be used again? Are you willing to take a stand to end the nuclear threat?

Please send any and all queries, comments, and information that you have regarding this newsletter, the Foundation, or nuclear disarmament issues to:

### NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123

Santa Barbara, California 93108

Tel: 805-965-3443 Fax: 805-568-0466

e mailto:[wagingpeace@napf.org](mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org)

Web Site: <http://www.napf.org>

Return-Path: <owner-newscope%ecunet.org@pcusa01.ecunet.org>  
To: newscope@ecunet.org (Newscope subscribers list)  
From: owner-newscope@ecunet.org (Newscope subscribers list)  
Reply-to: owner-newscope@ecunet.org (Newscope subscribers list)  
X-send-unsubscribe-to: newscope-request@ecunet.org  
X-Disclaimer: Views are those of the author, not necessarily Ecunet  
Subject: [newscope] note 337  
Date: Tue, 5 Aug 97 13:29:15 EDT

"NEWSCOPE" by NEWSCOPE OFFICE on July 21, 1993 at 21:36 Eastern, about  
SUBSCRIPTION-ONLY WEEKLY NEWS SOURCE (337 notes).

Note 337 by NEWSCOPE OFFICE on Aug. 5, 1997 at 10:56 Eastern (16720  
characters).

Newscope

A Newsletter for United Methodist Leaders

Vol. 25, No. 32/August 8, 1997

Is the UMC a Confessional Church?

That question is debated by two UM leaders in Perspective, a summer newsletter  
of Perkins School of Theology in Dallas.

Noting the difference between theology and doctrine, Leicester Longden, pastor  
of Trinity UMC in Lansing Mich., admits that UMs are not required to subscribe  
to a specific doctrine such as the Presbyterian Westminster Confession.  
However, Longden, who served as chair of the Theological Commission of the  
Confessing Movement, notes that "at every level of our community we can point  
to doctrinal accountability in some form or another." 20He observes that the  
baptismal liturgy calls people to confess Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior.  
There are also Articles of Religion, membership vows, and disciplinary  
requirements to maintain the doctrines of the UMC. "Clearly," says Longden,  
"UMs have to face the fact that we have our own way of being a confessional  
church and to persist in calling ourselves non confessional simply adds to the  
confusion between church doctrine and individual theological opinions."  
20Longden concludes that the crisis in the UMC is a doctrinal or confessional  
crisis and conservatives and liberals must both immerse themselves in the  
doctrine of the church.

John Swomley, professor emeritus of Christian ethics at Saint Paul School of  
Theology in Kansas City, disagrees. He believes charges that there is a  
confessional crisis in the UMC are flawed and misleading. "Never in the  
Wesleyan tradition is the identity of Methodists defined by right doctrine; it  
is defined by right living. The test of authentic faith for Wesley is the  
practice of holiness of heart and life that is manifested in love of God and  
neighbor." The professor says the Wesley quadrilateral (Scripture, reason,  
tradition, and experience) is the theological guide for UMs, not "selected

portions of Scripture and ancient creeds." 20He notes that the Bible contains more than 800 passages defending slavery, and the Apostles' Creed omits Jesus' Baptism, his teaching, or the purpose of his life and death. Swomley charges that people who recite creeds or believe they are saved by their beliefs concentrate only on the sins of sex or drunkenness and ignore the larger sins of militarism, imperialism, war, racism, and forced unemployment.

### Americans Taking Harder Line on Justice Issues

Americans are taking a harder line on some social issues, especially those pertaining to matters of life and death. For example, in recent surveys by the Gallup organization, 79% said they were in favor of the death penalty for murder and 80% favored life sentences for drug dealers. Twenty years ago, only 66% said they favored the death penalty.

On the other hand, 68% said they endorsed doctor-assisted suicide to end a patient's life by some painless means if the patient and his or her family request it. This was up slightly from 65% in 1990.

A majority (57%) supports a ban on late-term procedures known as "partial-birth" abortions. However, 56% oppose sweeping bans that would disallow all abortions except those intended to save the mother's life. In a 1984 poll just 50% opposed the sweeping ban.

Welfare continues to remain unpopular, with 71% supporting a two-year cutoff in cases where the recipient has failed to find work in the period. 20That figure is up from 63% in 1990. A slim majority of Americans, however, (53%) oppose sweeping overall cuts in social spending for health, education, and welfare.

Some 73% of Americans favor a constitutional amendment to allow prayer in the public schools.

Less than one person in three (28%) approves of legalized gay marriages.

These results are based on telephone interviews with a randomly selected national sample of 1,001 adults, ages 18 and older. -- Princeton Religion Research Center

### Reconciling Congregations Convocation Plans New Regional Focus

A new regional strategy emerged from the fifth national convocation of Reconciling Congregations July 24-27 in Atlanta.

Executive director Mark Bowman pointed out that the program, which now encompasses 127 congregations, 18 campus ministries, six annual conferences, and various other groups -- has grown far beyond the capabilities of its small national staff. Last year's "Open the Doors" campaign, for example, enrolled 12,000 individuals as Reconciling UMs. "To continue the movement, we really have to develop and empower local leadership," he explained. Eight leadership

training events also will be offered in the coming year.

But the 500 participants in the Atlanta event focused primarily on worship and Bible study. "The message that was heard again and again and again is that everyone is welcome at God's Table," Bowman said.

A Saturday night banquet honored the 15 bishops who spoke out on the inclusion of homosexuals in the church during the 1996 UM General Conference. Retired bishops C. Dale White and Melvin Wheatley Jr. attended and several others sent greetings. -- UM News Service

## UM Colleges and Universities in The News

Dakota Wesleyan University has established a Bishop Rueben Job Center for Leadership Development. Partially funded by the Dakotas Conference, the center will provide both on- and off-site leadership training for clergy and laity. An advisory board is now being formed.

Philander-Smith College has received national accreditation from the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs for its new business degree program.

Duke University recently became the sixth university in the nation to raise more than \$200 million in a single year. Some 76,000 donors gave a record \$219 million in the fiscal year ending June 30. The Duke Endowment gave the largest single-source total of \$28.9 million.

Nebraska Wesleyan University raised \$615,000 for its "Great Teaching Program," up more than \$16,000 from the last fiscal year. The fund-raising program is part of the UM school's effort to raise \$40 million.

Virginia Wesleyan College received a \$750,000 challenge grant from the Kresge Foundation for a new \$3 million academic building. It will be awarded if all other funds are secured in a \$25 million effort. Nearly \$18 million has been raised to date.

Georgia Wesleyan College received \$6 million from an anonymous donor. The gift honors Song Mayling (Madam Chiang Kai-shek). This is the largest gift in the school's history.

Each summer since 1989, Dillard University, New Orleans, brings ninth grade students from the all-male Kwansai Gakuin Junior High School in Nishinomiya, Japan, to the campus for three weeks of English classes and Black history study.

## Short Takes

Will your Cokesbury order for books or curriculum materials be delayed because

of the UPS strike? "Yes," said Larry Wallace, vice president of finance and administrative services of the UM Publishing House. The distribution center, which averages 3,000 shipments a day, has explored and will continue to consider all delivery options throughout the strike. However, all carriers are affected, and the Post Office will not be able to handle the overflow.

The Harper (Kans.) UMC and Orkin Exterminating Company reached an mid-July out-of-court agreement to "put the church back to where it was before the pesticide spill," said Lee Louderback, former pastor. The dollar amount of the settlement cannot be released, but it covers all stripping of the building, cleaning, laying new floor and carpet, painting, polishing, and replacing duct work, furnaces and ceiling and floor tiles, testing, and consultant and attorneys' fees." Clean-up also means replacing hymnals, library materials, music, carpet, upholstery of pews, banners, and paraments. Temporary teenage workers drilling holes to apply a termite pesticide containing chlorophyrifos accidentally drilled into heating and air conditioning ducts. The oil-based pesticide was then carried throughout the building. The church was closed last December. Within an hour of learning of the problem, Cokesbury provided free Sunday School curriculum, certificates, record books, Bibles, hymnals, and other materials. -- Kathy Kruger Noble

Eight conferences paid 100% or more of their 1996 apportionments to all eight general funds: Central Pennsylvania, Iowa, Oklahoma Indian Missionary, Peninsula-Delaware, Red Bird Missionary, South Indiana, West Michigan, and Wisconsin. Five additional conferences paid 100% of their World Service askings: Detroit, Eastern Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Rio Grande, and Troy.

Ted Hepner, a retired Army chaplain and director of endorsement for UM chaplains, celebrated the dedication of the first building designed exclusively for training Army chaplains. 20The General Board of Higher Education and Ministry staffer called the July 23 dedication of Watters Hall at Fort Jackson, Columbia, S.C., a "remarkable and historic event." He said for the first time in almost eight decades, the Army chaplain center and school "has a permanent place to call home." The \$8 million hall honors Charlie Watters, a Catholic chaplain and Medal of Honor winner who was killed in Vietnam. -- UM News Service

The Society of St. Andrew, a grassroots hunger action and education ministry headed by two UM clergy, has extended its program into Mississippi. In July, the program salvaged nearly 45,000 pounds of produce. The Big Island, Va.-based society also has staff in Florida, North Carolina, and Texas. Bishop Marshall (Jack) L. Meadors Jr. (Jackson) was among the volunteers at the state fairgrounds in Jackson who distributed 40,000 pounds of potatoes to numerous agencies and hunger programs. Diane Stanton-Rich, the new director who opened the new location July 1, said Mississippi has the highest rate of children in poverty and the second highest overall poverty rate. -- UM News

## Service

The United Church of Christ's General Synod voted July 5 to declare "full communion" with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. 20The "Formula of Agreement" had previously been approved by the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) and the Reformed Church in America. The three approving churches are already in full communion with each other. Only the Lutherans, who meet Aug. 14-20 in Philadelphia, are still to vote on the proposal.

Some 167 youth and adults participated in a July 23-28 leadership-training event in Birmingham, Ala. The event was sponsored by the Southeastern Jurisdiction Youth Council of Black Methodists for Church Renewal. Members participated in workshops on AIDS, youth crime and addiction issues, education, and economic empowerment. Joseph E. Lowery, retiring president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, told the group, "God will judge our nation, not by how we relate to leaders and barons, but by how we relate to the least of these." -- Ron Council

North Central Jurisdiction Urban Network and Town and Country Association will sponsor a Jan. 6-8, 1998 training event on "Training of the Child -- Teaching the Faith" at Southfield Hope (Michigan) UMC. Speakers will include Bishop Donald Ott (Michigan) and Pamela Couture, professor of Candler School of Theology. For information, call Charles Boayue Jr. (248-559-7000 ext. 61). To register, call Karen Shepler (614-228-1010).

The board of trustees of financially troubled Sue Bennett College, established a \$2 million campaign July 29 to help the institution maintain its accreditation in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. On June 25, the association recommended that the school be removed from its approved list, citing ongoing financial and administrative problems (see Newscope, July 18). Since then, the president resigned, an interim president was named, the school entered an appeal process and the trustees, established a "Save The College Fund." A project of the General Board of Global Ministries, the school is asking the agency for \$500,000 and permission to use school property as collateral for future financing. The land and buildings are owned by the Women's Division, which allows the school to use the property at no cost. -- UM News Service

"Various surveys suggest that as many as 30% of male Protestant ministers have had sexual relationships with women other than their wives," according to Newsweek (July 28). The weekly news magazine further alleges that "the divorce rate for Protestant clergy has risen to match the general population's." The article quotes a 1993 study by the Journal of Pastoral Care which found 70% of surveyed clergy said they had counseled at least one

women who had had intercourse with another minister. A 1988 survey by Leadership found 12% of clergy admitted to sexual intercourse outside marriage.

Volunteers from a 27-member North Texas Conference church feed 465 families every week. Bob Barrett, director of the food program based at the UMC in Josephine, Texas, says that every Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday, trucks from Dallas-area grocery stores deliver perishable food to the church. Wednesday deliveries are distributed by two congregations in Farmersville; Friday food is delivered to an Hispanic church in Greenville. On Saturdays, packages are delivered to 36 homes, the rest of the food is spread throughout the church and families are invited to pick up the food they need. -- Bob Robertson

### Positions Available

Five positions with the General Board of Global Ministries: Executive secretary for treasury relations, programmer analyst, research associate, assistant general secretary for mission volunteers, and business manager of the Mission Resource Center in Atlanta. Contact GBGM, Rm. 300, 475 Riverside Dr., New York, NY 10115.....Dean of Wesley Theological Seminary. Contact President Douglass Lewis, WTS, 4500 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20016.....Part-time director of youth ministries. Contact Douglas Brown, Bonner Springs UMC, 425 West Morse Ave., Bonner Springs, KS 66012 (913-422-5349). .... Three music positions. Contact Jim Hays, First UMC, 325 E. Franklin St., Appleton, WI 54911 (920-734-2677).....Youth and young adult director. Contact Kris Hansen, Morristown UMC, 50 Park Place, Morristown, NJ 07960 (973-538-2132).....Director of youth and children's ministries. Contact Terry L. Greer, Central UMC, 303 S. 11th St., Gadsden, AL 35901 (205-547-1654).

### Personalia

Warren Jenkins, 82, former teacher and chaplain at Claflin College, Orangeburg, S.C., and former staff member of UM Communications, died June 16 in Orangeburg.....Argentine Methodist Bishop Federico J. Pagura has been awarded the National Council of Churches' second annual human rights award "for his untiring efforts in defense of human rights.".... Cnaan Banana, the former president of Zimbabwe and a prominent Methodist theologian, has been indicted by a Zimbabwe regional court on 11 charges of sodomy and homosexual abuse. Banana has denied all allegations.... Joseph E. Lowery, retiring president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, has agreed to remain in his post a few more months while members find a successor....F. Thomas Trotter, former dean and professor at Claremont School of Theology (1959-73), will be honored by the UM seminary with a scholarship fund in his name.....Woody Woodrick, a 17-year veteran in newspaper publishing, has been named editor of the Mississippi UM Advocate, succeeding his uncle, Rayford Woodrick, who has retired..... Bishop Arthur Kulah (Liberia) was an observer of the July 24 elections in that African nation. Following the election of

Charles Taylor with 75% of the vote, Kulah agreed with others that the elections were free and fair.....Ann E. Geer, a clergymember of New England Conference and chair of the board of the National Coalition Against Gambling Expansion, was one of five persons testifying July 28 on Internet gambling before a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee..... Joseph F. Marsh, Jr., president emeritus of Concord College, presented a carillon to the college in honor of his parents. Twenty-three of the 48 bells of the carillon carry various inscriptions. The third largest bell is dedicated to Marsh's congregation, Concord UMC in Athens, Va.

Permission is granted to electronically download this newsletter. UM publications may also quote Newscope with credit without special permission. Any other electronic or mechanical reproduction and/or distribution of the entire newsletter requires prior permission from the UM Publishing House; Rights and Permissions Office, 201 Eighth Ave. South; Nashville, TN 27202. Rich Peck, Editor (615-749-6007).

~~~~~

This note sent to subscribers of the newscope list.  
To unsubscribe DO NOT REPLY TO THIS NOTE! Instead,  
create a new note to [newscope-request@ecunet.org](mailto:newscope-request@ecunet.org)  
containing just the word

unsubscribe

If you have trouble with the automated routine there, please send copies of error messages and other notes to [owner-newscope@ecunet.org](mailto:owner-newscope@ecunet.org) and a real person will assist. Here are links if your mailer supports that sort of thing.

unsubscribe notices: <mailto:newscope-request@ecunet.org>

human intervention: <mailto:owner-newscope@ecunet.org>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: INESnet@fy.chalmers.se  
Date: Tue, 05 Aug 1997 14:49:35 -0700  
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Abolition 2000 International Petition  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igcb.igc.org id PAA29590  
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

Dear Abolitionists:

Thanks to all of you who sent comments for improving the draft petition. The finalized version is provided below and sample hard copies are available from the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation. Many of us are launching the petition at August 6th events. Let's make this the start of gathering millions of signatures in all parts of the world. We have just two and a half years to enter the new century with the new commitment we are seeking: missiles to sunflowers.

David Krieger

**ABOLITION 2000 INTERNATIONAL PETITION  
MISSILES TO SUNFLOWERS  
A New Commitment for a New Century**

We call upon all states, and particularly the nuclear weapons states, to make the following commitment for a new century:

1. **END THE NUCLEAR THREAT.** End the nuclear threat by withdrawing all nuclear weapons from foreign soil and international waters, separating warheads from delivery vehicles, committing to unconditional no first use of nuclear weapons, and ceasing all nuclear weapons tests, including laboratory tests and "subcriticals."
2. **SIGN THE TREATY.** Sign a Nuclear Weapons Convention by the year 2000, agreeing to prohibit and eliminate all nuclear weapons within a timebound framework.
3. **REALLOCATE RESOURCES.** Reallocate resources to ensure a sustainable global future and to redress the environmental devastation and human suffering caused by nuclear weapons production and testing, which have been disproportionately borne by the world's indigenous peoples.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Email\*: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Email\*: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Email\*: \_\_\_\_\_

Address:

Name:

Email\*:

Address:

Name:

Email\*:

Address:

The results of this petition will be delivered to the United Nations General Assembly, the United Nations Conference on Disarmament, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conferences, the Human Rights Commission, and the governments of nuclear weapons states and nuclear threshold states, and announced on other suitable occasions.

\*By providing your email address, you will receive periodic updates on Abolition 2000.

Please return Abolition 2000 International Petitions to:

Abolition 2000

c/o Nuclear Age Peace Foundation

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123 ¥ Santa Barbara, CA 93108 ¥ Tel: (805)

965-3443 ¥ Fax: (805) 568-0466

e-mail: [wagingpeace@napf.org](mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org)

**NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION**

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123

Santa Barbara, CA 93108

Tel: 805 965 3443

Fax: 805 568 0466

e mailto:[wagingpeace@napf.org](mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org)

Web Site: <http://www.napf.org>

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Thu, 07 Aug 1997 14:45:06 -0400  
From: disarmament@igc.org  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Hiroshima  
To: ctb-followers@igc.org

The Mayor of Hiroshima uses the anniversary of the atomic bombing to criticize the U.S. ongoing nuclear weapons testing program

#### HIROSHIMA MARKS 52ND ANNIVERSARY

97-08-06 03:56:42

.c The Associated Press

by Kozo Mizoguchi

HIROSHIMA, Japan (AP) - With vows for peace and a moment of silent prayer, the people of Hiroshima today marked the anniversary of the atomic bomb attack that devastated their city on a clear summer morning 52 years ago.

About 45,000 people gathered in Peace Park, built at what was the epicenter of the blast, for a memorial ceremony at 8:15 a.m. - the precise moment the bomb exploded on Aug. 6, 1945.

As a bronze bell tolled nearby, the crowd observed a moment of silence to commemorate the victims of the world's first atomic attack.

About 140,000 people were killed by the blast and the firestorm and radiation that ensued in this western Japanese city, which was a major military center during World War II.

"We in Hiroshima are outraged that nuclear weapons have yet to be abolished and banished from the face of the earth, and we are very uneasy about the future of civilization," Hiroshima Mayor Takashi Hiraoka said in a speech.

Hiraoka criticized the United States for conducting a series of tests related to nuclear weapons that began in early July in Nevada.

"On the one hand, the U.S. promises to reduce its stockpiles of nuclear weapons, and on the other hand it obstinately maintains its nuclear testing program," Hiraoka said. "This attitude is utterly devoid of the wisdom needed if all peoples are to coexist."

The United States maintains the tests do not violate the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban because they do not produce a self-sustaining nuclear reaction.

Offering his "respects from the heart" to the victims, Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto vowed to work toward abolishing nuclear arms and "realizing a world without war."

Hashimoto said Japan was the first country to ratify the U.N. treaty banning nuclear test explosions.

Adopted in September 1996, the treaty must be formally ratified by 44 nations before it can officially replace the current informal moratorium.

Three days after Hiroshima, the United States dropped a second atom bomb on Nagasaki in Japan's southern main island of Kyushu, killing 70,000 people. Japan surrendered unconditionally on Aug. 15, 1945.

Many Japanese believe the atom bombings were unjustified, despite

Japan's war of aggression. U.S. wartime leaders defended the bombings as bringing a quick end to the war the only alternative to a bloody invasion of Japan.

Survivors and families of victims were to offer flowers and water today before an altar in the park. Hiroshima is now a city of 1.1 million people.

| The Seattle Times

Tuesday, Aug. 5, 1997

Trident sub to face protests at Seafair

by Sean Cavanagh  
Seattle Times staff reporter

A Trident nuclear submarine that will cruise into Elliott Bay tomorrow afternoon can expect to meet resistance from land and water.

The protests of numerous religious and nonviolence activists aren't likely to impede the USS Ohio, however, as the Navy vessel sails to the piers near Myrtle Edwards Park for this year's Seafair festival.

The protesters, who plan to greet the sub's arrival at Pier 91 with banners, speeches and vigils, say the vessel's military, wartime purpose clashes with the festival's family-oriented, celebratory atmosphere.

"We just want to show that this warship, which has the ability to incinerate a large number of people, should not be shown as a form of family entertainment," said Geov Parrish, coordinator of the

Nonviolent Action Community of Cascadia, one of the groups that helped organize the protest.

"Whether or not you're pro-nuclear weapons or against them, it's just not appropriate."

The protesters include members of Greenpeace, the Ground Zero Center for Nonviolent Action, and 25 to 30 other organizations. They also object to the nuclear submarine appearing on Aug. 6, the anniversary of the United States dropping the atomic bomb on Hiroshima. The protesters have planned a ceremony for tomorrow evening at Green Lake, commemorating the estimated 140,000 people who died in the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Parrish said demonstrators would be at the pier when the sub, which is based in Bangor, arrives about 1 p.m., and that some protesters from different organizations probably would remain until the sub departs Monday.

Parrish said protesters discussed the possibility of having boats bearing signs in the water at a meeting yesterday with officials from

Seafair and Seattle Mayor Norm Rice's office.

William Cate, president emeritus of the Church Council of Greater Seattle, which represents 20 Seattle-area religious denominations, protested the Trident's presence at its base in Bangor 15 years ago.

"We want to protest the arms race now as much as we did then. "It's a terribly devastating instrument of war," Cate said. "There's just a lot of feeling that we just don't need it here."

The USS Ohio submarine was commissioned in 1981. At the time, then-Vice President George Bush called the vessel a "new dimension in our nation's strategic deterrence." The sub can carry up to 24 nuclear missiles, is 560 feet long and weighs more than 18,000 tons when submerged, said Lt. Commander Becky Brenton, spokeswoman for Trident's submarine group in Bangor.

Brenton said the vessel has docked in Everett on numerous occasions, but she did not know if it had appeared in Elliott Bay before. In accordance with policy, she could neither confirm nor deny that nuclear weapons were on board the vessel.

Navy officials said the protesters have misunderstood the purpose of the Trident's visit. Fred Kuebler, a Navy spokesman, said the military was sending the vessel to Seafair to honor the sub's current and past crews, and to provide another facet to Seafair's maritime festival.

"We're not celebrating the submarine or what it stands for," Kuebler said. Instead, he said the Trident's presence will pay tribute to "the people who spend a lot of time at sea away from their homes and families. It's a chance for people in Seattle to offer (these people) a pat on the back."

Kuebler said it was unfair to blame the Navy for the Trident's arrival coinciding with the anniversary of Hiroshima because Seafair officials had arranged the time of the submarine's visit.

1997 The Seattle Times

Thursday, Aug. 7, 1997

Lanterns set memory of nuclear attacks afloat

by Dee Norton  
Seattle Times staff reporter

As hundreds readied for their part in last night's lantern-floating ceremony at Green Lake in Seattle, Martin Fleck gazed out at the mirrored waters.

"The world took a bad turn that day, and we want to steer it back to less violence," he said, referring to the day 52 years ago yesterday when an atomic bomb was dropped on the Japanese city of Hiroshima, ending an estimated 70,000 lives.

"We want to celebrate life on this day," said Fleck, a spokesman for the Physicians for Social Responsibility.

Moments later, hundreds of tiny silk-paper and plywood floating lanterns drifted on the lake, each bearing messages of peace and hope.

Calligraphers from Seattle's Beikoku Shodo Kenkyuka organization scribed prayers and names of loved ones on some.

One of the calligraphers, Midori Thiel, a third-generation U.S. citizen of Japanese ancestry, planned her own prayer to honor her parents and a cousin she never met.

"The family had moved from Hiroshima to Yawata," a 90-minute train ride away. "Kono, my cousin, went to Hiroshima City Hall on business that day and didn't come home. His younger brother, Kunio, went into town for him and found out nothing was there," she said.

"Everyone at that site was just evaporated. My family was very closely affected by the blast."

The atomic bomb that was dropped on Hiroshima and a second bomb dropped three days later on Nagasaki helped bring about the end of the war with Japan. It also heralded the beginning of the atomic age.

The keynote speaker for last night's From Hiroshima to Hope ceremony, Dave Hall, president of the National Physicians for Social Responsibility, said, "This is an international day of memory. The challenge before us today is to learn how to get along."

Referring to yesterday's arrival of the nuclear-powered Trident submarine USS Ohio in Elliott Bay for the Seattle Seafair celebration, Hall said, "There are 900 Hiroshimas tied up at Pier 91," issuing is estimate of the Ohio's nuclear arsenal.

The submarine's arrival was protested by Greenpeace, Physicians for Social Responsibility and other anti-war groups, but without incident, according to Lt. Cmdr. Becky Brenton.

Protesters aboard numerous boats, rafts and kayaks met the Ohio as it slid into the bay and tied to the pier.

The demonstrators were present to condemn the boat's nuclear-missile-launching ability. They were particularly incensed by the submarine's arrival on the 52nd anniversary of the nuclear bomb being dropped on Hiroshima in World War II. Navy officials said the date was coincidental.

\*\*\*\*\*

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005

TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232

FAX: 202 898 0172

<disarmament@igc.apc.org>



To: "Phillip H. Miller" <72124.3602@compuserve.com>  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Payment request  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Phil:

I worked four days in July on nuclear abolition activities. Therefore, I request a payment of \$800 from the Rubin grant.

I am still holding the bill for Ben Trammel's plane ticket to our board meeting in an amount of \$786.00. Since we receive partial support from the National Youth Ministry Organization, which I believe you put in the General Fund, could you provide a partial reimbursement, such as \$300 or \$386 from that fund? I'll catch up with the remainder some other time.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Date: Tue, 12 Aug 1997 11:04:01 -0400

From: ike <ike@swva.net>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Russia nuclear weapon risk

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

X-URL: [http://guide-p.infoseek.com/Content?arn=a1383LBY686reulb-](http://guide-p.infoseek.com/Content?arn=a1383LBY686reulb-19970811&qt=%22nuclear+weapon%22+nuclear+nuke+&lk=noframes&col=NW&nh=25&kt=A&ak=allnews)

[19970811&qt=%22nuclear+weapon%22+nuclear+nuke+&lk=noframes&col=NW&nh=25&kt=A&ak=allnews](http://guide-p.infoseek.com/Content?arn=a1383LBY686reulb-19970811&qt=%22nuclear+weapon%22+nuclear+nuke+&lk=noframes&col=NW&nh=25&kt=A&ak=allnews)

REUTERS: Russia nuclear weapon risk seen great - report

02:09 p.m Aug 11, 1997 Eastern

By Clifford Coonan

FRANKFURT, Aug 11 (Reuter) - The Cold War may be over but there is a danger that Russia's ageing nuclear weapons could be fired by accident, says a German study made available to Reuters on Monday.

The study by Germany's Peace and Conflict Research Foundation said serious problems with early warning systems in Russia have led to the practice of keeping nuclear weapons in a permanent state of alert becoming increasingly common there.

This means they could be launched at the first signs of a real or imagined attack, according to the study.

``Nuclear weapons in emergency mode can be launched very quickly. This leads to the danger of unintentional launches through technical errors or false alarms," it said.

``Poor security standards could lead to an unauthorised start," the study said.

Since the break-up of the former Soviet Union into 16 states, much of Russia's early warning network is no longer situated on Russian territory but in former Soviet republics.

Some satellites in early warning systems are too old to be used, while power cuts affect satellites and early warning stations in use.

Nuclear weapons in other countries are often kept in alert mode but the problem is particularly acute in Russia, it said.

``There is unsettling news here, which implies an acute danger for German and European security," said the Frankfurt-based foundation, which advocates nuclear disarmament.

Russia and the United States have cut the number of stationary strategic nuclear warheads by almost 50 percent since 1990.

Only two of Russia's nuclear submarines are still on patrol, while the rest of the fleet are sitting in harbours. These and Russia's land-based nuclear warheads are in constant alert mode because being stationary

they can easily be targeted.

The study proposed "de-alerting" as a possible solution.

This involves leaving many of a warhead's navigational systems and detonating systems unprimed, which delays the time it takes to get the warhead into launch mode.

"Countries with nuclear weapons will only be ready to radically cut back on their arsenals, or do away with them altogether, if secret nuclear weapons' programmes can be identified securely and early enough," the study said.

"Creating a world free of nuclear weapons makes sense, because it is more secure than a world in which nuclear weapons exist," the study concluded. ^REUTER@

the above can be found at

[http://guide-p.infoseek.com/Titles?](http://guide-p.infoseek.com/Titles?qt=%22nuclear+weapon%22+nuclear+nuke+&col=NW%2Crf_i500sRD%2Ckt_N%2Cak_allnews&sv=IS&lk=noframes&nh=25)

[qt=%22nuclear+weapon%22+nuclear+nuke+&col=NW%2Crf\\_i500sRD%2Ckt\\_N%2Cak\\_allnews&sv=IS&lk=noframes&nh=25](http://guide-p.infoseek.com/Titles?qt=%22nuclear+weapon%22+nuclear+nuke+&col=NW%2Crf_i500sRD%2Ckt_N%2Cak_allnews&sv=IS&lk=noframes&nh=25)

- Ike Jeanes



>speed. We specifically argued that, let no one fool you, there is not a  
>technological barrier to doing this. The technology is there, the money is  
>there.

>  
>"The political will is what is required. The cost involved....of  
>dismantling nuclear weapons and seeing their safe dispatch is in our  
>estimation vastly less than the cost to maintain them today, and the  
>bombers, and the missile systems...."

>  
>A quote from Australia's United Nations Ambassador, Richard Butler,  
>Chairman of the Canberra Commission, an independent international  
>commission of 17 experts to propose practical steps toward a  
>nuclear-weapons-free world.

>  
>A challenge to you, Mr. President, is to accomplish this during your last  
>term of office. The key state to take the initiative is the USA.

>  
>Sincerely yours,  
>[Your name, post address & country]

>=====

>  
>Since the Prime Minister of Israel also has Email, please send the following:

>  
>=====

> To: [likud1@likud.org.il](mailto:likud1@likud.org.il)  
>Subject: Technology is here to disable all nuclear weapons by 2000

>  
>Dear Prime Minister Benyamin Netanyahu,

>  
>"We called....for the five nuclear weapon states to make a commitment to  
>eliminate nuclear weapons [with] the need for this to be done with all due  
>speed. We specifically argued that, let no one fool you, there is not a  
>technological barrier to doing this. The technology is there, the money is  
>there.

>  
>"The political will is what is required. The cost involved....of  
>dismantling nuclear weapons and seeing their safe dispatch is in our  
>estimation vastly less than the cost to maintain them today, and the  
>bombers, and the missile systems...."

>  
>A quote from Australia's United Nations Ambassador, Richard Butler,  
>Chairman of the Canberra Commission, an independent international  
>commission of 17 experts to propose practical steps toward a  
>nuclear-weapons-free world.

>  
>A challenge to you, Mr. Prime Minister, is to accomplish this in Israel  
>during your term of office.

>  
>Sincerely yours,  
>[Your name, post address & country]

>=====

>  
>Many people think there are technological problems with disabling nuclear  
>weapons quickly. Do not believe it. Nuclear physicists have assured us

>that all nuclear weapons in the world can be disabled in a year.

>

>Sincerely,

>

>Sue & Marvin Clark

>Co-directors

>Global Demilitarization

>42 Maple Ave.

>Troy, NY, 12180 USA

>phone: +1-518-274-0784

>Email: [glodem@wizvax.net](mailto:glodem@wizvax.net)

>Web Site: <http://www.rpi.edu/~clarkg2/nwfw2000/>

>

>Administrative Board Members

>

>Oscar Arias, Nobel Peace Laureate, honorary member

>Mary Evelyn Jegen, SND, Pax Christi International

>Dietrich Fischer, Author, Professor, Pace University

>Bill Price, Director, World Peacemakers

>Bill Hartung, Author

>Organizations are for identification only

>

>

>

>

>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 18 Aug 1997 08:00:48 -0500  
From: john klotz <jklotz@walrus.com>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: NY TIMES: Atom bomb designs  
To: jklotz@ibm.net  
X-Sender: jklotz@walrus.com

>From the pages of today's New York Times

## NEW YORK TIMES

August 18, 1997, p. 1

### U.S. Plan Shows New Work on Designs for Nuclear Arms

By WILLIAM J. BROAD

Although the Cold War ended years ago, the United States is hard at work on new or modified designs for nuclear arms, a formerly secret federal document reveals.

Critics say the document shows that the nation is undermining a treaty that is intended to halt innovations in making weapons of mass destruction. Government officials strongly disagree and insist that the work complies with the international accord.

The Energy Department document is one of the nation's official plans for work on nuclear arms, which involves 25,000 people in a highly secretive industry.

"The laboratories are currently working on programs to provide new or modified designs," the document says, adding that the work "will exercise a broad range of design skills." The document says the work on some types of warheads includes steps toward redesigning the heart of the hydrogen bomb, its atomic trigger.

A declassified copy of the document was obtained by the Natural Resources Defense Council, a private group in Washington that advocates arms control and monitors arms work internationally. The council gave a copy of the document to The New York Times.

The document was declassified in June and obtained in July after the council sued the Energy Department, which maintains the nation's nuclear arsenal for the military. The council plans to make the document public on Tuesday, along with an analytical report, "End Run," that accuses the government of bad faith in its weapons work.

In interviews, officials of the Energy Department denied that the agency was making new weapons and insisted that it was only modernizing old designs, despite the language of the declassified document.

The goals of the work, they said, included increasing the warheads' life, safety and security, and allowing new kinds of weapon emplacements -- but no increases in explosive power.

But the council disagrees and says the work in some cases is meant to increase the power and precision of the weapons and to strengthen them for jobs like penetrating deep into the earth to knock out enemy bunkers.

The dispute centers on the nation's adherence to the intent of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, for decades sought by arms controllers. Its goal is to halt the development of new weapons of mass destruction by imposing a global ban on nuclear detonations.

President Clinton signed the accord in 1996, and the United Nations endorsed it. The treaty has been signed by 146 nations, including Russia, China and the other declared nuclear powers. But the Senate has yet to ratify it.

In seeking support for the treaty last year, Clinton administration officials stressed that the ban would rule out all new weapons and, in effect, be a technological barrier that would end the nuclear arms race.

Yet the government's secret plan says that even with no explosive tests, an army of high-technology machines and personnel is quietly working to upgrade and replace a wide range of thermonuclear arms.

The work focuses on the B-61, a bomb for planes; the W-87, a warhead for MX missiles; and the W-76 and W-88, warheads for Trident missiles launched from submarines.

"The Clinton administration has failed to exercise adequate policy and fiscal oversight" over the nation's bomb-making complex, argues the report by the Natural Resources Defense Council, criticizing the \$4 billion annual budget for the weapons work as far too generous.

"It's the wheels of the Cold War grinding on," Christopher Paine, a senior researcher at the council and co-author of the report, said in an interview. "The military is working with the old assumptions and moving forward with the same kinds of programs there had been with nuclear testing."

He added, "You can't fault the military so much as the political leadership for not coming up with a new paradigm for the role of nuclear weapons in international security."

Paine wrote the report with Dr. Matthew McKinzie, a nuclear physicist at the council who did graduate research at the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico, the birthplace of the atomic bomb.

Dr. Victor Reis, the architect of the nation's bomb maintenance program and the assistant secretary for defense programs at the Energy Department, said in an interview that the council was wrong. The department is designing no new weapons, he said, contrary to the council's claims and the language of the formerly secret document.

The programs for the B-61, W-76, W-87 and W-88 are simply meant to improve or modify existing warheads, with no major redesigns that would raise the power of their thermonuclear blasts, Reis said.

Reis added that the work outlined in the plan was wholly consistent with the goals of the test-ban treaty and had been widely vetted by administration officials and Congress, contrary to the council's criticism.

"Everybody and their brother-in-law has seen it and they've all gotten to comment on it," he said.

In defending the work, Reis used an automotive analogy to suggest that its nature was modest.

"When you take your car to the shop and put a new battery in and get a ring job, it's still the old car," he said. "At some stage of the game you may even rebuild the engine, but it's still the old car."

The growing controversy over the secret work has prompted some prominent experts to call for new national policies.

Dr. Hans Bethe, a Nobel laureate in physics who oversaw the birth of the atomic bomb during World War II, recently wrote Clinton to ask for a pledge of no new weapons. "The time has come for our nation to declare that it is not working, in any way, to develop further weapons of mass destruction," he wrote.

The White House has made no such declaration to stop the development of nuclear arms, even though it supports a treaty that it says would ultimately achieve that end.

As originally conceived four decades ago, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty was to bring creation of nuclear weapons to a halt. But arms controllers increasingly worry that today it is being undercut by the march of technology and a scientific elite eager for new challenges.

Traditionally, new types of nuclear arms have been detonated in explosive blasts beneath the earth in order to expose flaws, which can then be fixed. The absence of explosive testing sharply raises the odds that a new weapon will fail or perform poorly in a war.

The last underground nuclear test by the United States was beneath the Nevada desert in September 1992. Washington gave up the practice voluntarily as part of an emerging global moratorium.

The Clinton administration came into office in 1993 wanting to end all nuclear explosions around the globe and worked hard over the years to achieve that goal. By 1995 and 1996, it succeeded in getting the test-ban treaty on the global agenda and in promoting its virtues.

"The effect," Robert Bell, director of defense policy and arms control at the National Security Council, told reporters last year, "will be to rule out opportunities to create new weapon types."

John Holum, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, told arms controllers in Geneva that the treaty would "constrain the advancement of nuclear weapons capabilities by any country."

As the test-ban push accelerated, the administration sought to soothe bomb makers uneasy about their future and to find a way to safeguard the American nuclear arsenal for the indefinite future.

To do both, it launched a \$4-billion-a-year program to understand and fix any flaws that might arise in the 10,000 or so warheads in the nation's nuclear arsenal and to make sure that the aging weaponry can work in the decades ahead.

Critics now fear that the well-funded custodians are getting carried away, coming up with new designs and perhaps even new classes of nuclear weapons. Arms controllers worry that even without real nuclear explosions, weapons scientists will make remarkable progress, using new tools like computer-simulated bomb blasts.

The Natural Resources Defense Council sued the Energy Department for its secret document, titled "Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan" and dated Feb. 29, 1996. Reis of the Energy Department said it is current, adding that an updated version of the annual plan is almost finished.

Among other things, the document shows that the government is making plans to replace the W-76 and W-88 warheads for the Trident missile. "One design," it said, "would require new pit fabrication," referring to the atomic triggers of thermonuclear bombs.

The council says the replacement for the W-76 would be more powerful than its predecessor, and contended in its report that such major improvements run counter to the goals of the test-ban treaty.

In an interview, Reis strongly disagreed and said that any Trident modifications would be relatively minor, and in any case were only in their preparatory stages and had yet to win White House approval.

"If you did a replacement W-88, it would be a W-88b," he said, indicating a relatively minor change. "Its safety might be improved. But it's not a new type of weapon at all."

Paine of the Natural Resources Defense Council said the Energy Department was splitting definitional hairs in order to do whatever it wanted to do, despite the treaty.

"They're not only changing the door knob and the trim but sometimes the engine and the whole body," he said, drawing on the automotive analogy. "It's not like putting on fins. They ought to concede that it's a new car."

JOHN KLOTZ

<http://www.walrus.com/~jklotz/>  
885 Third Avenue, Suite 2900  
New York, NY 10022  
(212) 230-2162

(718) 601-2044

Return-Path: <owner-newscope@ecunet.org>  
To: newscope@ecunet.org (Newscope subscribers list)  
From: owner-newscope@ecunet.org (Newscope subscribers list)  
Reply-to: owner-newscope@ecunet.org (Newscope subscribers list)  
X-send-unsubscribe-to: newscope-request@ecunet.org  
X-Disclaimer: Views are those of the author, not necessarily Ecunet  
Subject: [newscope] note 339  
Date: Mon, 18 Aug 97 16:19:59 EDT

"NEWSCOPE" by NEWSCOPE OFFICE on July 21, 1993 at 21:36 Eastern, about  
SUBSCRIPTION-ONLY WEEKLY NEWS SOURCE (339 notes).

Note 339 by NEWSCOPE OFFICE on Aug. 18, 1997 at 10:33 Eastern (17159  
characters).

Newscope

A Newsletter for United Methodist Leaders

Memo to all e-mail subscribers.

Some subscribers report they did not receive the Aug. 15 issue. We are  
sending it again. We apologize if this is your second copy.

If you'd like to read Newscope on the UMPH Web Page here are the instructions:

- 1) go to <http://www.UMPH.org>
- 2) click on the news icon
- 3) click on "Newscope on Line."
- 4) click Member Access to Newscope Live
- 5) enter user name as "news" (without the quotation marks)
- 6) enter password as "livens" (without the quotation marks)

Please do not give this information to non-subscribers. Thanks

If you want to discuss any aspect of the news, click on "Newscope  
Exchange-Join the Discussion."

If you prefer to get Newscope this way and you wish to drop your e-mail,  
please send a note to Newscope\_Office

Newscope

Vol. 25, No. 33/August 15, 1997

## Youth Say They Are Not Easily Influenced

The assertion that national youth leaders are unduly influenced by adults on the issue of homosexuality was formally discounted during the biennial meeting of the National Youth Ministry Organization (NYMO) of the UMC. A resolution passed at the July 29-Aug. 2 meeting in Nashville said, "Youth can and do think for themselves. Youth are not easily influenced by adults."

The action was precipitated by a one-page article in the Jan./Feb. 1996 issue of Good News magazine that criticized the youth organization for passing legislation at its 1995 assembly asking that proscriptions against homosexuality be dropped from the Discipline. The article, written by Arkansas pastor, Roger Glover, said "it is a serious misuse of a UM organization's purposes to use the legislative process at a national youth meeting to manipulate young people in an effort to change church law on a matter as important as homosexual practice." The "Voice of Youth" resolution, submitted by Iowa delegates, was approved overwhelmingly by the assembly's 250 participants. It said youth are "vital" church members whose word should be trusted.

In other business, the group: 1) invited other youth to "affirm peaceful actions taken by the U.S. government to reduce starvation, ethnic elimination, religious persecution, warfare, nuclear proliferation, and tyranny"; 2) urged others to combat racism; 3) challenged youth to be more aware of poverty in their midst and to participate in hunger programs; 4) supported free speech by students and discouraged bans on any practices that aren't substantially disruptive to the educational process in public school settings; 5) celebrated NYMO's 20th anniversary; 6) raised more than \$10,000 for national and international projects through an auction; and 7) heard Grace Imathiu, a native of Kenya and doctoral student at Vanderbilt University, urge the group to see everyone as children of God and to see God in each person. -- UM News Service

## UM Couple Organizes Emergency Network for Sierra Leone

Asserting that Sierra Leone now has the worst record of human-rights abuses on this planet, a UM couple has established an emergency network to bring the world's attention to the crisis that followed a May 25 military coup in that West African nation.

Ron and Velma Mitchell, former missionaries to Sierra Leone for the General Board of Global Ministries (1976-83), told Newscope that the news media have ignored atrocities in that nation since the U.S. evacuated its citizens.

Velma, a high school teacher in Mt. Vernon, N.Y., is from Sierra Leone and reports that her family members are among the 30,000 persons who left their homes and all their possessions to flee the nation. Ron, an administrator of a homeless shelter in White Plains, N.Y., said that roving bands of soldiers and rebels go house to house in Freetown terrorizing, looting, raping, maiming, and killing at will.

In a telephone call, Bishop Joseph C. Humper (Sierra Leone) told Ron that the church's headquarters in Freetown have been looted and vandalized. Major equipment has been destroyed. For information about the Sierra Leone Emergency Network, call 914-668-2894. To provide aid, give to Advance No. 982450-1, Sierra Leone.

## New Jersey Court Decision Could Influence Other Clergy Malpractice Cases

A recent New Jersey state supreme court decision has possible ramifications for the future, according to Mary Logan, general counsel for the General Council on Finance and Administration.

The case relates to charges of "clergy malpractice" and "breach of fiduciary duty" -- along with other charges -- against an Episcopal clergyman by a parishioner who alleges that the clergyman established a sexual relationship with her during counselling.

On July 22, the New Jersey court ruled that the case could be pursued on the basis of breach of fiduciary trust but not on the basis of clergy malpractice complaints. Pursuit of malpractice suits requires the testimony of witnesses to speak to the question of whether the care given met the standard of care, she continued, but for clergy that gets into church polity or doctrine.

A fiduciary relationship is a special trust relationship, Logan said, in which one party has an obligation to provide a higher standard of care to the client, patient, or whomever because of the relationship.

Bishop Alfred Johnson (New Jersey) and chancellors of the two New Jersey Conferences signed friend-of-the-court briefs prepared by Roman Catholic Church representatives. Sanford Brown, chancellor of the Southern New Jersey Conference, said he plans to cite the state court decision not to apply the malpractice standard in a case involving a UM clergyman.

Brown is concerned, however, that the court did apply a fiduciary standard as a non-religious standard. It ruled, he explained, that in a pastoral counselling setting, a minister could be held responsible for breach of trust and that the courts could determine this without interfering in doctrine or religious belief. Brown said he took note of the dissenting opinion of two justices, who indicated their belief that a presumption of a civil standard of trust will require all references to the defendant's being a clergyman be deleted from depositions and testimony when the remanded case finally comes to trial.

## UM Service Results in Cancellation of KKK Cross Burning

A plan to hold a Ku Klux Klan cross burning near Crofton, Md., was canceled when UM clergy sponsored an Aug. 2 "Breaking Down the Walls" counter demonstration.

Chris Holmes, pastor of Crofton Community UMC, site of the parking-lot rally,

said, "If you have come here tonight to join with others in a spirit of hatred toward the Klan or any other group in our society, then you are in the wrong place. But, if you are here to be an instrument of peace, then you are in the right place." Herbert Watson, pastor of St. Mark's UMC in Hanover, told the 300 participants that in contrast to the KKK message of hate, "Love is the message."

Bishop Felton E. May (Washington, D.C.) challenged the ecumenical gathering to consider why Sunday morning worship services continue to be segregated. He asked if the rally was "just an event" or the "beginning of a movement for equality and systemic changes in a culture where racial harmony is not yet reality?"

During the service, police reported persons, whose license plates identified them as Klan members, attempted to disrupt the rally by driving by shouting obscenities and honking their car horns. -- Evelyn JB Brewster

## Short Takes

United Theological Seminary in Dayton got good news July 24 when a federal bankruptcy court judge approved a plan that will return 71 cents for each dollar lost by non-profit groups to New Era Philanthropy. United lost \$1.75 million in a scheme in which New Era promised to double funds by matching them with anonymous donors. The organizer of the foundation was later found guilty of running a Ponzi scheme in which money from later investors was used to pay early investors. The total agreement will return \$61 million of the \$105 million lost by 150 non-profit groups.

"One cannot separate the heart from the mind and be whole or have integrated learning." That's what Parker Palmer, noted author and educator told The National Association of Schools, Colleges, and Universities of the UMC, meeting July 27-31 in Breckendridge, Colo. Speaking to the presidents of 104 UM schools, Palmer said connectedness and vulnerability are more important characteristics of leaders than skills and knowledge. During business sessions, the association received updates on a Northern Ireland joint-training educational partnership, a Korean student recruitment initiative, and matters of federal public policy impacting student access to education.

Are Americans overworked? That's a question asked by the Aug. 10 issue of FaithLink, a weekly faxed and e-mailed Sunday school lesson produced by The UM Publishing House. The writers cite a 1991 study that found we are working 163 hours more per year, than we did in 1969. While some dispute that study, most agree that there seems to be less leisure time. FaithLink passes on a recommendation from Leonard Sweet (The Jesus Prescription for a Healthy Life, Abingdon, 1996): We need time to "moodle." Sweet says this is a time to balance our "casual time" with "pausal time" for recuperation, rejuvenation, and recreation. "Even though God needed to relax one day a week," he writes,

"many of us think we are better than God." He says moodling offers a place to get off the carousel of greater and greater means and less and less meaning" or a place to "explore the difference between the right to do your own thing and doing the right thing." Call 1-800-672-1789 to order FaithLink.

Some 1,200 educators attending "Focus '97," a national UM conference for workers with children, July 28-Aug. 1 in St. Louis, were told that teachers and parents are at their best when they are able to accept children for who they are. "Accept every child, even the ones you don't understand," urged Al Burr, an educational consultant. He advised the educators and teachers to: 1) keep things simple by having a mental list of what is most important; 2) treat students the way their favorite teachers treated them; 3) treat students like ladies and gentlemen and expect them to behave; 4) plant gentleness to grow gentleness; 5) focus on successes and potential successes instead of on the problems; and 6) be risk takers and dreamers. Other speakers were Lucia Guzman, director of the Colorado Council of Churches, and Bishop Kenneth L. Carder, (Nashville). -- Cheryl Capshaw

Short-term emergency relief will not solve North Korea's food problems, according to James Laney, a UM and a former U.S. Ambassador to South Korea. Laney, who also is president emeritus of Emory University in Atlanta, noted that while emergency supplies are needed urgently for famine relief, "the fact is we're facing long-term deterioration not only in agriculture but in the whole economy." North Korea must be willing to make some changes in their system, he said during an Aug. 6 interview with UM News Service. "They've isolated themselves from the world and they can't survive," he explained. "Even under the best of circumstances, they can't feed their own people. When you have a bad agricultural system, depleted soil, floods, and drought, it's terrible." -- UM News Service

A Summer Law College for Teens sponsored by the UM Lawyer's Guild, climaxed for the 21 Washington, D.C., area student participants with two days of mock hearings and trial in the nearby Prince George's County courthouse. The final event of the six-week experience, conducted primarily at the UM Building in Washington, D.C., was graduation on July 30. The UMC provided \$600 stipends for high-school students who received training in legal research, writing, and elements of trial preparation. Bishop Felton E. May (Washington, D.C.) praised the attorneys' work with disadvantaged students. He said, "The effort on the part of these attorneys demonstrates more than lip service from the church." -- UM News Service

The General Assembly of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), meeting July 25-29 in Denver: 1) opposed the U.S.-led trade embargo against Cuba; 2) called for removal of U.S. military from Okinawa; 3) emphasized the importance of Jerusalem to Christian, Moslem, and Jewish faiths; 4) demanded more accountability in cases of police abuse; 5) asked members to monitor welfare

reform; 6) lobbied for improved job training and employment opportunities for African-American males; 7) encouraged the church to reassert its role in sex education; 8) called for reflection on the participation of gay and lesbian persons in the church's life; and 9) defeated a plan to decrease the number of members of their general agencies. -- DNS

Some 85 members of Black Clergywomen of the UMC recently held their first meeting in Atlanta. The group was formed following a vote to dissolve the African-American Clergywomen's Steering Committee of Black Methodists for Church Renewal (BMCR). The new group will relate to BMCR, but it will not be under its leadership. The group: 1) elected an executive committee; 2) ratified by-laws; 3) set goals to: a) develop a system of networking, b) understand the appointment process, and c) mentor young women in the ministry; and 4) asked the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry to establish a scholarship in honor of Bishop Leontine T.C. Kelly (retired) and gave its first Bishop Kelly Justice Award to Joyce Harris-Scott, pastor of Central Avenue UMC, Kansas City. -- UM News Service

In the controversy over the place of homosexuals in the Episcopal Church, signals from the General Convention flashed green, red, and yellow: Now, no, and not yet. ~"Now" to the option of providing health benefits for domestic partners of clergy and church employees covered by the Episcopal Church Clergy and Employees' Medical Trust.~ "No" to extending pension benefits to surviving partners of lesbian and gay clergy. "Not yet," to the church's blessing of same-gender unions. On the last day, the convention apologized to lesbians and gay men for "years of rejection and maltreatment by the church." -- ENS

The UM Committee on Relief is helping communities recovering from flooding in northern Vermont, northeastern Colorado, the upper Midwest, and in the Alabama-West Florida Conference. 20Five tons of cleaning supplies were supplied to Marlow, Ala., after Hurricane Danny visited the area. For Vermont and Colorado, give to Advance 901670-1 (designate conference). For Upper Midwest, give to the Bishops'Appeal for `97 Spring Storms and Floods 901680-3. For Alabama-West Florida, give to Hurricanes `97 -- 982515-0.

Candler School of Theology invites nominations for its 1998 Alumni Service Awards. The Atlanta seminary offers two award categories based on graduation more than 15 years ago or in the past 15 years. Nominations should include qualifications of the nominee. Send to: Sally Potts, 400 Bishops Hall, Emory University, Atlanta GA 30322 (404-727-6351).

Focus on the Family's Internet block, Cybersitter, blocks a young person from any sexually-oriented sites. The system also will not allow the user to seek

sites with the word "meth" which blocks access to all UMC sites. The intention of the Focus on the Family is probably to block methamphetamine, which provides access to various drug sites.

## Personalia

Darrell Reeck, a retired clergymember of the Pacific Northwest Conference and senior portfolio manager for Progressive Investment Management in Portland, Ore., has been named executive secretary of the UM Development Fund, succeeding John Ness Jr., who retired in March.....Ann Die, president of Hendrix College, Conway, Ark., was elected president of the National Association of Schools, Colleges, and Universities of the UMC succeeding Thomas Courtice, president of Ohio Wesleyan College, Delaware, Ohio.....Linda Lee, a district superintendent from Detroit, has been elected chair of Black Clergywomen of the UMC.....John Carr, a retired minister from the New York Conference, has been appointed volunteer executive director for the Association of Physically Challenged Ministers.....Jerald Lillian Scott, international coordinator of the UM Special Program on Substance Abuse and Related Violence, will attend the late August World Conference on Tobacco and Health in Beijing, China.....Bertha Forster English, 67, wife of Donald English, former chair of the World Methodist Council and former president of the Methodist Church of England, died of cancer July 23 in Shipton-Under-Wychwood, England.

Permission is granted to electronically download this newsletter. UM publications may also quote Newscope with credit without special permission. Any other electronic or mechanical reproduction and/or distribution of the entire newsletter requires prior permission from the UM Publishing House; Rights and Permissions Office, 201 Eighth Ave. South; Nashville, TN 27202. Rich Peck, Editor (615-749-6007).

~~~~~

This note sent to subscribers of the newscope list.  
To unsubscribe DO NOT REPLY TO THIS NOTE! Instead,  
create a new note to [newscope-request@ecunet.org](mailto:newscope-request@ecunet.org)  
containing just the word

unsubscribe

If you have trouble with the automated routine there, please send copies of error messages and other notes to [owner-newscope@ecunet.org](mailto:owner-newscope@ecunet.org) and a real person will assist. Here are links if your mailer supports that sort of thing.

unsubscribe notices: <mailto:newscope-request@ecunet.org>

human intervention: <mailto:owner-newscope@ecunet.org>



Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 18 Aug 1997 18:02:17 -0400  
From: Ross Wilcock <RWILCOCK@execulink.com>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: A Bill of Rights for Future Generations  
To: "Abolition Caucus List (E-mail)" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>

## A Bill of Rights for Future Generations

The U.N. General Assembly

MINDFUL of the determination proclaimed by the peoples of the world in the Charter of the United Nations to reaffirm the faith in the dignity and worth of the human person and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

ACKNOWLEDGING that it is among the purposes of the United Nations to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems and to be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends,

RECOGNIZING that for the first time in history, the rights of future generations to exercise options with respect to the nurture and continuity of life and the enrichment and diversity of their mental and physical environment are seriously threatened,

BELIEVING that the preservation and promotion of these rights has a claim on the consciences of all peoples and nations,

CONVINCED that each generation has the right to determine its own destiny and the corresponding responsibility to accord a similar right to future generations as an extension of the right of the living,

SOLEMNLY PROCLAIMS the necessity of securing the universal recognition of this right and this responsibility; and to this end,

DECLARES THAT:

Article 1.

Future generations have a right to an uncontaminated and undamaged Earth and to its enjoyment as the ground of human history, of culture, and of the social bonds that make each generation and individual a member of one human family.

Article 2.

Each generation, sharing in the estate and heritage of the Earth, has a duty as a trustee for future generations to prevent irreversible and irreparable harm to life on Earth and to human freedom and dignity.

Article 3.

It is therefore the paramount responsibility of each generation to maintain a constantly vigilant and prudential assessment of technological disturbances and modifications adversely affecting life on Earth, the balance of nature, and the evolution of mankind in order to protect the rights of future generations.

Article 5.

Governments, non-governmental organizations, and individuals are urged, therefore, imaginatively to implement these principles, as if in the very presence of those future generations whose rights we seek to establish and perpetuate.

>From Calypso Log, February 1989, a document of the Cousteau Society. The Bill of Rights for Future Generations was drafted by the Cousteau Society's Council of Advisors in 1977. It is the Cousteau Society's purpose that this be incorporated in the U.N. Charter and in the constitutions of

all the world's nations. In order to be incorporated into the U.N. Charter,  
it requires introduction by two U.N. member nations.  
Made available through the courtesy of David Krieger, President, Nuclear  
Age Peace Foundation - who once hosted Captain Jacques Cousteau

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Tue, 19 Aug 1997 12:27:44 -0400  
From: disarmament@igc.org  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Too Comfy?  
To: ctb-followers@igc.org

The Christian Science Monitor, Wednesday August 13,  
"Opinions and Essays" Section

"Take Nuclear Weapons off Alert"

By Dan Plesch and Lutz Hager

NATO is attempting to flesh out a new security order for Europe. Yet, how can we have a new relationship with Russia while nuclear weapons are kept ready to fire at a moment's notice? Together with Russia, NATO should seek to minimize the risk that nuclear weapons are used. The NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council is an ideal forum to work on the topic.

NATO and Russia still have thousands of nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. On land, intercontinental ballistic missiles are ready to launch within minutes, while at sea nuclear-armed submarines are on 24-hour patrol. NATO and Russia continue to deploy tactical warheads in Europe.

Although nuclear weapons in Europe have been greatly reduced since the 1987 Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty and unilateral initiatives by Presidents Bush and Gorbachev announced in 1991, NATO and Russia have largely been conducting nuclear business as usual.

The dangers of high-alert status are clear. The decline of the Russian command-and-control system increases the risk of technical malfunctions and early-warning system failures. The continued, unnecessary reliance on high-alert status increases the danger of inadvertent or accidental use of nuclear weapons, with disastrous consequences. With the cold war over, such dangers between friendly nations are unnecessary. Nuclear weapons should be taken off alert.

De-alerting is intended to prolong the time needed to prepare a weapon for use from minutes at present to hours, days, weeks, or longer. Not all weapons would have to be de-alerted at the same time or by the same mechanism. De-alerting could proceed gradually.

As a first step, NATO and Russia should agree to reduce the number of submarines on patrol. They also should download all warheads from submarines in port, especially submarines on 15-minute launch readiness at pier-side, and place them in local or central storage. Warhead downloading would take several days to reverse and could be observed by satellite surveillance.

With more sophisticated verification measures in place, more ambitious

steps could be undertaken, such as storing tactical weapons (bombs,air-delivered missiles, and anti-aircraft nuclear missiles) away from the planes that are earmarked to deliver them.

Political signs are encouraging. NATO and Russia seem willing to talk about de-alerting. At the Paris summit, Russian President Boris Yeltsin said Russia was ready to curb the alert status of its nuclear forces if the West followed suit. This message was later reiterated by his foreign minister, Yevgeny Primakov, and picked up by French President Jaques Chirac, who seemed ready to come on board. NATO Secretary-General Javier Solana recently said NATO "will talk about that issue [de-alerting]" in the NATO-Russia Joint Council.

NATO and Russia have an interest in reducing the risk of accidental nuclear war. De-alerting would reopen a dialogue with Russia on nuclear weapons. It also could demonstrate the efficacy of new NATO-Russia cooperation and help to overcome the tensions created by NATO enlargement.

The NATO-Russia Joint Council is well positioned to focus on de-alerting. NATO and Russian foreign ministers will convene the first substantive meeting of the Joint Council in late September in New York. There, the ministers should agree to install a permanent high-level task force that will work out concrete steps that can be taken by the nuclear weapon states. De-alerting is the right thing to do, and this is the right time to do it.

\* Dan Plesch and Lutz Hager are director and research assistant, respectively, at the British American Security Information Council, an independent research organization.

\*\*\*\*\*

## THE PHILADELPHIA DAILY NEWS

Monday, August 18,1997

Don't get too comfy: Terror threats abound

Associated Press

WASHINGTON -- To moviegoers, it sounds like a summer blockbuster: Terrorists threaten the nation's capital with a nuclear weapon.

To U.S. policymakers, it sounds like an increasingly possible scenario.

``People don't understand the enormity of the national security threats out there," said Sen. Richard Lugar, R-Ind., a foreign-policy and arms-control expert. ``We need to be vigilant. This is not a time to go to sleep at the switch."

Former National Security Adviser Anthony Lake, who is writing a book titled ``Six Nightmares," detailing major threats to the U.S.

government, let slip that one involves a blackmailing nuclear terrorist.

“You'll just have to wait for the book,” Lake said of his other nightmare visions, explaining his publisher would not let him give a preview.

National security experts list these top modern menaces:

[ \* ] Weapons of mass destruction -- nuclear, biological and chemical devices that can kill huge numbers of people and, in some cases, do immense physical damage.

[ \* ] Terrorism, domestic and foreign.

[ \* ] Narcotics traffic and international crime.

[ \* ] Global conflicts -- from belligerents in the former Yugoslavia and Russia, to the Middle East and the Persian Gulf, to Asia, particularly the Korean Peninsula and around disputed China Sea territories. “People are most afraid of the nuclear scenario, but biological weapons produce the same number of kills and are very easy to put together,” said Robert Kupperman, a terrorism expert at the Center for Strategic and International Studies. “You could just go over a major city and spray.”

What-would-happen-if scenarios have no limit.

Imagine the 1993 World Trade Center bombing or the 1995 Oklahoma City federal building blast with a nuclear capability or a toxic cloud. Consider the 1995 Japanese subway sarin gas attack. In July, a former member of the cult responsible for it told a Tokyo court the group considered attacking the United States, shipping the gas to America by hiding containers in concrete.

In the latest apparent terrorist threat, two Palestinians were shot and arrested July 31 in Brooklyn and accused of plotting to blow up a New York subway station with nail-loaded pipe bombs. Police said they found a note that vowed to “burn the ground under America” if six jailed Islamic militants were not freed. An FBI theory says the goal actually was extortion, the suspects seeking a \$2 million reward from the State Department's “heroes” program that buys information about terrorists. Jeane Kirkpatrick, former U.S. ambassador, to the United Nations, warns of growing ranks of extremist terrorists, both freelancers and those backed by “outlaw nations” such as Iran, Iraq, Syria and Libya.

\*\*\*\*\*

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
1101 14th Street NW #700, Washington, DC 20005  
Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232  
Fax: 202 898 0172  
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

Return-Path: <owner-newscope@ecunet.org>  
To: newscope@ecunet.org (Newscope subscribers list)  
From: owner-newscope@ecunet.org (Newscope subscribers list)  
Reply-to: owner-newscope@ecunet.org (Newscope subscribers list)  
X-send-unsubscribe-to: newscope-request@ecunet.org  
X-Disclaimer: Views are those of the author, not necessarily Ecunet  
Subject: [newscope] note 340  
Date: Tue, 19 Aug 97 13:16:02 EDT

"NEWSCOPE" by NEWSCOPE OFFICE on July 21, 1993 at 21:36 Eastern, about  
SUBSCRIPTION-ONLY WEEKLY NEWS SOURCE (340 notes).

Note 340 by NEWSCOPE OFFICE on Aug. 19, 1997 at 11:33 Eastern (16853  
characters).

Newscope

A Newsletter for United Methodist Leaders

Vol. 25, No. 34/August 22, 1997

### Israel Using Suicide Bombings to Punish All Palestinians, Says UM Group

Jerusalem authorities and the Israeli military are using the July 30 suicide bombings by unidentified individuals to impose a siege on Palestinian territories. That's the word from documents received by Bonnie Jones Gehweiler, coordinator of "Bethlehem 2000," an initiative sponsored by the UM Southeast "Volunteers-in-Mission." Both Palestinians and Israeli peace organizations note that this is apparently the result of a policy of "collective punishment" of 2.5 million innocent Palestinians. Such action is a violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention, the groups say.

In 1993, the Israeli government imposed a permanent blockade on the West Bank and Gaza and instituted a system of "entry permits," that denies Palestinians the right to enter Israel without permits. The groups report that the Israeli government has been demolishing Palestinian homes to make room for Israeli settlements and bypass roads. "The demolishing of homes, the withdrawal of over 1,000 identification papers of Palestinians who are native Jerusalemites, and the devastation of the Palestinian economy through the closures is basically ethnic cleansing, racism, and the creating of a Jerusalem for Jews only," said Gehweiler. She said such a policy will leave no room for Christians or Muslims in a city held holy by three faith groups.

Gehweiler observes that the per-capita income of Palestinians is \$600 compared to \$17,000 for Israelis. "This is partially the result of U.S. policy that gives \$3-\$5 billion annually from U.S. tax payers to Israel," says the UM leader. "Because of the closure, there is lack of money, medicine, food, water, and basic human necessities in the West Bank and Gaza." Gehweiler urges UMs to write to President Clinton, U.S. Secretary of State Madeline Albright (fax 02920736-4461), or Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu

(fax 972-2-566-4838).

"Israel talks about security, but that's just a cover," concludes Gehweiler, "Israeli security can come only when they cease their acts of greed for more land, cease ethnic cleansing, and when they show compassion and love for the Palestinian people whose land this was in the first place."

"Bethlehem 2000" will be sending three 25-member "Volunteers-in-Mission" teams to the West Bank this fall and many more next year to Gaza and the West Bank. These teams help Christian Palestinians remain in their native land and prepare for the 2,000th anniversary of the birth of Jesus. For information or dialogue, fax Gehweiler (606-273-3966).

### Guidelines Will Change the Way Federal Employees are Treated

Guidelines on religion in the federal work place issued Aug. 14 by President Clinton "will change the way religious employees are treated, not just in the public work space but in the private work place as well," declared Oliver Thomas, special counsel on religious and civil liberties for the National Council of Churches.

The guidelines forbid discrimination in hiring, firing, promoting or otherwise favoring or disfavoring employees on the basis of their religion. At the same time, federal employers must permit employees to engage in personal religious expression, just as they permit other constitutionally valued expression, to the greatest extent possible, consistent with interests in work place efficiency and requirements of law. An exception is when a reasonable observer would be led to conclude that the government is endorsing or denigrating religion. Further, federal agencies must reasonably accommodate employees' religious practices, such as holiday observances and religiously compelled dress. In some cases, interests in work place efficiency may take precedence over religious rights, but an agency must always try to accommodate religion to the fullest extent permissible under the law.

Here are some dos and don'ts: 1) employees may keep Bibles on their private desk and read them during breaks; 2) an agency may restrict all posters, or posters of a certain size, in private work areas, or require that such posters be displayed facing the employee, and not on common walls; 3) in informal settings, such as cafeterias and hallways, employees are entitled to discuss their religious views with one another; 4) supervisors may express their views so long as they do not take further steps to coerce agreement with their views; and 5) employees may wear religious items such as crucifixes and they may display religious messages on their clothing to the same extent that they are permitted to display other comparable messages. The guidelines are posted on the internet at [WWW.WHITEHOUSE.GOV](http://WWW.WHITEHOUSE.GOV). -- NCC

### Bishop Talbert Leads Team to East Timor

Bishop Melvin G. Talbert (San Francisco), president of the National Council of Churches (NCC), is leading a mid-August ecumenical delegation to express

solidarity with citizens of East Timor who are struggling for self-determination. The 10-member team will also visit Indonesia in order to strengthen ties with church partners there.

Church World Service, the NCC relief arm, initiated relief and rehabilitation programs in East Timor in 1975, when Indonesia's invasion and occupation of East Timor caused the deaths of about 200,000 people, fully a third of the population. A movement for political change in East Timor was galvanized in 1991 when Indonesian troops killed more than 271 people at a memorial service. Since then, the NCC has advocated for those involved in the struggle and called for the U.S. government to halt military aid to Indonesia.

East Timor is located on half of a small island in Southern Indonesia and is a former Portuguese colony. The NCC's general board passed a resolution in November 1995 supporting the rights of the indigenous East Timorese people to self-determination.

John Chamberlin, a clergy member of the California-Nevada Conference and chair of the NCC East Timor Working Group, and Rebecca C. Cunningham, secuded NCC staff on the East Timor issue, UMC, are also accompanying Talbert. -- NCC

## Short Takes

With 3,500 shipments a day, officials at the UM Publishing House (UMPH) are celebrating Aug. 18 agreements between the Teamsters and UPS officials to settle the 15-day UPS strike. Orders that had accumulated in UPS trailers from Aug. 1 to Aug. 11 were upgraded to priority mail at UMPH expense. Orders since Aug. 11 have been sent parcel post. Although the strike is over, your fall curriculum material will probably be delayed, but should reach you by Aug. 31 if the order was placed before Aug. 22. If you haven't received your material by Aug. 28, call Cokesbury for assistance (800-672-1789).

The UMC in the Philippines is planning for a 1998 celebration of its centennial. On Aug. 28, 1898, George C. Stull, a clergy member of the Montana Conference of the former Methodist Episcopal Church, conducted the first Protestant service on the islands. The service was held in an old Spanish dungeon facing the bay. The Manila Area plans a series of plays and the production of a centennial book. They also hope to secure funding for a centennial headquarters that will include offices, a conference center, and meeting rooms. -- The Filipino Methodist

It seems lots of churches are now sponsoring "Great Days of Service." 20First UMC in Sherman, Texas, is joining two Baptist churches and one Presbyterian church to sponsor their second annual "Great Days of Service." 20Some 600 volunteers from the four churches help repair houses, clean up yards, sew baby gowns, paint, clean up parks, and immunize children, according to Jim Pledger,

pastor of First UMC. -- Robert L. Robertson

The extensive changes made in the Discipline by the 1996 General Conference are reflected in the newly updated edition of *The Organization of the UMC: Revised 1997 - 2000* (ISBN 0-687-056659) by Bishop Jack M. Tuell (Abingdon Press). Call 1-800-672-1789 to order.

The executive staff of UM Communications is hatching a plan to offer one-year fellowships to ethnic minority college graduates to work with conference communicators. Noting that only four racial ethnic minority persons now serve as communicators in the 66 annual conferences, the group hopes the plan, proposed to begin in July, 1998, will encourage more ethnic minority persons to become conference communicators. Judy Weidman, general secretary of the communications agency, estimates that each fellowship will cost \$50,000, including a salary of \$30,000, plus benefits, moving expenses, and travel. A \$5,000 stipend would be provided for the conference communicator serving as a mentor. Weidman hopes the Foundation for UM Communications will be able to fund three fellowships a year by the year 2000. The agency presently provides a \$6,000 annual Stooddy-West Fellowship for graduate students in religious journalism and a \$2,500 Leonard M. Perryman Communications Scholarship for undergraduate ethnic minority students studying journalism and mass communications. -- UM News Service

Bob Kuyper, editor of *Transforming Congregations*, told Newscope his organization needs to oppose current efforts to discourage homosexuals from trying to change their orientation. He says the American Psychological Association wants to force sexual-reorientation therapists to read a statement to their patients declaring that homosexuality is normal and healthy.

Four shalom communities, with roots in the UMC, soon will receive a total of 52 workers, who will be assigned and supported by the AmeriCorps federal program. According to Lynda Byrd, national director for Communities of Shalom, the teams will serve in Shalom Zones in Houston, Miami, Charleston, S.C., and Albany, N.Y. Houston will be assigned 12 workers; Miami, 14; Charleston, 10; and Albany, 16. The grants from AmeriCorps will total \$610,600, not counting local matching funds provided by the churches and communities. AmeriCorps is a nationwide program, initiated by the Clinton Administration, that connects education and community service. Under the program, according to Byrd, participants may receive a stipend for their service or they may receive a financial award to pay education costs in exchange for their work, comparable to a work-study program. -- UM News Service

A two-and-a-half hour satellite teleconference Nov. 13 at 1 p.m. EST will

focus on quality of life issues for people who live with handicapping conditions. 20To host a downlink site, contact Shirley Whipple Struchen (212-870-3802). -- UM News Service

Pat Boone, the squeaky-clean Christian singer who was bounced by Trinity Broadcasting Network for wearing heavy metal with stenciled-on body tattoos, says he is being judged in the same way he has judged others. "And I deserve it," he said. "Christians have got to deal with this judgmental, self-righteous opinionated attitude that if somebody doesn't dress like we dress, or doesn't like the same music, or maybe rides a Harley-Davison, they must be heathens."

The experiences of 15 Arkansans on a UM mission trip to Russia will be the focus of a television documentary. "To Russia With Love," a 30-minute program to air on six Arkansas television stations in October, will chronicle the experiences of a mission team's June 16-28 travel to Ekaterinburg, Russia. -- Jane Dennis

"What is Spirituality?" That question is addressed by Barbara Wendland, editor of Connections, a monthly newsletter. The UM laywoman writes that spirituality is not "sweetness" and the use of religious words or gestures, nor is it goody-goody behavior that shuns secular entertainment and sensual pleasures, nor is it being anti-intellectual. "Being spiritual," says Wendland, "comes from having God's Spirit at work in us, and the Spirit's action is often fierce, not sweet. It often leads people to get angry at current conditions, and to work for change, not to smile."

By a six vote margin, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) failed to pass full communion with the Episcopal Church Aug. 18. A two-thirds vote was needed and the General Assembly, meeting in Philadelphia, voted 66.1% in favor to 33.9% against (684 to 351). However, the assembly overwhelmingly approved full communion with The United Church of Christ, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), and the Reformed Church in America 81.3% to 18.7%. 20All four bodies have now approved the "Formula of Agreement."

Coming events: The Sixth Annual Christian Men's World Peace Congressional Conference, Washington, D.C., Sept. 24. Call the Commission on UM Men, 800-509-4563, for information. The UM Historical Society, Boston, Oct. 3-5, focusing on the ordination of women. Contact Faith Richardson, 617-332-1971 or Joseph Beardsley, 603-444-5567. Wesley Theological Seminary Ministers' Convocation, Washington, D.C., Oct. 7-8, focusing on the African- American religious community. Call Michael Armstrong, 202-885-8659. A School of New Congregational Development, Nashville, Oct. 21-23, for church leaders of new congregations. Call Craig Miller, 615-340-7081. Turning Point, Tampa, Fla.,

Jan. 28-31, for adults in ministry with youth. Call General Board of Discipleship, 615-340-7134.

Russian President Boris Yeltsin, 66, is trying to mend fences with the Russian Orthodox Church following his veto of a bill that placed restrictions on all Christian groups except the Russian Orthodox Church. Yeltsin, a member of the church, telephoned Patriarch Alexy II, spiritual head of the Russian Orthodox Church, to explain his actions.

The Washington, D.C.-based Interfaith Alliance is opposing the "Religious Freedom Amendment" sponsored by Rep. Ernest Istook (R. Okla.). The alliance, with over 60,000 members from 50 faith communities, says, "A Constitutional Amendment mandating prayer in public schools jeopardizes religious liberty in America and violates the First Amendment." The group suggests that the creation of a "majority-rule" system of religion will destroy the rights of minorities and will take away "the rights of parents to determine the religious upbringing of their children." Alliance leaders say current laws already give public-school students the right to pray, read Bibles, and form religious groups.

#### Positions Available

Manager of East Ohio Conference Area Center facilities. Contact Helen V. Juve, 444 Rothrock Rd., Copley, OH 44321-1339. ....Youth director. Contact Donald Bird, Search Committee, Sunrise UMC, 2655 Briargate Blvd., Colorado Springs, CO 80920. ....Minister to families with youth. Contact Kay Burris, SPR Committee chair, St. James UMC, 321 Pleasant Valley Dr., Little Rock, AR 72212.....Two positions: Associate music director. Contact Bryan Fitzgerald, St. Lukes UMC, 4851 S. Apopka-Vineland Rd., Orlando, FL 32819 (407-876-4991). Activities and recreation director. Contact Ken McNutt, same address (407-876-4991). ....Two positions: Director of music and part-time organist. Contact Roger Blackburn, Haddonfield UMC, 29 Warwick Rd., P.O. Box 366, Haddonfield, NJ 08033.....Short-term volunteer physicians for Mutumbara Hospital in Zimbabwe. Contact UM Volunteers-In-Mission (404-659-5060).....Director of education. Contact James Archibald, Colesville UMC, 52 Randolph Rd., Silver Springs, MD 20904 (301-831-3299).....Two positions with UM Communications Conference Resourcing Team: administrative assistant and networking specialist. Contact UMCCom, 810 12th Ave. So., Nashville, TN 37203 (616-742-5137).

#### Personalia

John E. Sims, St. Joseph, Ill., will be installed as president of the UM Historical Society at an October meeting in Boston. He succeeds C. Faith Richardson, Newton, Mass.....Hector Sanchez, professor of Spanish at Southwest Texas State University, San Marcos, Texas, has been named assistant editor of

El Int rprete, the UM Spanish language program journal.....David Blackburn, 70, former Alaska missionary, died May 1, not May 16 as earlier reported.....Andrew Sung Park, professor of theology at United Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio, has won the 1997 John Templeton Foundation Award in Science and Religion. Park, with his wife, S. Jane Myong, a chemistry professor at Sinclair Community College, wrote "Christian Mystics and Science." Each school will receive \$5,000.

Permission is granted to electronically download this newsletter. UM publications may also quote Newscope with credit without special permission. Any other electronic or mechanical reproduction and/or distribution of the entire newsletter requires prior permission from the UM Publishing House; Rights and Permissions Office, 201 Eighth Ave. South; Nashville, TN 27202. Rich Peck, Editor (615-749-6007).

~~~~~

This note sent to subscribers of the newscope list.  
To unsubscribe DO NOT REPLY TO THIS NOTE! Instead,  
create a new note to [newscope-request@ecunet.org](mailto:newscope-request@ecunet.org)  
containing just the word

unsubscribe

If you have trouble with the automated routine there, please send copies of error messages and other notes to [owner-newscope@ecunet.org](mailto:owner-newscope@ecunet.org) and a real person will assist. Here are links if your mailer supports that sort of thing.

unsubscribe notices: <mailto:newscope-request@ecunet.org>

human intervention: <mailto:owner-newscope@ecunet.org>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

X-Authentication-Warning: igc6.igc.org: majordomo set sender to owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org using -f

Date: Tue, 19 Aug 1997 11:39:20 -0700 (PDT)

From: Peace Action - National Office <panukes@igc.apc.org>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: NRDC "End Run" report

To: abolition-caucus palist tomatompn+@igc.org

I'm sure you've all heard/read about the Natural Resources Defense Council's (NRDC) expose of the DOE's Stockpile Stewardship & Management program (SS&M) in the New York Times and other papers yesterday and today. To get a copy of their report "End Run: The U.S. Government's Plan for Designing Nuclear Weapons and Simulating Nuclear Explosions under the CTBT" call 202 289-6868 (ask for Matthew McKinzie). NRDC's web page is: <http://www.nrdc.org>

NRDC is getting a lot of press calls and enquiries. For the next few days, at least, the media and hopefully our policy makers will be very interested in this topic -- grassroots activists need to take advantage of this opportunity!

\* Let's get LOTS of letters sent to the NYT and other newspapers who have covered the story: if a paper receives 100 letters on a topic, it's much more likely to print at least one of them than if only one or two come in.

\* If you know a nuclear "expert", a well-known professor, scientist, politician, someone with name recognition, ask them to co-author an opinion piece with you, and submit it to newspapers of note.

\* See if you can find a local angle on this story: do you live by a nuclear weapons facility? Is your local/state university involved in research for the DOE's SS&M program? Has your area suffered recent cuts in goods and services that you can contrast with DOE's latest handout from Congress for 1998 nuclear weapons design work: over \$4 billion.

\* Call your local radio talk show and talk about this issue on the air. Offer yourself as a local nuclear weapons expert and activist who could be on their show.

\* Send a news clip and NRDC's press release (or one from your group) with a letter to your Rep and Senators, demanding Congressional hearings on US nuclear weapons policy. Don't forget to mention the Abolition 2000 poll that shows high levels of public support among Americans for disarmament and low support for investing taxes in nuclear weapons research and development.

\* Let's use this opportunity to call for the cancelation of the planned September subcritical test!

Please feel free to contact me if you need adetails about this report

or have questions about our response. We should all be strategizing on ways to maximize public education and pressure on our politicians on this issue.

Karina Wood  
Peace Action Education Fund, US  
panukes@igc.apc.org  
202 862-9740 ext. 3044

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Wed, 20 Aug 1997 10:42:57 -0400  
From: disarmament@igc.org  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org  
Subject: De-Target  
To: ctb-followers@igc.org

RTw 08/20 0834 Russia nukes no longer targeted at Western states

By Andrei Khalip

MOSCOW, Aug 20 (Reuter) - Russia, in line with a pledge given by President Boris Yeltsin in May, is no longer targeting its long-range nuclear missiles at Western states, a spokesman for Russian Strategic Nuclear Forces (RSNF) said on Wednesday.

"The promise by President Boris Yeltsin concerning non-aiming of strategic missiles at Western countries has been realised in full," the spokesman told Reuters.

He did not specify what had happened to the missiles, but Itar-Tass news agency quoted an RSNF official as saying some of them had been reprogrammed to go nowhere, while others had had their warheads disconnected.

During a Russia-NATO summit in Paris in May Yeltsin shocked the gathering with an impromptu statement in which he said Moscow would remove warheads from all its missiles targeted at member countries of the Western defence alliance.

He made clear later that he meant the non-aiming of missiles and not the removal of their warheads.

The RSNF also issued a statement on Wednesday denouncing a recent German study which said Russia's ageing nuclear weapons could be fired by accident due to serious problems with its early warning systems.

"The reported views of experts at the Hessen Peace and Conflict Research Foundation concerning RSNF's nuclear armaments are groundless and far-fetched," the statement said.

The study by the foundation, which advocates nuclear disarmament, said the problems had led to a widespread practice of keeping nuclear weapons on a permanent state of alert. It said the missiles could be launched at the first sign of a real or imagined attack.

The RSNF fiercely denied such a possibility.

"The missile attack warning system... is working and is reliable. Neither its space nor ground services have ever caused a single false alarm," the statement said.

"Moreover, it would be flippant to assume that the country's top political and military leadership would take a decision of global consequences based on only one, however reliable, method of warning."

The RSNF conceded that its troops, along with the rest of Russia's army, had troubles with supplies and financing, but insisted its combat readiness remained intact.

"Despite supply difficulties, the troops remain fully under

control, they are in a state of mobilisation and battle readiness and successfully meet all requirements set."

But former defence minister Igor Rodionov, sacked by Yeltsin earlier this year, has more than once raised the question of the reliability of Russia's strategic nuclear forces.

\*\*\*\*\*

From: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005  
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232  
FAX: 202 898 0172  
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

Return-Path: <stuwhis@enter.net>

Date: Thu, 21 Aug 1997 22:25:14 -0400 (EDT)

X-Sender: stuwhis@mailman.enter.net (Unverified)

To: mary.miller@ecunet.org

From: stuwhis@enter.net (bill stuart-whistler)

Subject: Episcopalians pass Nuclear Abolition Resolution

Cc: dgracie@afsc.org, cramey@igc.apc.org, mupj@igc.apc.org, jgchisholm@aol.com, cp16@cornell.edu, pcolbert@igc.apc.org, vfausey@aol.com, barnabas@wwa.com, myasutake@interaccess.com, eliza@nh.ultranet, eowens@msmailhg.netimage.com, panukes@igc.apc.org, wdavidon@haverford.edu

Dear Friends and Nuke Ab Interest Group Members:

The 72nd General Episcopal Convention has joined a growing number of judicatories in passing "Abolition of Nuclear Weapons" at its Convention on July 25th. This adds the pressure of our Church to the cause of hastening the day of total abolition of such genocidal weapons. Hallelujah! The Resolution follows:

RESOLVED, the Houses of Bishops and Delegates concurring, that the 72nd General Convention of the Episcopal Church support the goal of total nuclear disarmament; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this Convention urge the Government of the United States to exercise leadership among the nations, especially among the nuclear weapons states, to initiate negotiations immediately for an international Treaty on Comprehensive Nuclear Disarmament in all its aspects and including a definite deadline for completion of such disarmament; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this General Convention Support the World Campaign To Abolish Nuclear Weapons and encourage Episcopalians to sign the Campaign's Citizen's Pledge on Nuclear Weapons Abolition; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this Convention call upon the comparable bodies in our sister Churches in the Anglican Communion to speak out in a similar manner to the governments in their own Province so that the world-wide Anglican Communion may work in concert toward the goal of total nuclear disarmament; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of General Convention to the President of the United States, the Secretaries of State, Defense and Energy, Episcopal Members of Congress, the Secretary General of the United Nations, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, the Anglican Observer at the United Nations, and the Primates of the Anglican Communion.

We hope that this Resolution will be a source of hope for those struggling with their various hierarchies and offer suggestions as well to those strugglers.

Yours in Peace, Bill Stuart-Whistler

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 25 Aug 1997 21:49:18 -0700 (PDT)  
From: flick@igc.apc.org (flick)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Looking Towards NPT 1998  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: flick@pop.igc.apc.org

Dear Abolitionists,

Felicity Hill and Alice Slater, Co-Convenors of the Abolition 2000 NPT Working Group recently met in New York with Stephanie Fraser and had enthused and inspired thoughts, detailed below, about the 1998 NPT PrepCom, to be held in Geneva.

Before April 1998

1. The importance of NGO preparation and prior national lobbying can't be emphasised enough. Our conversation entailed both ideas about the Abolition presence at the PrepCom itself and pressure that can be exerted prior to April 98. An example of this pressure is the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom's (WILPF) Women Insist on Nuclear Disarmament (WIND) campaign having an international week in February of each year as a flash point of focus on the the nuclear disarmament issue in the build up to the NPT. This kind of pressure being placed in 45 countries will start the ball rolling for WILPF. Abolition 2000 can coordinate similar public actions throughout its European and Pacific networks for example, and worldwide systematic pressure on states as they are formulating their agendas to take to Geneva can be done via this list.

**PLEASE SHARE YOUR IDEAS WITH THE ABOLITION LIST SERVE ABOUT HOW TO GET THE RESULT WE WANT AT THE PREPCOMM BY STARTING OUR WORK TO INFLUENCE GOVERNMENTS NOW**

2. Another preparatory strategy has to do with the media. Any person considering coming to the NPT PrepCom should make contact with media and offer to be a conduit for information about the PrepCom, or even to write articles or do telephone radio interviews. For those in capital cities, it would be an especially good idea to establish contact with media outlets that have reps at the UN - many do. The list of media present in Geneva will be provided by the Special Committee on Disarmament upon arrival in Geneva.

3. The Panel discussions at the 1997 PrepCom were of a very high quality and were an incredible educational and credibility building exercise. However we felt that we might need to augment our educational efforts for next year.

We discussed the idea of holding a 2 day NGO conference in Geneva PRIOR to the NPT, which would ground the activists present firmly in the information needed, which would stretch our discussions which these chances to share information provide, and would orient us to the political and geographical surroundings, perhaps even provide skills training in lobbying- inviting

Diplos to speak is an option.

We think that panels should once again be held during the PrepCom - only one or two a day - a lunch time and early evening event would attract more diplos and would \* maximise our time in lobbying \*. We felt it was essential that Abolition 2000 having a day AFTER the PrepCom to debrief and plan ahead was important. Yes, these suggestion will involve people staying more days away from their lives and jobs, but we felt it was worth suggesting and we await your feedback.

**PLEASE GET YOUR SUGGESTIONS FOR PANELS UP ON THE LIST AS SOON AS POSSIBLE**

4. Felicity, in addition to her work as co-convenor of the working group, will be also employed by the Geneva based Special NGO Committee on Disarmament to work on the PrepCom and will be in Geneva starting January. She will present proposals to the CD secretariat and the chair of the NPT about NGO presentations. Because we want to do NGO presentations EARLIER in the programme of the NPT - the Special NGO Committee on Disarmament will attempt to foster discussions via email and other mediums on the nature of the NGO Presentation and the preparation that will need to go into them. Could Abolition 2000 people please provide suggestions about the best things to ask for in this regard.

Alice suggested perhaps we might try to arrange for NGO presentations throughout the conference, ie 3 in the morning, 3 in the afternoon each day, so that it would be likely that everyone who wanted to address the delegates would be permitted to do so. Felicity didn't agree with this approach, but if it is a starting point for discussion with the secretariat, it's worth a go. **WE NEED FEEDBACK NOW ON THIS DELICATE ISSUE ON THE BEST WAY TO PROCEED SO THAT WE CAN MAKE OUR REQUESTS FOR NGO PARTICIPATION IN ADVANCE.**

5. Felicity will negotiate with the UN to get display and art space. We need NGOs to liaise with each other and with her regarding art works and displays they would like to exhibit in the UN during the PrepCom. Stephanie, Alice and Felicity really wanted to emphasise the special impact that can be made with artwork and photography and ideas also for street theatre and demonstrations outside the UN which we hope to hold daily. Stephanie agreed to contact a puppet group. We thought Pol might have some ideas about effective street demonstrations. Felicity is fixated at the moment on how to visualise cancer and communicate it via images. Please ask your arty friends, or if you happen to be an activist AND an artist - let your creativity flow! Stephanie agreed to contact the Creative Coalition in New York and see if they would be interested in helping us.

6. We thought it would be especially important to invite and help to bring people who have suffered due to uranium mining, nuclear weapons testing and nuclear energy from all over the world. Seeing the impact of landmine survivors speaking to (torturing) diplomats with the true face of suffering was what sparked this thought - is it appropriate for us to do also?? As a grass-roots based network, we have a special responsibility to give space for these often silent victims to speak in these international forums.

7. Felicity said that she would try to extract a guaranteed copy of all

documents

circulated at the NPT to be delivered to an NGO box of some kind so that we were not scrambling and stealing documents with the feverish desperation that can be fun but is usually humiliating and a hassle.

Things you will see on this list soon:

\* Felicity agreed to draft a[n Abolition 2000 NPT Working Group letter to go to Ambassador Tadeusz Strulak congratulating him on the assumption of the chair of the 1998 PrepCom, indicating Ab 2000's number one priority to see negotiations completed by the year 2000 on a treaty to eliminate nuclear weapons, ensuring him of our eagerness to communicate with the delegates and himself, and asking him to consider increased NGO participation, including all the Abolition statements.

\* Alice said she would pursue communications with a number of people, Doug Roche and Alyn Ware on a number of issues such as Canada's programme of disarmament, and promoting an intersessional NPT working group on negotiations for a NW Convention ( supported by the Marshall Islands at the PrepCom in 1997 (NPT/Conf.2000/PC.I/11) , and that she will post to the Abolition list a comment as the basis of discussion on the role of South Africa and possible strategies to influence Nelson Mandela to take a stronger position for Abolition.

At the PrepCom

1. Abolition 2000 will have its daily 8am meetings as usual. The meeting of all NGOs will be held at 9am and possibly another briefing will be organised for the conclusion of each day. The meetings may involve hearing from a person on the 'inside' and then sharing 'our' information and coordinating demonstrating and lobbying efforts.
2. Stephanie Fraser has agreed to prepare a template and coordinate a daily Abolition 2000 NPT Working Group 4 page (or so) news sheet which will report on the meetings, will interview delegates and will contain pieces from the variety of organisations that make up Abolition 2000. The information that goes into this bulletin[] will require Abolition 2000 people to do more intelligence gathering from the diplomats and record their reactions to proceedings as they are happening, this will give analysis and opinion, information and communication.
3. Again, inspired by the Landmines campaign at the UN, every diplomat had 3 or 4 people talking and listening to them if they dared to come out of the room, they weren't safe to go to the toilet without being greeted by 2 or 3 smiling faces outside!!! **We MUST CONCENTRATE MORE ON EXTRACTING INFORMATION AND ASSERTING OUR DEMANDS** - this is a hard skill to acquire but is one of the main points of being at the meetings. This isn't just for people who look confident and important - we are also confident and important and have our line to push - we must do it well, and we can if we coordinate, strategize and divide up the task amongst our membership.

## Special NGO Committee on Disarmament

Besides the preparation of an information booklet that will contain maps of the UN, maps of Geneva, the treaty text, media people at the UN, and other things people might need (please suggest), the Special NGO Committee will work on booking space for the panels, will help organise the conference prior to the PrepCom, will book demonstration sites with the proper multiple authorities in Geneva, will help to provide billeting, and will organise accreditation to the UN.

Until January - speak to Felicity via [flick@igc.apc.org](mailto:flick@igc.apc.org) about any queries or suggestions you might have for the NGO Committee.

these amended minutes submitted by felicity and reviewed by Alice

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, aslater@igc.apc.org, inesap@fy.chalmers.se  
Date: Tue, 26 Aug 1997 17:24:46 +0200 (CET)  
From: Martin Kalinowski <dh3m@HRZPUB.th-darmstadt.de>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: Looking Towards NPT 1998  
To: flick@igc.apc.org (flick)  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id IAA23112

Dear Felicitas, dear Alice, dear abolition friends, dear INESAPpers,

Thank you very much for taking the initiative for planning NGO activities at the forthcoming NPT PrepCom in Geneva.  
INESAP will be active to push the abolition of nuclear weapons in Geneva. We will discuss our strategy for Geneva at our INESAP 1997 Conference on September 8 to 10 in Shanghai. Alice Slater will be with us and will present a paper on seizing the opportunity of the NPT PrepCom for abolition. If you have any recommendations what we should discuss in China, please let me know. I will take your minutes that you distributed on the abolition caucus list as a basis for our discussions.

My own feeling is that besides of the Nuclear Weapons Convention and especially the Model NWC prepared by NGOs the following topics will play a major role at the PrepCom and should be addressed with briefings and prepared papers by NGOs:

- future steps for nuclear disarmament, timebound framework, phased approach
- cut-off for nuclear weapons usable materials
- negative security assurance  
(does it really help or does it mislead the discussion?)
- nuclear weapon free zones, especially in the Middle East  
and declared by local authorities and single countries

Personally, I hope to have the opportunity to work more frequently in Geneva next year. I would like to concentrate on finding ways out of the current deadlock in Geneva and especially how disarmament measures and a weak timebound framework can be integrated in the cut-off negotiations, because a fixed linkage between disarmament and non-proliferation appears not to be feasible. I have more ideas about this written down. If you are interested, I am happy to send you a copy.

Best regards,  
Martin

---

Martin Kalinowski, IANUS, c/o Institut fuer Kernphysik  
Schlossgartenstr. 9, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany  
Tel.: +49-6151-163016 FAX: +49-6151-166039  
Internet, private: KALINOWSKI@HRZPUB.TH-DARMSTADT.DE  
Internet, group: IANUS@HRZPUB.TH-DARMSTADT.DE  
<http://www.th-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/welcome.htm> and [.../inesap.htm](http://www.th-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/welcom.htm)

---



Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: "'ABOLITION-CAUCUS'" <ABOLITION-CAUCUS@IGC.APC.ORG>,  
    "'Atwood, David'" <atwood@pop.unicc.org>,  
    "'Ballantyne, Edith'" <edibal@iprolink.ch>,  
    "'WILPF'" <womensleague@gn.apc.org>  
Date: Tue, 26 Aug 1997 13:08:36 -0200  
From: International Peace Bureau <ipb@gn.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: NPT 98 preparations  
To: "'Slater, Alice'" <aslater@IGC.APC.ORG>,  
    "'Hill, Felicity'" <flick@IGC.APC.ORG>,  
    "'Fraser, Stephanie'" <sfraser@IGC.APC.ORG>

Dear all,

Many thanks to the NY group for doing such detailed advance thinking for PrepComm 2. Certainly as one of the Geneva host organisations we'll do all we can to help.

Here are a few preliminary comments:

1. Influencing governments early.

This is definitely the key to success. If the NWS are not persuaded to budge even a tiny bit on the issues we care about, then no amount of lobbying and smiling, expert panels etc etc will make any difference when it comes to their positions at the PrepComm.

For me the big difference between 97 and 98 is the election of two socialist governments in UK and France. Without expecting miracles - and being aware of the continuing impasse in the CD this year - this new situation does seem to offer some possibility of greater dialogue, both with the NAM and with NGOs. While continuing pressure on Abolition goals, esp. the Nuclear Weapons Convention is important, the areas where we might expect some small shifts in position in advance of the 2000 Review Conf are in my view:

- no first use
- negative security assurances
- laboratory testing (Note Jospin position)
- intersessional working group

I would think these topics should be high priority for panels. But there ought to be room for many other issues also.

2. Preparatory/concluding conferences

An opening/orientation session could be useful, but maybe one day would be easier than two for those who work Mon-Fri and would need to travel on the Sat - jet lag etc. A lot of information can be presented on paper or picked up during the first day or so. Main thing to discuss would be the NGO presentation(s). If we want to have them early in the proceedings (first week), then a team needs to be set up immediately we arrive, with some of the work done beforehand by email.

The day at the end could be very useful also.

Can we be clear - is your suggestion that the preceding conf be for all NGOs, and the concluding conf for Abol 2000 only? I think I would agree with doing it this way.

### 3. NGO presentations

It makes sense to put in a bid to do this again, since last year's was so successful. I'm not clear about the proposal for daily presentations (6 per day??) and I would guess this would not be accepted anyhow. I would go for last year's model - one combined presentation - but with considerable thought about how to introduce new material, rather than just re-hash what we said in 1997.

### 4. Panels

There must be many speakers as possible but could we make a big push to get Gen Lee Butler to come and do a special presentation? Could maybe CDI or others in the US help on this?

### 5. Art/photo space

Space is usually available in the Palais, E Building, should be no problem. Visualising cancer: You might want to contact Dr Anne-Marie Jansen of Swedish IPPNW who did an impressive slide show on cancer and plutonium during the ICJ/NGO meetings in the Hague a couple of years ago. Also Robert del Tredici's photo exhibitions are wonderful - we have a small-size set at IPB. Maybe there are more up to date materials.

For your info: in landmines campaign, Handicap International has just now set up a huge 'sculpture' outside the Palais: a wooden chair with one leg broken. Impressive! Nuclear equivalent needs some thought. We have also managed to get the old 'rusty cannon' with knotted barrel set up on the grass opposite as a permanent reminder of the goal of the UN's disarmament efforts.

### 6. Victims/survivors

It would certainly help to bring the issue alive - problem is fundraising for the travel costs. Who should coordinate foundation bids?

### 7. Lobbying/states positions

If someone could come up with a pre-PrepComm chart of country positions that would be a very useful job - but quite a lot of work. It would help to identify lobbying priorities. An Abolition 2000 meeting with representatives of the NAM could be a useful event.

### 8. Daily Newsheet

Great idea, esp. as we don't have a Disarmament Times over here. Although maybe the new DT team has fresh ideas for covering Geneva events.

### 9. NGO Committee conf December

The dates for the Geneva NGO Committee's conference on disarmament in Stockholm has now been fixed: Dec 5-7. A separate email will be forthcoming very soon. This is obviously a good opportunity for at least some of us to continue the planning process. Hope to see as many people as possible there.

Hope this is helpful

Colin Archer  
IPB, Geneva



Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 26 Aug 1997 20:58:10 GMT  
From: acronym@gn.apc.org (Rebecca Johnson)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: Looking Towards NPT 1998  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: acronym@gn.apc.org

Many thanks to Flick, Stephanie and Alice for sending your thoughts on NPT PrepCom organising to the server. I am very glad that more people are thinking and planning for this EARLY, as this is the key to effectiveness.

Since you ask for responses and discussion, here goes.

i) I completely agree with the need for prior national lobbying and media preparation -- the more we do before Geneva in April, the better.

ii) There will already be a few groups setting up seminars on particular issues relevant to the NPT prior to April. I think a few on particular topics at different times organised by groups with a particular focus (e.g. there's a possible seminar on the NWC in the pipeline for February) might be more effective than one large seminar on a host of NPT topics.

iii) an NGO meeting before the NPT would be a good idea, if intended to incorporate the 'training' aspects of the day before the 1997 PrepCom, which I think was largely successful. To maximise participation, it would have to take place the day or week-end before the PrepCom starts, with people prepared to come to Geneva early. Does this need to be two-day or would one day be enough? If the idea is also to train on the issues, as well, that could make for a very heavy schedule.

iv) the NGO panels were very useful for other NGOs but, frankly, did not involve many diplos. To be realistic, that is always going to be a problem. Who are your priority audiences, the diplos or each other? Both are important, but we will have better meetings if we are clear about the purpose of meetings and panels before speakers are set up). I haven't got any easy answers, but don't overload the schedules or some NGOs could become overly frustrated and exhausted (and disappointed).

v) The campaign to make the diplos listen to and acknowledge the suffering of landmines victims was very successful because the victims were perceived as 'innocent' and the harm was seen to be happening here and now, long after the war had moved on. The Hiroshima and Nagasaki images shocked for many decades and were important in raising consciousness (my own included), but I think that they are perceived by many politicians and diplos now as 'ritualistic'. Chernobyl has largely replaced Hiroshima as providing images that make people question nuclear energy. Few people in power seem to know the horror stories from the uranium mines, Gemma Darcy and others from Sellafield, the downwinders at the sites. I agree with Flick that it would be good to give voice to these silent sufferers. In doing so, the shocking pictures and personal and human stories work best, but we also have to be very careful not to be exploitative. I also think it would be important to try to represent as many of the sites as possible. Rather than

re-inventing the wheel, perhaps we can unearth some of the work done by activists already. e.g the Nevada-Semipalatinsk movement did a very moving video and exhibition of the results of the Russian testing programme, and also in the mid-1980s, I recall a compelling exhibition from Medact (IPPNW affiliate in UK) on 'Even before the bomb drops'.

While the exhibitions may need to be heart-searing to get through, the demos should be as visually interesting, quirky and humourous as poss!

#### vi) PARTICIPATION

the idea of Flick sending a letter to Strulak is good, but this leads to my biggest confusion on reading the message. It reads as if Abolition 2000 and 'the NGOs' are the same constituency and that Flick will be representing both i.e. putting the Abolition 2000 agenda to Strulak, while at the same time requesting additional NGO participation. There will be many NGOs making valuable contributions who are not members on the abolition caucus.

I think it is necessary to draw a clear distinction between working to achieve wide, smooth and effective participation by NGOs and working to put across the abolition 2000 agenda. All the NGOs going to Geneva will need to feel welcomed and involved, regardless of the countries or coalitions they are from. The purpose of NGO activities should be to promote debate and foster creative ideas for achieving a nuclear free world, and for this we need to recognise and respect the diversity of views on HOW to achieve this, regardless of whether that person, group or approach fits exactly with our own mind set.

I hope that the 'training', networking, information-sharing seminar held before the PrepCom will be open to all NGOs committed to a nuclear free world.

I like the idea of art space and exhibitions, but again I hope that a diversity of images and ideas will be put forward. [Flick, I suspect that the NPT will be held in Rm 19 in the E building, which has brilliant exhibition space outside and on the floor below by the cafe. But you may have to contact the Palais way before you get there in January (ie now), as I think it gets booked well in advance.]

On the specific question of NGO participation at the NPT, I and others have already spoken to Strulak, and I think there is an extremely good chance that we will be given a half day 'informal' meeting, probably chaired by Strulak, during the first week. As we saw in NY, that 'three hours' becomes little more than two, and can only be used effectively by 6-9 speakers, max.

While I have no objection to anyone asking Strulak for more, I think Alice's idea has zero chance of being accepted and could muddy the water for other NGO demands. On behalf of all NGOs, Flick will be asking for effective distribution of documentation, a right for NGOs to display, distribute and hand out our own information, a session for NGOs to address the conference, an office area and/or meeting space with photocopier and perhaps a couple of computers, rooms for holding seminars and probably a whole lot more, as we all work out what we want and need. Strategically, I think Flick/the NGO Committee should not squander our political capital by asking for NGOs to speak in every session. It aint gonna happen (do you realise how difficult

it was to overcome the resistance to us getting that one half day at the PrepCom??) If Alice's idea is put forward it should be done by individuals or organisations on their own behalf. It can push the envelope, and who knows, maybe become something we can push for in the future, if we lay the groundwork more effectively to stand some chance of success.

Most of all, MANY THANKS for starting the ball rolling this early. It will be great having Flick's energy and organisational skills on this in Geneva!  
rebecca

=====  
email: [acronym@gn.apc.org](mailto:acronym@gn.apc.org)  
The Acronym Institute  
24, Colvestone Crescent  
London E8 2LH  
England  
telephone (UK +44) (0) 171 503 8857  
fax (0) 171 503 9153  
=====

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
Date: Thu, 28 Aug 1997 18:38:34 +0200 (CET)  
From: Martin Kalinowski <dh3m@HRZPUB.th-darmstadt.de>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: how to overcome the deadlock at Geneva  
To: flick@igc.apc.org (flick)  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id JAA28861

Dear Abolition friends,

Felicity Hill encouraged me to send my thoughts on how to overcome the current deadlock at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva to the abolition-caucus. She said:

> I feel that if we can represent the detailed thoughts we have  
> about these subjects that the list would be a more educational forum and  
> would create friction warmth from good ideas being discussed between  
> Abolitionists.

>  
I am very interested in any comments from you on my ideas.  
Here they are:

-----  
How to overcome the current deadlock between  
complete nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation\*

Martin B. Kalinowski (IANUS/INESAP)

Finding new and creative ways how to overcome the current deadlock in nuclear arms control and especially at the Conference on Disarmament (CD) in Geneva became the most important question in the past year.

For long time it was expected that after the conclusion of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) the next step would be to ban the production of fissile materials for weapons purposes. In fact, a negotiating mandate for a verified agreement on a cut-off of production of nuclear-weapons-usable fissile material was agreed at the CD early in 1995. However, the negotiations never actually started. The prospects for getting into a successful negotiation process have even dimmed in the past year and especially by failing to reach a consensus on the CTBT. This year, even the decision on the agenda of the CD was completely deadlocked.

It is important to note that we have to deal with two different conflict structures. The conflict between the recognized nuclear weapons states and the three threshold states which hold out of the NPT is dominating the situation at Geneva and responsible for the current deadlock. A different conflict is appearing traditionally between the recognized nuclear weapons states and the states of the Non Aligned

Movement (NAM) which joined the NPT as non nuclear weapons states. This second conflict dominates the NPT review process.

In a statement issued in August 1996 the NAM insisted on a linkage between nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament as well as on a phased program for the elimination of all nuclear weapons within a fixed timetable (1). However, the nuclear weapons states do not want other states to dictate the agenda for their own nuclear disarmament process. They feel that the five nuclear weapons states - and especially Russia and the USA - should agree among themselves on further disarmament which will be made dependent on the progress in non-proliferation and especially in satisfactory steps by nuclear threshold states to put their nuclear ambiguity under strict international control (2).

The hard position taken by the NAM appears to become more flexible. The NAM presented a joint working paper during the first Preparatory Committee meeting for the Review Conference of the NPT in the year 2000. Though cut-off and nuclear disarmament are mentioned in the same sentence, no linkage is explicitly called for. This may indicate a softening of the NAM position in comparison to its statement issued in 1996.

The first conflict has its implications for the second. Further significant progress beyond the current deadlock appears only to be feasible, if the first conflict can be solved. A solution of the second conflict depends on such a positive outcome of the first conflict. The future of the NPT will be endangered, unless the promises given in the paper "Principles and Objectives" of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference are turned into action. Therefore, progress at the CD appears as precondition for a successful NPT review process.

In face of the current impasse at the CD in Geneva, three strategies are of utmost importance:

1. One is to make use of other multilateral fora to reach agreements between a limited number of states,
2. another is to agree on an international register of weapons-usable nuclear material as an important and agreeable starting step for progress towards a cut-off agreement,
3. the third strategy is to identify further steps which have equivalent impact on recognized and threshold nuclear weapons states.

These strategies establish a complimentary approach to the proposed immediate start of negotiations towards a Nuclear Weapons Convention (NWC) which might serve as a framework for progress in both nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament in a reciprocal way (3).

First strategy: Other fora.

Since the prospects for negotiating a cut-off agreement at the CD became unclear, other possible fora to reach relevant agreements are

of increased importance:

- Talks for an International Plutonium Regime at Vienna
- NPT Review Conference and related PrepComs
- Discussions among the five nuclear weapons states
- Discussions between the nuclear threshold and nuclear weapons states
- Bilateral talks between Russia and USA (Gore-Chernomyrdin committee)
- Bilateral talks between India and Pakistan
- Israelic-Arabic peace talks

The goal of expanding the cut-off mandate to civilian materials is sometimes included in proposals for a Comprehensive Cut-off Convention (CCC) (4). For this the talks at Vienna regarding an International Plutonium Regime are of special significance, because it touches the civilian weapons-usable materials in the five nuclear weapons states as well as Belgium, Germany, Japan and Switzerland. The aspect of agreement on common standards for the safe and secure handling of plutonium set aside, these talks can also be seen as a chance to discuss possible commonly agreed restrictions on production and use of plutonium. For example Japan proposed the "zero stock" approach which would imply a moratorium on plutonium reprocessing until all existing stocks of separated plutonium are immobilized, e.g. by putting it into MOX fuel and irradiating it in a nuclear reactor.

As a result of the first NPT PrepCom in April 1997, it was agreed that special time should be reserved in the further review process to discuss a ban on the production of fissile material for nuclear explosive devices. This proves the assumption that the NPT review process might become a further international forum to deal with the cut-off issue. The second PrepCom is scheduled for April 1998 in Geneva, the third for April 1999 in New York. Both will play an important role in making progress with regard to future non-proliferation measures. Whereas nuclear disarmament has been judged at the first PrepCom in the usual fashion by observing the past achievements, the demand for inclusion of negotiations with the NPT member states on future measures was strictly denied by the nuclear powers (5).

For further progress regarding restrictions on weapons-usable materials it is important to search for possibilities for unilateral steps, regional approaches, or bilateral agreements. For example India and Pakistan might start a bilateral process to put the nuclear ambiguity under control by addressing first tritium production because it appears to be the least delicate issue (6).

Second strategy: Begin with an international register

In order to get things moving again, the efforts should first concentrate on the easiest and least demanding step to put all weapons-usable materials under international control. This is the establishment of an international register of inventories and

production capabilities for all relevant materials. Amazingly, this demand addresses the most urgent step to be taken, though many analysts would at first glance complain that it would be a significant drawback to focus on material balances and leave further production uncontrolled for the time being. However, when analyzing nuclear disarmament from the perspective of the final goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world it becomes apparent that this measure is actually the most important to assure at a later stage that there are no retentions of secret stockpiles of weapons-usable materials.

The incentive to withdraw nuclear weapons or related materials increases with progress in nuclear disarmament and is the highest when nuclear weapons are completely eliminated. The incentive is very low now. But successful, and undetected withdrawal is absolutely easy as long as no international registers are in place. Therefore, registration of all stocks should begin before the motivation for hiding material increases in order to achieve the highest possible (7) trust and assurance for all future times that no material has ever been put aside. This measure is even more important than effective production bans and reductions of stocks. These steps not only require the registration as a basis for verification but would also increase the incentive for clandestine withdrawal as long as detailed registers are not in place.

All nuclear weapons and materials will have to be declared, detailed balances to be published and any changes have to be declared as well on a regular basis. Verification is most necessary at the beginning. When later physical inventory taking and other inspections are accepted, it will be possible to check the consistency with past declarations and any discrepancies will give raise to suspicions of hidden materials which will trigger special investigations. Therefore, it is of utmost importance to demand very detailed material balances. Figures should not be rounded on a scale larger than kilogram. The international registration of weapons-usable materials is the step which is the easiest to achieve and, in fact, first actions have already been undertaken in this regard. The nine countries which participate in the International Plutonium Regime talks in Vienna have promised early in 1995 to release annual plutonium balances (8). They have now almost reached an agreement on a common standard for these balances. At the NPT PrepCom meeting in April, Norway has proposed a specific approach to take voluntary measures to increase transparency on holdings of weapons-grade fissile material. Such a confident building measure would facilitate negotiations on a cut-off treaty as well as any further talks on nuclear disarmament. To increase the international confidence in the correctness and accuracy of the reported data Norway suggested four specific measures: (9)

- "1. All nuclear capable states would submit information on their stocks, if any, of weapon-grade fissile material.
2. Cooperative international measures would be put into place in order to clarify and confirm these declarations.
3. The nuclear weapons states, or any state that submits information on holdings of weapons-grade fissile material, could permit inspection of such holdings. The aim would be to ensure that the

inventory in storage can only be withdrawn for non-weapons purposes.

4. Agreed monitored net reductions from stockpiles could be envisaged.“

Third strategy: Identify equivalent steps

A clearly accepted demand is that a cut-off agreement should be non-discriminatory. Currently, the view is predominant that this would imply identical obligations for all states. For example all states should stop the production of fissile material for weapons purposes or outside of safeguards. On the other hand it has to be taken into account that identical provisions may have different impact on the perceived national security interests of different groups of countries. A mandate at the CD which is in this sense discriminatory and any agreement based on such a mandate will not be acceptable to those states which see themselves in a disadvantage. Therefore, it is imperative to search for reciprocal measures which have equivalent impact especially on the five recognized nuclear weapons states and on the nuclear threshold states.

When looking from the perspective of going from very deep cuts down to a nuclear-weapon-free world one can get a more clear understanding of equivalent steps. The nuclear threshold states have a policy of nuclear ambiguity which means that they neither deny nor confirm whether they have nuclear weapons. They are known to possess sufficient amounts of nuclear-weapons-usable material to produce a number of nuclear weapons. It is suggested here that never in the process towards a nuclear-weapon-free world shall these states be recognized as nuclear weapons states. When these states join the nuclear disarmament progress they should reduce the upper limit of their stocks of nuclear-weapons-usable materials while the recognized nuclear weapons states reduce further the limits of their nuclear arsenals. In the last step towards eliminating nuclear weapons the threshold states should surrender the remaining stocks of material while the nuclear weapons states surrender the remaining nuclear weapons. The complete surplus of nuclear material of the latter may be put under control at an earlier stage.

>From this logic it becomes apparent that the reductions of stocks of weapons-usable materials in the two different groups of countries are not equivalent. Materials in threshold states should be regarded equivalent to nuclear weapon arsenals in recognized nuclear weapons states. Therefore, the current mandate at the CD for cut-off negotiations cannot be made non-discriminatory by only including reductions of stocks from past production into the agreement. This is because the nuclear weapons states do not need further production of fissile materials and in general have already a production moratorium in place. On the other hand, the threshold states have the feeling that their nuclear options are significantly restricted especially if stocks from past production are included in the ban.

The only way of taking reciprocity serious is to aim at a cut-off

agreement that includes both non-proliferation and disarmament provisions. Any measure that puts the unsafeguarded weapons-usable material and production facilities in nuclear threshold states under some sort of control serves per definition the goal of non-proliferation. Therefore, it is necessary to look for provisions which are clearly serving nuclear disarmament.

The only measure within an agreement on nuclear-weapons-usable materials that may have some impact on disarmament by the nuclear weapons states would be a control of further tritium production because fresh supplies of this material may be necessary some time early in the next century in the case that nuclear disarmament stops to keep pace with the natural decay of this radioactive superheavy hydrogen isotope at 5.5% per year (10). Therefore, it is suggested here to take a ban on tritium production in recognized nuclear weapons states as a measure that is equivalent to an appropriate control of fissile materials in threshold states.

In the year 1988 a similar suggestion with the intention of using the decay of tritium as a forcing function for nuclear disarmament was discussed in the USA (11). This proposal was rejected on good purpose mainly with the argument that it would resemble the dog wagging its tail. If one tries to push nuclear disarmament by using the tritium decay as a forcing factor, then one is diverting the delicate negotiations about stockpile reductions. The proposal made here is significantly different from the one put forward earlier. If tritium is taken out of a nuclear weapon, it is made dysfunctional but it is still a nuclear weapon and this process is reversible (12). Tritium can be introduced again into the same weapon. Therefore, this process can be viewed as taking nuclear weapons off alert for a longer time. It will take some time to get them on alert again. In the worst case it may take about a year to produce the required amount of tritium, depending on how long tritium was allowed to decay below the demand.

The advantage of such an approach is that a weak linkage is established between non-proliferation efforts directed against threshold states and disarmament measures addressing the recognized nuclear weapons states. This weak linkage avoids the seemingly unbridgeable gap between nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. The linkage is weak because a ban on tritium production may never have a restricting effect on nuclear arsenals provided that independently conducted disarmament keeps pace with the decay of tritium. If START II is realized no tritium production is necessary for at least the next two decades. Thus, the decay of tritium provides a soft and - if perceived to be necessary, a reversible - time bound framework for nuclear disarmament and thus enables to achieve a compromise between the NAM states and the nuclear weapons states regarding such a demand.

## Conclusion

Since nuclear arms control negotiations at the Conference on

Disarmament in Geneva appear to be widely deadlocked, other international fora and unilateral measures in the direction of restricting the accessibility of nuclear materials for weapons purposes gain importance.

When analysing proposals on nuclear disarmament from the perspective of going towards a nuclear-weapon-free world one can clearly learn two lessons.

1. The most important step to be taken soon is the establishment of a detailed and complete international public register of nuclear weapons and nuclear-weapons-usable materials. Fortunately, this is the most easiest step to be taken to overcome the current deadlock in nuclear disarmament.

2. Any approaches to internationally further restrict the accessibility of nuclear materials for nuclear weapons purposes can only be achieved, if they are non-discriminatory in their effects on nuclear ambitions of recognized and threshold nuclear weapons states. One possibility in this respect is to ban the production of tritium in nuclear weapons states. This bears the potential of solving two international conflicts. Besides of introducing a real disarmament provision into a cut-off agreement and overcoming the conflict between nuclear weapons and threshold states, this measure would at the same time be able to meet the demand of the NAM states to agree on a time-frame for a phased elimination of all nuclear weapons. Thus, it may avoid the conflict between NAM and nuclear weapons states at the NPT review process.

As long as the nuclear weapons states are not prepared to include disarmament measures into a cut-off agreement, the nuclear threshold states will never be prepared to negotiate such a treaty.

As long as the nuclear weapons states are not prepared to discuss future disarmament measures within the NPT review process, a discriminatory situation in this important international forum can hardly be avoided.

\* This paper has been prepared for the 47th Pugwash Conference, Lillehammer, Norway, 1-7 August 1997.

- (1) On August 8, 1996, at the CD in Geneva the G-21 group of states tabled a Programme of Action for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons which Chile and South Africa did not support. See for example INESAP Information Bulletin No. 10, August 1996, page 47.

- (2) See M.B. Kalinowski, Nuclear powers reluctant to talk with other nations on nuclear disarmament within the NPT review process, proffered paper, 47th Pugwash Conference, Lillehammer, Norway 1-7, August 1997.

- (3) A model Nuclear Weapons Convention was drafted by NGOs and launched on April 7 in New York. The drafting group was convened by the Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy (LCNP) and technical assistance was provided by the International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation (INESAP).

- (4) See for example W. Liebert, M.B. Kalinowski, Proposal for a Comprehensive

Cutoff including civilian weapon-usable material, INESAP Information Bulletin No. 4, January 1995, pages 11-14.

(5) See Kalinowski (1997), op.cit.

(6) See P. Hoodbhoy and M.B. Kalinowski, The Tritium Solution, The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists Vol. 52, July/August 1996, pages 41-44.

(7) It should be noted that absolute assurance that no material has been diverted can never be given due to the large uncertainties which are inherent to accountancy of bulk material.

(8) See Nucleonics Week, 26 January 1995, page 5.

(9) See conference room paper on cluster 1 presented by the Delegation of Norway during the first Preparatory Committee Meeting in April 1997 in New York.

(10) M.B. Kalinowski, International Control of Tritium - A Technical Assessment of Measures for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament, forthcoming as volume 4 of the Science and Global Security Monograph Series (edited by H.A. Feiveson), Gordon and Breach Science Publishers: New York et al. 1997.

(11) Nuclear Control Institute (NCI) and American Academy of Arts and Sciences (AAAS), The Tritium Factor - Tritium's Impact on Nuclear Arms Reduction, Washington/Cambridge 1988.

(12) M.B. Kalinowski, The impact of complete elimination of tritium on a nuclear arsenal. Appendix A to M.B. Kalinowski, L. Colschen: International Control of Tritium to Prevent Horizontal Proliferation and to Foster Nuclear Disarmament, Science and Global Security 5 (1995) 187-196.

---

Martin Kalinowski, IANUS, c/o Institut fuer Kernphysik  
Schlossgartenstr. 9, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany  
Tel.: +49-6151-163016 FAX: +49-6151-166039  
Internet, private: KALINOWSKI@HRZPUB.TH-DARMSTADT.DE  
Internet, group: IANUS@HRZPUB.TH-DARMSTADT.DE  
<http://www.th-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/welcome.htm> and [.../inesap.htm](http://www.th-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/welcomes.htm)

---

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 28 Aug 1997 22:10:45 -0700 (PDT)  
From: flick@igc.apc.org (flick)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: response re 1998 prepcom  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: flick@pop.igc.apc.org

Thank you dear Abolitionists for your responses re the 1998 NPT PrepCom.

I want to try to summarize what I've heard so far and ask for volunteers for jobs. Sorry its long.

BEGINNING NOW :-)

Its generally agreed that Abolition 2000 should start NOW on NPT stuff. Can people on this list volunteer the steps they will take in each country to begin the application of NPT focused pressure? How many countries are represented on this list?

Colin suggested a pre-PrepComm chart of country positions . Who would like to begin this project? Who will volunteer to coordinate the collection of this information and its updating as Abolition 2000 people ascertain governmental positions as they develop? Colin I'm led to believe from your materials that IPB is the world's most "comprehensive peace network" - would you consider doing this??

#### VICTIMS/SURVIVORS

Can you all inform groups and individuals you know about the meeting and help to raise money for their travel? Which wealthier Abolition 2000 organisations can commit to fundraising in order to allow victims and survivors to the 1998 meeting? Should Abolition 2000 commit to raising a sum of say which might be distributed to assist but not completely pay for participants? Who do we know who will be in the area? Representation from the following areas would be great, any others Ive forgotten? :

- \* Australia
- \* Tibet
- \* Algeria, Muroroa and Fangataufa Atolls;
- \* India Rajasthan & various power plant sites
- \* Russia Kazakhstan and Novaya Zemya;
- \* Ukraine and Belaruss
- \* Johnston Atoll, Marshall and Bikini Islands, Eniwetok, Nevada, Alaska, Colorado and New Mexico.

#### PRE & POST NPT MEETING

To clarify - the idea was to have a conference open to \* ALL \* NGOs for information sharing/panels and some training workshops PRIOR TO the NPT and an Abolition 2000 wrap up AFTER the NPT for Abolition 2000 people to analyse positions, successes and future strategies. The responses indicate that a one day conference beforehand would be better.

I feel that 2 days prior to the conference would give us the time we really need but that one day is more realistic. Perhaps it could have 3 sections with equal emphasis on,

1. anticipating the political outcomes of 1998 NPT Meeting, (i.e. country positions and what to lobby for)

2 background information on the technical issues to be discussed (i.e. how to argue about fissban, NSA's and NWFZ)

3 training and orientation (ie. lobbying styles, where to get documents, who are the personalities to watch out for, housekeeping)

## PANELS

Rebecca suggested that groups organise pre NPT forums on particular subjects with the delegations. She also warned against gratuitous panels performed without clear aims or targeted audiences.

Can we organise forums on the following suggested topics in imaginative ways? Can we hold ones designed for other NGOs at the Pre NPT meeting? Which ones might they be?

- \* future steps for nuclear disarmament, timebound framework, phased approach
  - \* cut-off for nuclear weapons usable materials
  - \* negative security assurances, (does it really help or does it mislead the discussion?)
  - \* nuclear weapon free zones, especially in the Middle East and declared by local authorities and single countries
  - \* laboratory testing (Note Jospin position)
  - \* intersessional working group (Martin suggests: Perhaps we should find a country that proposes intersessional sessions and invite a delegate of such a country to brief NGOs about such a proposal. It would be even better to have more delegates present at such a discussion. How can we achieve this?)
- ANY RESPONSES TO MARTIN'S QUESTION?
- \* Asking Butler to come along and help - WHO HAS CONTACT WITH HIM???
  - \* A forum between Abolition 2000 and NAM countries.

## ART SPACE

I will get as much as I can for all NGOs and Abolition 2000 will need to volunteer information about spaces that are needed for particular displays. Thanks Rebecca, I'll begin now to make inquiries.

## NGO PRESENTATIONS

Groan. Personally I really do wish that the NGO community could do what we did in 1997 - coherently speak to the different issues while articulating the differences within the diversity of opinions. I think we jeopardize much if we demand indiscriminately. Making sure that we speak earlier and that copies of our interventions are distributed to each and every delegation is important to me. Getting a better audience than in 1997 also

has to be an aim.

## FOR YOUR INFORMATION

the 1998 NPT Logistics Coordinator is

Ms. Hannelore Hoppe  
United Nations Center for Disarmament Affairs  
Preparatory Committee  
Secretariat S-31408  
New York, NY 10017  
ph# 212.963.5540

## LETTER TO NPT CHAIR

I don't want my name to letters from Abolition 2000 because I will be doing stuff for the Disarmament Committee. This is the draft text to go to Strulak -- Please comment and Alice can you take suggestions for change from here and sign it??

Ambassador Tadeusz Strulak  
Foreign Ministry's Department of the UN,  
Al. J. Szucha 23, 00580,  
Warsaw Poland

Dear Ambassador Strulak,

The Abolition 2000 global network to eliminate nuclear weapons would like to congratulate you on the assumption of the chairmanship of the second Preparatory Committee for the NPT Review, meeting in Geneva in 1998. As a network of over 700 Non-governmental organisations (NGOs), Abolition 2000 is eager to observe and contribute to the proceedings of the second PrepCom. As with Ambassador Patikallio, we hope to have the opportunity of hearing from you as the chair of the Preparatory Committee during the proceedings and at their conclusion.

The Abolition 2000 network was pleased by some decisions made at the 1997 PrepCom regarding NGOs. We very much hope that the opportunity to distribute documents will again be available in 1998. In turn, it would be extremely helpful if a mechanism could be established that would allow NGOs to receive the text of working documents and speeches delivered in the Preparatory Committee meetings. Perhaps the Special NGO Committee on Disarmament could receive a set number of copies which could then be distributed to NGOs present.

At the first Preparatory Committee held in 1997, the Abolition 2000 caucus was disappointed by the limited access NGOs had to the discussions. The role of NGOs in building the 'political will' so often referred to by governmental actors should not be underestimated. We request that more sessions be held informally in 1998 so as to enhance the dialogue between governments and the NGO community who are eager to help make the NPT Review a fruitful one.

While we very much look forward to the opportunity of addressing the

delegates to the conference similar to that we had in 1997, we suggest that our expertise and views would be more useful and pertinent if expressed earlier in the proceedings. Using 1997 as a precedent, we would like to see a half day session devoted to hearing from NGOs. We very much believe that encouragement from you as the chair would ensure governmental attendance of this session and suggest that making the session a formal one would best fulfill this purpose.

Throughout the Preparatory Committee meeting the Abolition 2000 caucus and the NGO community will be conducting a series of panel discussions on relevant subject areas. We very much hope that you will be able to join us in these informal discussions held to maximise the opportunity of dialogue between governmental and non-governmental actors working towards strengthening the implementation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

blah blah

Thats all for now,

love flick

PS I wish the pest debate would end soon.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 1997 01:18:01 GMT

From: acronym@gn.apc.org (Rebecca Johnson)

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Geneva update

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id SAA01268

X-Sender: acronym@gn.apc.org

## GENEVA UPDATE

### CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

#### Summary

The Conference on Disarmament (CD) heard the preliminary reports from the four special coordinators appointed at the end of June on the issues of landmines and three aspects of the CD's structure and functioning: the agenda, possible further expansion, and improving the ways the CD works. No further decisions were taken on ad hoc committees. This summer has seen a great changeover of ambassadors and delegation members. While some turnover is inevitable, it is clear that a number of capitals are using the present impasse to re-assess the resources they put into the CD.

At the weekly plenaries, the time is divided between government statements, mostly covering old ground, and thoughtful, sometimes humorous farewell speeches from outgoing ambassadors. US President Clinton's decision on 18 August, to join the Ottawa Process and participate in the Oslo meeting to finalise a total ban on the production, export and use of landmines, was formally welcomed in a statement from Kofi Annan, the UN Secretary-General.

The four special coordinators appointed on 26 June reported back from their consultations on 28 August. Ambassador John Campbell of Australia identified four possible options for future work on anti-personnel landmines (APL) but reported that CD members wanted to see the outcome of the Ottawa Process before deciding how to address the landmines issue in the Conference. Campbell's request to continue as special coordinator for landmines during the intersessional period, in order to prepare for a decision early in 1998, was not greeted with enthusiasm by the G-21 Group of Non-Aligned States, and is unlikely to be agreed.

As Special Coordinator on 'the improved and effective functioning of the CD', Ambassador Mounir Zahran of Egypt reported that CD members wanted generally to retain the present rules of procedure, group system and rule of consensus in decision-making. Zahran identified four issues on which further discussion would be needed: whether to make a distinction between matters of substance and procedure when applying the consensus rule; whether the agenda and programme of work should be adopted each year, as at present, or less frequently, on a biennial basis or longer; whether to provide a more descriptive annual report from the CD to the UN General Assembly; and whether to permit greater involvement of NGOs in the work of the Conference, such as allowing them to deliver statements at plenary meetings.

Ambassador Harald Kreid of Austria, Special Coordinator on CD expansion,

reported that while no delegations opposed further expansion in principle, there was much disagreement over timing, scope and selection criteria. In particular, he noted the importance to several delegations of ensuring the optimum number for conducting negotiations, with balanced political and geographical representation. After describing the various considerations put forward, Kreid concluded that "at this stage a decision on the question of expansion appears premature."

The Special Coordinator on the review of the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament, Ambassador Péter Náray of Hungary, gave an overview of two 'main schools of thought' on the agenda, and then summarised the particular attitudes towards each individual item on the agenda adopted this year. The first school of thought (clustered round the non-aligned states) stresses the necessity for nuclear disarmament to remain 'the absolute priority on any future Agenda of the CD'. As this group advocates a strong relationship between the final document of the first special session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament (UNSSOD I, 1978), the 'decatalogue' and the CD's agenda, they consider that major changes to the priorities can only be introduced by a new special session on disarmament. The Non-Aligned Movement had proposed a fourth special session on disarmament to be held in 1999, but after the UN Disarmament Commission failed to agree on its agenda in April, it looks as if the United States will be successful in preventing the special session from being held before the year 2001.

The second school of thought (clustered around the Western group), argues that 'the agenda should be brought in line with the profound changes which have occurred in the world'. They believe that the present agenda is 'anachronistic and should be replaced by a new, updated, streamlined, forward-looking and realistic' agenda, focusing on items with a real potential for substantive or preparatory negotiations. They subscribe to the 'notion of balance between nuclear and conventional items' and tend towards the view that the priority now is to start negotiations on banning the production of fissile materials for explosive purposes (fissban) and on landmines.

There is no expectation that work can begin this year on any of the issues before the CD: fissban; nuclear disarmament; landmines; prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS); negative security assurances (NSA) from the nuclear weapon states (NWS) to the non-nuclear weapon states (NNWS); or transparency in armaments and the registration of conventional weapons (TIA).

The more optimistic among the diplomats and observers hope that the CD can use its time now to build consensus so that work on one or two key issues could begin in 1998. Their wishes do not look likely to be realised. As debate on the work programme during the two-day plenary at the end of the second part of this session showed, [footnote, the verbatim record of this important plenary has now been published, as CD/PV.770, 26 June 1997.] there are at least four factions vying for dominance. Simply characterised, at opposite poles are the NWS (with the exception of China), who say 'anything but nuclear disarmament', and a group of delegations within the G-21 group of non-aligned states, who insist 'first and foremost, negotiate a time-table for nuclear disarmament'. These delegations are akin to the 'group of like-minded states' which opposed the indefinite extension of the NPT in 1995, but in the CD, India plays a prominent role. Then there are

the NNWS from the Western Group, Eastern Europeans and some non-aligned states who argue for the CD to fulfil the Shannon mandate and start negotiating a fissban as a first step.

The demand for fissban negotiations became blurred at the beginning of 1997 by the United States' determination to have the CD deal with the issue of landmines, perceived by many as an early attempt to divert support from the Ottawa Process and maintain 'big power' solidarity with China and Russia. Although the Clinton administration appeared to want a fissile materials cut-off treaty (FMCT) as well, the consequence of its initiative on landmines was that attention and pressure were diverted from the fissban issue. In his plenary address on 31 July, the Deputy Director of the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), Ralph Earle II, claimed that "The CD has a window of opportunity to negotiate a fissile material cutoff and a ban on APL." However, in the view of many other delegations, neither they nor the Conference have the resources to negotiate two detailed agreements simultaneously.

Those for and against the CD addressing landmines cut right across the boundaries drawn by the nuclear issue. To add to the complications, the opponents to the CD taking up landmines in 1997 comprised both advocates of a total ban, which preferred the fast-track Ottawa approach, and governments who wanted to retain the right to make and use landmines, at least in some circumstances. Countries which advocated the total prohibition of landmines production, export, stockpiling and use were unenthusiastic about doing it in the CD, because they considered that the structure and procedures of the Conference would hinder the rapid and effective achievement of such a ban.

Now that the Ottawa Process looks certain to conclude a total ban accepted by some 80-100 countries, the CD may end up dropping the landmines issue, leaving it to the Convention on Certain Weapons (CCW) and the Ottawa Process to fill in the holes between them. Alternatively, the Conference may decide on a role for itself in negotiating a step by step process towards a total ban, as promoted by Britain, France and the United States, beginning with a verifiable ban on exports that would include all major producers, including countries such as China and Russia, which have no present intention of signing the Ottawa treaty.

#### Fissban still deadlocked

Despite the rhetoric of support from a number of western countries, the fissban seems further away than ever. Most of the non-aligned (and many other NNWS, privately) do not see much point in a fissban that does not address the existing stockpiles of plutonium and highly enriched uranium. At the very least they want the convention to be able to audit the quantities and locations of storage. The NWS, India and Israel oppose the inclusion of stocks, although India's position has recently shifted. Instead of rejecting consideration of stocks per se, India now argues that negotiations on any fissban must be within a framework of commitment to the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Several levels of compromise would have to occur before the CD will be in a position to open negotiations on a fissban next year. The NWS, particularly the United States, would need to agree to some mechanism for addressing the

wider issues of nuclear disarmament in the CD. The G-21, especially India, would need to accept initial discussions on this without a mandate to negotiate the time-bound elimination of nuclear weapons. Both sides would need to accept that the question of whether stockpiles will be addressed or excluded will need to be discussed during the negotiations and cannot be settled before negotiations start. The NWS could help the process along by opening discussions among themselves on transparency and accounting, with a view to resolving some of the political and technical questions that will arise. If it were possible for the states concerned to compromise their positions sufficiently, fissban negotiations could then get started. But unless the underlying political problems are resolved, the multilateral negotiations will be difficult and time-consuming, with the likelihood of duplicating the entry-into-force problems that beset the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in 1996.

The different attitudes towards existing stocks of fissile materials and India's demand to place a fissban in the context of a time-bound framework for nuclear disarmament reveal fundamentally different perceptions of the purpose of halting fissile material production. It will not be possible to conclude a multilateral fissban successfully without resolving the competing interests of those who seek non-proliferation as a step towards nuclear disarmament and those who advocate non-proliferation as a means of freezing the nuclear status quo at current levels.

In an attempt to revive the prospects of the neglected cut-off, Ralph Earle asserted the importance of the FMCT in "the overall process of nuclear disarmament". He cited the importance of codifying the voluntary policy declarations by the NWS into a legal and verifiable obligation, "making the reversal of those policies far more difficult." Earle also urged the CD to "consider the reinforcing impact that an FMCT would have on parallel efforts to dismantle nuclear warheads, to place fissile material that is determined to be excess to national security requirements under safeguards and to achieve even deeper nuclear weapons reductions leading toward their eventual elimination. These efforts could be harmed if unsafeguarded fissile material production is not banned." He concluded by emphasising that "without a cut-off treaty, the chances of achieving the ultimate goal of nuclear disarmament would be decreased significantly." But for most of the non-aligned states the problem lies not only in new production, but in the fissile material being retained for 'national security requirements', begging fundamental questions about the nuclear haves and have-nots.

Though many accept Earle's arguments on the benefits of a fissban, there is real scepticism about the motives of the NWS and the limitations of a basic cut-off treaty. Their cynicism has been fuelled by the recent disclosure of US Department of Energy documents which indicate the extent of US nuclear weapon modernisation programmes under the CTBT, signed in September 1996.[footnote: Christopher E Paine and Matthew G McKinzie, End Run: the US Government's Plan for Designing Nuclear Weapons and Simulating Nuclear Explosions under the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, Natural Resources Defense Council, Washington D.C., August 1997]

Landmines

The pressure to deal with landmines in the CD has relaxed considerably. It

is clear to all that the Ottawa Process is on track to finalise a draft 'Convention on the prohibition of the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines and on their destruction' by December. Whatever happens in the CD now will not materially affect the Ottawa Process. At the CD plenary on 21 August, the United States announced its intention to participate fully in the Oslo meeting of the Ottawa Process, scheduled for September. Katherine Crittenberger said that in view of the growth in support for the Ottawa process and to "take advantage of the momentum behind the Ottawa process" the US had decided to participate in the Oslo meeting and would "work to secure an agreement that achieves our humanitarian goals while protecting our national security interests." Crittenberger also reiterated the US support for step-by-step negotiations in the CD.

The US move was welcomed in a statement from UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, but prompted a sharp response from China's Ambassador Sha Zukang, who indicated that China would have to rethink whether the CD should be enabled to play any role in restricting APL. On the reported understanding that the P-5 would 'stick together' against the Ottawa process, China had compromised its early position of complete opposition to landmines being addressed in the CD, and had shown flexibility towards the proposal for a phased, step-by-step approach, beginning with a ban on exports and transfers. First France and Britain, and now the United States, had deserted the P-5 solidarity to join the Ottawa process. Under intense pressure from public opinion and a well-organised landmines campaign, the US had found it increasingly difficult to hold out against the Ottawa Process. By joining now, it may hope to exert influence on the emerging treaty, especially with regard to the scope and entry-into-force provisions.

In its present form, the draft landmines convention which will be considered at Oslo categorically prohibits the use and production of anti-personnel mines (APM) 'under any circumstances'. There has been considerable discussion of exceptions for particular circumstances, as a number of countries including the United States prefer, but this has been fiercely resisted by the majority of Ottawa participants. According to the present draft, mines will be able to be transferred or retained only for the development and teaching of mine detection, clearance and destruction. The convention will include an obligation to destroy all anti-personnel mines and provide for certain rights and responsibilities of international cooperation and assistance. In its present form the convention does not place heavy emphasis on verification, but relies on transparency measures and procedures for consultations and clarification in the event of questions concerning compliance. Transparency measures would involve the declaration by participating states of the types, quantities and locations of mines and minefields, the status of programmes for decommissioning or converting mine production facilities and for destroying existing mines. Entry into force would be on the basis of ratification by 40 states, but this provision may come under heavy pressure in Oslo.

Ambassador John Campbell of Australia, appointed Special Coordinator for the CD on landmines, has been consulting with delegations about the possibilities for the CD to work on landmines in 1998. In his two reports to the CD, on 14 and 28 August, Campbell identified four possible options for dealing with APL in the CD:

i) a comprehensive mandate along the lines proposed by Japan and Hungary on 15 May (CD/1455), with the objective of negotiating an effective, legally-binding international agreement to ban the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of APL;

ii) a phased or step-by-step approach under an overall comprehensive objective, such as that proposed by the UK on 30 January (CD/1443), starting most probably with a ban on exports, imports and transfers of APL;

iii) a partial approach, according to which an ad hoc committee would consider discrete issues, such as exports and transfers and/or verification, but without the overall declared objective of seeking the total elimination of landmines.

iv) an ad hoc committee 'simply to review and discuss the world situation regarding landmines', but with no negotiating mandate.

Of these four options, Campbell said, the mandate with the most support was option ii), for a phased approach, beginning with consideration of a ban on exports, imports and transfers. However, it was clear from his consultations that there was no point in pushing for a decision on a mandate before the outcome of the Ottawa Process is known. Most delegations would prefer to decide on a specific mandate in early 1998.

Campbell concluded that, from 55 bilateral consultations, "a clear majority of delegation members of the Conference are in favour, or are at least not opposed to, appropriate work commencing in the CD on landmines." He also noted that at least two delegations needed further instructions and that two remained opposed to work in the CD.

Unofficial soundings among many of the delegations suggest that while overt opposition may be limited to a few, among those whom Campbell characterised as 'at least not opposed to' the CD taking up the issue of landmines, there is less enthusiasm than the Special Coordinator's report seems to indicate.

\* Very few seem to regard the Japan/Hungary comprehensive mandate feasible for the CD at this time.

\* As Campbell noted, if the CD is to address landmines, the phased approach has more backing than others. The United States, Britain and France are particularly strong advocates of starting this step-by-step option. Russia has said it could accept this approach. China had begun to acquiesce in this approach, but may revert to its earlier opposition in view of the US 'defection' to the Ottawa process.

\* There is also some support for an experts group to be set up by the CD to consider verification and technical issues concerning various levels of APL restrictions and prohibitions.

However, two other groups of views will need to be accommodated.

\* Mexico continues to argue that the CD should prioritise nuclear disarmament and not work on landmines at all, a position supported to a greater or lesser degree by a significant number of other G-21 states.

\* China appeared at one time to be flexible towards the option of working on an export ban, but its fundamental position is that the CCW remains the

correct forum for addressing landmines. China also argues that the priority should be de-mining, mine-clearance and rehabilitation of the injured, which is best done by other international organisations. China's view is shared by a number of other countries, none of whom are enthusiastic about the CD taking up landmines at all.

In addition to China and Russia, there are a significant number of governments which consider mines to be an essential component of their armoury. Few if any will expose themselves in outright opposition to the CD taking on landmines. At present, the persistent refusal by some of the NWS to consider the G-21 demand for an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament provides the non-aligned members of the CD with both cause and excuse for refusing an ad hoc committee on landmines.

#### Nuclear disarmament

Earle condemned linkages drawn between one area of work, such as fission or landmines, and another, particularly nuclear disarmament. However, he acknowledged for the first time that there was a conceptual distinction between the demand for a nuclear disarmament committee, backed by all members of the G-21, and the demand that the immediate task of such a committee should be to negotiate the elimination of nuclear weapons in a time-bound framework or by a set date, a position advocated by 26 of the G-21's members (29 states, now that 'Zaire' has been dropped from the CD).

Once again, Earle reiterated the US view that "The only realistic way to pursue nuclear reductions is through the bilateral START process and eventually through a process involving other nuclear weapon states." France and Britain, which do not engage in the START process, have long argued the same. Russia, which until early 1997 gave support (or at least non-opposition) to the G-21 call for a nuclear disarmament committee, is now reported to be opposed, sharing the US view that the CD could derail or jeopardise the START process. However, the START process is presently imperilled by the failure of the Duma to ratify START II. China has consistently given support to the G-21 demands and also voted in favour of the Malaysian resolution to the UN General Assembly in December 1996 (51/45M).

The special coordinator's report on the agenda from Náray again underlined that for a significant number of countries, nuclear disarmament remains the absolute priority for work in the CD. This has been reiterated time and again in official documents, working papers and plenary statements from the G-21. 'Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament' is presently item 1 on the CD agenda. Some delegations have suggested deleting the first part, so that the agenda item would simply cover nuclear disarmament. Some would favour merging this with agenda item 2, on 'prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters'. Some Western countries argued for a new agenda item covering 'non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament' to 'better reflect existing realities and the progress made in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation'. However, most of the G-21 would oppose this, fearing a shift in focus to the threshold states and away from the obligations of the declared NWS to negotiate the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

While the new governments in Britain and France may be more flexible on establishing nuclear disarmament talks in the CD, Russia's position on

nuclear weapons issues has been hardening over the past two years. The key to any possibility of movement on this issue remains the United States. Although all recent public statements have reiterated US government opposition to a CD role on nuclear disarmament, there are indications that the question is the subject of debate among sections of the Administration. As with the zero yield decision in the CTBT negotiations or the recent shift towards the Ottawa Process, the fact that a clear message against multilateral involvement in nuclear disarmament is being currently broadcast on all wavelengths does not preclude a future compromise. If the US changes position, it is likely to do so without much warning, choosing a time when conditions on Capitol Hill are more favourable. At that time it would expect to carry Britain and France, but may encounter stronger opposition from Russia.

The final part of the CD's 1997 session began on 28 July and will close on 12 September.

## BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

The Ad Hoc Group of States Parties to the 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction (BWC), met in Geneva from 14 July to 1 August to continue their work on strengthening verification. Following five previous meetings, held between 1995 and 1997, the Ad Hoc Group now for the first time has a rolling text for a draft protocol. The draft protocol, which covers confidence building and transparency, compliance measures and exchange of information for peaceful purposes and international cooperation, will be the subject of further negotiations in the Ad Hoc Group from 15 September to 3 October.

### Cuba accuses the United States

The States Parties to the BWC, of which there are presently 138, held a formal consultative meeting on 25 and 27 August to consider an allegation by Cuba of a suspected violation by the United States in 1996. The importance of this allegation lies not only in its serious subject matter, but because it is the first test of the procedures adopted at the Second Review Conference for consultations and clarifications among States Parties. The future credibility of the emerging verification regime may depend on the way in which Cuba's allegation and the evidence from both countries are treated in this test case.

Cuba alleged that on 21 October 1996 a small US-registered fumigation aircraft, normally used for crop spraying for narcotics eradication, was seen by a Cuban plane releasing a 'white or greyish mist' while flying high over Matanzas Province, in the western region of Cuba. Two months later, the potato plantations in that region were found to be infested by an insect blight called 'Thrips palmi karny', which, according to the complaint, had not been known in Cuba before then. The infestation later affected fields of corn, beans, pumpkins, cucumbers and other crops.

The United States 'unambiguously denies' the allegation. In his statement to the BWC Parties on 25 August, US representative Donald A Mahley agreed the presence of the aircraft, but argued that it was configured so as to

render it "incapable of carrying or dispensing insects as the Cuban government has alleged." He said that the plane was en route to Colombia via Grand Cayman after undergoing maintenance. The pilot released a plume of visible smoke as a safety precaution because he was not certain whether the Cuban civilian plane, which was flying below him, was aware of his presence. The US provided considerable technical evidence to back up its case that the plane could not have sprayed any infestation and that the Thrips palmi could not have survived in the plane's fuel-saturated tank system in any case.

The US argued that, though the Thrips palmi insect was indigenous to Asia, it had affected a number of Caribbean islands since 1985, and therefore could have spread to Cuba by wind dispersion or by inadvertently being carried in cargo from ships and aircraft from infected countries or islands. Some parts of Florida have also been affected by Thrips infestations. Mahley said that while the US had "no reason to doubt the accuracy" of Cuba's claim that the Thrips infestation had only been detected in the western province after December 1996, "it is not possible to determine conclusively the first appearance of an insect because of environmental and propagational variables." He concluded: "Simple failure of border quarantine is an obvious possible source of infestation, as is Hurricane Lili or numerous earlier windstorms. But one is absolutely certain -- the current infestation in Cuba was not caused by a cloud dispensed from a US aircraft overflying Cuba on October 21, 1996 or at any other time."

Cuba registered its first complaint with the US on 26 December, 1996, asking for clarification. Since then, there have been several exchanges on this subject between the two countries. Dissatisfied with the answers it had received, Cuba formally registered its complaint of a potential violation of the BWC with the UN Secretary-General on 29 April 1997 (A/52/128). The US rebutted the allegation on 6 May. Cuba submitted its counter-arguments and provided supplementary information on 27 June (A/52/213).

On 25 August, Cuba and the United States each gave their statements of evidence to the BWC parties. After two days of consultations between the two countries, mediated by the United Kingdom, which chaired the meeting, a deadline of 27 September was set for any states parties to- raise questions or make submissions regarding the Cuban and US arguments and evidence. These would then be incorporated into a report by 31 December 1997.

ends

email: acronym@gn.apc.org  
The Acronym Institute  
24, Colvestone Crescent  
London E8 2LH  
England  
telephone (UK +44) (0) 171 503 8857  
fax (0) 171 503 9153

Return-Path: <DCulp@nrdc.org>  
Date: Tue, 2 Sep 1997 08:08:24 -0400  
From: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)  
Subject: Nuclear Calendar  
To: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)  
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

NUCLEAR CALENDAR  
September 2, 1997

Revised the first of each month (and more frequently when warranted) by David Culp, Plutonium Challenge, (202) 289-2388, dculp@nrdc.org.

Changes from the last edition are marked with an asterisk (\*).

- \*September 2 Senate reconvenes
- Week of Sept. 2 House floor action on the  
Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill,  
H.R. 2267 (includes ACDA)
- Week of Sept. 2 House-Senate conference committee on the  
defense authorization bill, H.R. 1119
- Week of Sept. 2 House-Senate conference committee on the  
Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of  
1997, H.R. 1757
- Week of Sept. 2 House-Senate conference committee on the energy  
and water appropriations bill, H.R. 2203
- Week of Sept. 2 House-Senate conference committee on the  
defense appropriations bill, H.R. 2266  
(includes the Nunn-Lugar program)
- \*September 3 House of Representatives reconvenes
- \*September 3 Secretary of Energy Advisory Board, report from  
the Openness Advisory Panel, 10:15 a.m., Ritz-  
Carlton Hotel at Pentagon City, Arlington, Va.
- \*September 3 Russian Duma reconvenes for its fall session
- \*September 4 Senate Environment and Public Works  
Subcommittee on Superfund, Waste Control and  
Risk Assessment, hearing on the Superfund  
reauthorization bill, 2 p.m., SD-366 Dirksen
- \*September 5 DOE Defense Programs Office, tritium production  
tests begin at the Watts Bar nuclear power  
plant (Tenn.)
- September 6 U.S.S. Louisiana, the 18th and last Trident  
submarine, is commissioned, Kings Bay, Ga.
- \*September 9 Senate Armed Services Committee, confirmation  
hearing for Chairman-Designate of the Joint  
Chiefs of Staff Gen. Henry Shelton, 10 a.m.,  
SR-222 Russell
- \*September 9 Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee,  
confirmation hearing for DOE Under  
Secretary-Designate Ernest Moniz and DOE  
General Counsel-Designate Mary Anne Sullivan

(tentative)

- September 9 U.K. Prime Minister Tony Blair visits Washington
- \*September 11 Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, markup of the Superfund reauthorization bill, SD-366 Dirksen
- \*September 11 NATO-Russia Joint Council, preliminary meeting of ambassadors, Brussels, Belgium
- \*September 12 Conference on Disarmament, third session of 1997 ends, Geneva
- September 14-16 Women's Action for New Directions and Women Legislators Lobby conference, Washington
- \*September 15 Senate Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services, hearing on proliferation in the information age, 2:30 p.m., SD-342 Dirksen
- September 15 DOE Defense Programs Office, deadline for proposals for the production of tritium in commercial reactors
- \*September 15 Preliminary four-party Korean peace talks, New York
- \*September 15-19 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization, Preparatory Commission, third session, Vienna, Austria
- September 16 U.N. General Assembly convenes, New York
- \*September 18 50th anniversary of the Defense Department
- \*September 22 President Clinton addresses the U.N. General Assembly and meets with Russian President Boris Yeltsin, Indian Prime Minister I.K. Gujral and Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif, New York
- September 22 First NATO-Russia Joint Council meeting, New York
- \*September 22-24 Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission meeting, Moscow
- September 24 First anniversary of the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
- \*September 25 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, signing of demarcation agreement by United States, Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus, New York
- September 25-27 International Peace Bureau and (Russian) Civic Peace Association, international peace conference, Moscow
- \*September 26 Opening of The Peacemaker, a movie about terrorists who threaten New York City with a nuclear bomb stolen from Russia
- September 27 Sixth anniversary of the end of the Cold War (date used by the Energy Department)
- \*September 28 Rally to Stop Cassini, noon- 8 p.m., Lafayette Park, Washington
- \*September 30 State Department reorganization plan (including ACDA) submitted to Congress
- \*September 30 Federal Executive Branch agencies submit their Strategic Plans to the Office of Management and Budget and to Congress (Government Performance and Results Act)

September House Commerce Committee, markup of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997, H.R. 1270

September House Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, markup of the Superfund reauthorization bill (tentative)

\*September Senate Armed Services Committee, confirmation hearing for Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board member-designate Jack Mansfield

\*September Senate Armed Services Committee, courtesy hearing on the nomination of DOE Under Secretary-Designate Ernest Moniz (The Energy and Natural Resources Committee has jurisdiction for the confirmation of this position.)

\*September Senate Armed Services Committee, confirmation hearing for Under Secretary-Designate of Defense for Acquisition and Technology Jacques Gansler

\*September Senate Armed Services Committee, expected confirmation hearing for Assistant Secretary-Designate of Defense for International Security Policy Rose Gottemoeller (Ms. Gottemoeller has not yet been nominated.)

\*September DOE Nevada Test Site, subcritical nuclear test Holog

September DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, decision on preferred immobilization form for plutonium disposition (glass or ceramic)

September DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor for tritium EIS, notice of intent

\*September DOE Hanford Site (Wash.), solid waste EIS, notice of intent

\*September DOE INEEL (Idaho), high-level waste and facilities disposition EIS, notice of intent

\*September DOE Hanford Site (Wash.), draft remedial action EIS and land use plan

\*September DOE Rocky Flats (Colo.), plutonium residues draft EIS

\*September DOE Savannah River Site (S.C.), spent nuclear fuel management draft EIS

\*September DOE WIPP (N.M.), final supplemental EIS

\*September Russian Duma, debate and ratification of the NATO-Russian Charter (estimate)

October 1 Beginning of the federal budget year

October 1 20th anniversary of the Energy Department

\*October 1 DOE Environmental Management Advisory Board meeting, Washington

October 1 DOE Environmental Management Office, draft land use plans for Hanford Site (Wash.), INEEL (Idaho), Rocky Flats (Colo.), and Savannah River Site (S.C.) (P.L. 104-201, sec. 3153(f))

October 1 DOE Environmental Management Office, deadline for implementing performance-based contracting

for environmental remediation (P.L. 104-201, sec. 3176(d))

- \*October 1 National Cancer Institute, release of additional data on radioactive fallout from nuclear testing
- \*October 4 Stop Cassini demonstration, 2 p.m., Cape Canaveral, Fla.
- \*October 6 Senate Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services, hearing on the safety and reliability of the nuclear stockpile
- \*October 6 NASA launch of the Cassini-Saturn space probe, 5:38 a.m., EDT, Cape Canaveral, Fla.
- October 6-9 Australia Group (chemical and biological weapons nonproliferation regime) annual meeting, Paris
- \*October 8 U.S.-Australian ministers meeting, with Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and Defense Secretary Bill Cohen participating, Washington
- \*October 10-13 Fall "Call to the Desert" Gathering, Healing Global Wounds, Nevada Test Site
- October 11-19 Congressional fall recess
- October 12-17 President Clinton visits Brazil, Argentina and Venezuela
- October 15 Russian Defense Council, deadline for recommendations to President Yeltsin on plutonium disposition from committee chaired by Evgeny Velikhov
- Week of Oct. 20 NGO Committee on Disarmament, Disarmament Week conference, New York
- \*October 27 Senate Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services, hearing on North Korean proliferation
- \*October 29 Chinese President Jiang Zemin visits Washington
- \*October President Clinton submits the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to the Senate for ratification approval (estimate)
- \*October House of Representatives floor action on the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1997, H.R. 1270 (estimate)
- \*October DOE Arms Control and Nonproliferation Office, meetings on the draft study on the nonproliferation impact of reprocessing research reactor fuel at the Savannah River Site (S.C.), Washington and near Aiken, S.C.
- \*October DOE Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.), site-wide draft EIS
- \*October DOE WIPP (N.M.), supplemental EIS record of decision
- \*October DOE Environmental Management Office, waste management programmatic EIS record of decision
- \*October DOE Hanford Site (Wash.), public hearing on the

draft remedial action EIS and land use plan,  
Richland, Wash.

- October U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit, decision on electric utilities suit over the Energy Department's 1998 commercial high-level nuclear waste contract date (estimate)
- \*October Beginning of four-party Korean peace talks, Geneva (estimate)
- \*October Russian Duma, possible ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention (estimate)
- Fall Espionage and treason trial of Russian environmental activist Alexandr Nikitin, St. Petersburg, Russia
- November 1 Pittsburgh Regional CTBT Summit (proposed)
- November 4 U.S. election day (Special election to fill the seat of former New York Rep. Susan Molinari, New Jersey and Virginia gubernatorial elections, and many city elections.)
- November 14 Congressional adjournment (target date)
- November 15 Denver Regional CTBT Summit (proposed)
- November 24-25 Asian Pacific Economic Cooperation summit, Vancouver, Canada
- November DOE Rocky Flats (Colo.), plutonium residues final EIS
- November DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, draft request for proposals for MOX disposition for plutonium
- \*November Secretary of State Madeleine Albright visits India and Pakistan (estimate)
- \*November International Chernobyl financing conference, chaired by Ukrainian President Leonid Kuchma, Vice President Al Gore and European Bank for Reconstruction and Development president Jacques de Larosiere, New York
- December 1 National Defense Panel submits its final report on the Quadrennial Defense Review to Defense Secretary Bill Cohen (P.L. 104-201, sec. 924(e))
- December 2-3 NATO defense ministers meeting, Brussels, Belgium
- December 8 Tenth anniversary of the signing of the INF Treaty by President Reagan and President Gorbachev
- December 15 National Defense Panel final report on the Quadrennial Review goes to Congress (P.L. 104-201, sec. 923(e)(2))
- December 16-17 NATO foreign ministers meeting, Brussels, Belgium
- December 18 NATO-Russia Joint Council meeting, Brussels, Belgium (estimate)
- \*December DOE Arms Control and Nonproliferation Office, final study on the nonproliferation impact of reprocessing research reactor fuel at the Savannah River Site (S.C.)

- \*December DOE Environmental Management Office, draft accelerated cleanup plan released
- December DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor for tritium EIS scoping meetings, Washington and other cities
- December DOE Savannah River Site (S.C.), accelerator for the production of tritium draft EIS
- \*December DOE Savannah River Site (S.C.), spent nuclear fuel management final EIS
- December DOE Rocky Flats (Colo.), plutonium residues record of decision
- \*December EPA hearings on WIPP (N.M.) certification, Albuquerque, Carlsbad and Santa Fe, N.M. (estimate)

1998

- January 31 DOE takes title to the high-level nuclear waste at commercial nuclear power plants
- \*January DOE Savannah River Site (S.C.), spent nuclear fuel management record of decision
- January DOE Environmental Management Office, waste management programmatic EIS record of decision
- February 2 President Clinton submits the annual federal budget to Congress
- \*February DOE Hanford Site (Wash.), final remedial action EIS and land use plan
- February DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, final request for proposals for MOX disposition for plutonium
- February DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, surplus plutonium disposition draft EIS
- \*February 15 Central Intelligence Agency, report on congressional intelligence committees on National Intelligence Estimate on missile threats to the U.S. and on chemical, biological and nuclear weapon threats to the U.S. other than by missiles (Intelligence Authorization Bill for FY 1998, S. 858)
- March 1 DOE Defense Programs Office, selection of commercial nuclear power plants for tritium production
- March 15 DOE Environmental Management Office, final land use plans for Hanford Site (Wash.), INEEL (Idaho), Rocky Flats (Colo.), and Savannah River Site (S.C.) (P.L. 104-201, sec. 3153(f))
- \*March DOE Environmental Management Office, final accelerated cleanup plan released (estimate)
- March DOE Hanford Site (Wash.), remedial action EIS and land use plan record of decision
- \*March National Academy of Sciences' Institute of Medicine, completion of review of radioactive fallout from nuclear testing (estimate)

- March or April G-8 Energy Ministers Conference, Moscow
- \*April 10-13 Spring Healing Global Wounds gathering, Nevada  
Test Site
- April 22 Earth Day
- April 22 20th anniversary of the Treaty of Tlatelolco,  
which created the Latin American nuclear-free  
zone, entering into force
- April 26 Chernobyl commemoration day
- April 28 - May 8 Second PrepCom for the 2000 Non-Proliferation  
Treaty Review Conference, Geneva
- April Citizens for Alternatives to Radioactive  
Dumping, National Conference on Communities  
Contaminated by Nuclear Facilities, to be held  
in southeastern New Mexico
- \*April DOE Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.), site-  
wide final EIS
- \*Spring DOE Environmental Management Office, receives  
the first shipment of spent foreign research  
reactor fuel at the Concord Naval Weapons  
Station, (northeast of San Francisco, Calif.),  
to be transported to INEEL (Idaho)
- \*Spring President Clinton visits India and Pakistan  
(estimate)
- May 1-3 Physicians for Social Responsibility national  
conference, Arlington, Va.
- May 15 DOE Environmental Management Office, report to  
Congress on land use plans for Hanford Site  
(Wash.), INEEL (Idaho), Rocky Flats (Colo.),  
and Savannah River Site (S.C.) (P.L. 104-201,  
sec. 3153(g))
- May 15-17 G-8 Summit, Birmingham, United Kingdom
- May DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office,  
proposals due for MOX disposition for plutonium
- \*May DOE Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.),  
site-wide EIS record of decision
- May DOE WIPP (N.M.), target date for opening the  
facility
- Spring or Summer Senate floor action on the Comprehensive Test  
Ban Treaty (estimate)
- June 10 35th anniversary of President Kennedy's nuclear  
testing speech at American University

Copyright c 1997 by the Plutonium Challenge. Permission (and encouragement) is given to citizens groups to reproduce this calendar.

Return-Path: <owner-sunflower-napf@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 04 Sep 1997 20:52:27 -0700  
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>  
Sender: owner-sunflower-napf@igc.org  
To: sunflower-napf@igc.org  
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

THE SUNFLOWER  
a free electronic monthly newsletter  
of the NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION  
no. 4 (September 1997)

-----~oOo~-----  
The Sunflower is an educational newsletter which provides  
information on nuclear weapons abolition and other issues  
relating to peace in the Nuclear Age.

-----~oOo~-----  
IN THIS ISSUE  
-----~oOo~-----

# NEWS  
- NASA Intends To Launch Plutonium Probe  
- US Modifies Nuclear Warheads  
- UN Dues Still Not Paid By US  
- Australia Considers Buying Cruise Missiles  
- 43 Arrested At Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory  
# NEWS BRIEFS  
# ANNALS OF THE BIZARRE  
# ACTIONS YOU CAN TAKE  
# SEPTEMBER DATES TO REMEMBER  
# UPCOMING EVENTS  
# FOUNDATION NEWS  
# WORDS OF WISDOM  
# LETTERS TO THE EDITOR  
# BOOKS AND ARTICLES  
# EDITORS

-----~oOo~-----  
Since the third Tuesday in September is celebrated as the International  
Day of Peace (this year, September 16th), we have chosen the following  
quote to reflect on:

"Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the  
defense of peace must be constructed....Peace must therefore be founded,  
if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of  
mankind." --Charter of UNESCO

-----~oOo~-----  
NEWS  
-----~oOo~-----

NASA INTENDS TO LAUNCH PLUTONIUM PROBE

On October 6, 1997 NASA plans to launch a space probe to Saturn that is  
loaded with 72.3 pounds of Plutonium. The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation,

along with many other citizen action groups, believes that the U.S. government should postpone launching the so-called "Cassini Probe" until it has replaced the Plutonium on board with a solar energy source. Cassini will be riding on the same model Titan IV rocket that blew up after a launch from Vandenberg, California in 1993. Any disintegration at launch or at a later "slingshot fly-by" could release its plutonium contents into the Earth's atmosphere.

Info link: <http://www.fenton.com/archive/cassini.html>

Info link: <http://www.rain.org/~openmind/kaku1.htm> [and [../kaku2.htm](http://www.rain.org/~openmind/kaku2.htm)]

Info link: <http://www.rain.org/~openmind/cassolar.htm>

#### US MODIFIES NUCLEAR WARHEADS

U.S. laboratories are currently working on programs to provide new modified nuclear weapons designs. This violates the promise made by the Clinton administration when the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) was signed last year. Secretly, the U.S. government has employed an army of scientific and technological personnel to upgrade and replace a wide range of thermonuclear arms. (NYT, 970818; SBNP, 970819)

- FACT ->|According to a new study by the Natural Resources Defense
- FACT ->|Council the current U.S. nuclear stockpile is at 12,500
- FACT ->|warheads. New Mexico stores 2,850; Georgia 2,000;
- FACT ->|Washington 1,600; Nevada 1,450;

#### UN DUES STILL NOT PAID BY US

Earlier this year a bill was passed in the US Congress pledging to pay \$819 billion to the UN--less than what the US owes. Now, even this "underwhelming" bill is languishing after unsuccessful negotiations between the Senate and the House. The House version wants to bar UN funding for abortions and family planning, while the Senate is demanding UN reforms that would effectively marginalize the UN. (LAT, 970808)

#### AUSTRALIA CONSIDERS BUYING CRUISE MISSILES

On August 25, 1997 Reuters reported that Australia said it was considering purchasing long-range cruise missiles, a move that defense analysts immediately labeled a potential trigger for an arms race in Southeast Asia. (Reuters, 970825)

- FACT >|Eleven U.S. Nuclear bombs were lost in accidents
- FACT ->|and never recovered.

#### 43 ARRESTED AT LAWRENCE LIVERMORE NATIONAL LABORATORY

On August 6, the 52nd anniversary of the U.S. atomic bombing of Hiroshima, about 150 people gathered at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in Northern California for a rally and nonviolent direct action. 43 people were arrested at the main gate to the Lab as they attempted to symbolically deliver an "Order to Cease and Desist Illegal Activities" pursuant to the World Court opinion on the illegality of nuclear weapons. This event was part of the Abolition 2000 Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days campaign. (reported by Jackie Cabasso, <mailto:wslf@igc.apc.org>)

-----\-----~oOo~-----  
/##/ NEWS BRIEF  
-----\-----~oOo~-----

\*The US has regained from Russia the lead in exporting arms to developing nations. US sales reached \$7.2 billion last year, compared to Russian sales of \$3.9 billion. (NYT, 970816)

\*As many as 75,000 people exposed to Iodine-131 in fallout from above-ground nuclear bomb tests in the 1950s could develop thyroid cancer as a result, according to the National Cancer Institute. (LAT/NYT, 970802)

-----~oOo~-----  
ANNALS OF THE BIZARRE  
-----~oOo~-----

The Associated Press reported that a CIA special study group worried in 1952 that "the Soviets could use UFO sightings to touch off mass hysteria and panic in the United States." (LAT/AP, 970804)

-----~oOo~-----  
WHAT CAN I DO?  
-----~oOo~-----

- 1)==> POSTPONE THE CASSINI LAUNCH
  - ==> e-mail your REPRESENTATIVE: <http://www.house.gov/writerep/>
  - ==> e-mail your SENATOR: <http://www.senate.gov/senator/>
  - ==> write to the PRESIDENT: <mailto:president@whitehouse.gov>
- 2)==> SIGN THE ABOLITION 2000 INTERNATIONAL PETITION  
<http://www.wagingpeace.org/intlpetition.html>
- 3)==> CHECK OUT OUR WEB-PAGE: <http://www.wagingpeace.org/>
- 4)==> FORWARD THIS NEWSLETTER TO A FRIEND

-----~oOo~-----  
SEPTEMBER DATES TO REMEMBER  
-----~oOo~-----

- 1 September 1939: Hitler Germany invades Poland and starts the Second World War
- 17 September 1961: Dag Hammarskjold, second Secretary General of the United Nations, dies in a plane crash in the Congo while on a peacekeeping mission.
- 24 September 1996: Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), adopted by the UN, is opened for signature.
- 30 September 1986: Mordechai Vanunu, who revealed information on Israel's secret weapons program, is kidnapped in Italy by Mossad agents leading to a secret trial and sentencing to 18 years in solitary confinement. Vanunu has now served 11 years in solitary.

-----~oOo~-----  
UPCOMING EVENTS  
-----~oOo~-----

SEPTEMBER  
1-9 More than 100 UN member states are expected to attend the Oslo

Conference on Land Mines. Moves to ban the production, use and export of anti-personnel land mines will be finalized prior to a treaty being signed in Ottawa in December.

7-10 Non-Government Organization Forum Program debate and discussion on the dilemmas of landmines.

Info e-mail <mailto:jill@vi.org> or

Info link <http://www.vvaf.org/landmine/uscbl.htm>

8-10 Third Conference of the International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation (INESAP) at Fudan University in Shanghai, China. David Krieger, President of the Foundation, and Deputy Chair of INES, will speak on "International Humanitarian Law Versus State Survival In The Opinion of the International Court of Justice." By mid September, the speech will be available at:

<http://www.wagingpeace.org/shanghai97.html>

16 International Day of Peace (Hear the Children)

5pm-7pm: Santa Barbara, California: County Court House --  
Sunken Gardens

Info e-mail <mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org>

Info link <http://www.wagingpeace.org/pday.html>

25-28 "Human Security And Global Governance (HUGG): Non-Nuclear Prerequisites for Nuclear Disarmament." An international conference co-sponsored by The Toda Institute for Global Peace and Policy Research and The Norwegian Institute of International Affairs in London. David Krieger, President of the Foundation will speak on "Global Action For A Nuclear Weapons Free World, From Arms Control To Abolition." By the end of September, the speech will be available at:

<http://www.wagingpeace.org/london97.html>

## OCTOBER

23 Senator ALAN CRANSTON, chair of the Gorbachev Foundation/USA and chair of the State of the World Forum will discuss "Nuclear Weapons: New Dangers and New Opportunities," in a free talk at the Faulkner Gallery of the Santa Barbara Public Library. The event is co-sponsored by the Foundation and moderated by David Krieger.

-----~oOo~-----  
**FOUNDATION NEWS**  
-----~oOo~-----

The Foundation has published a new booklet in its WAGING PEACE series. The booklet, "Creating a Nuclear Weapons Free World: A Guide to Students and All Concerned Citizens" contains the following sections: Background on Nuclear Weapons Abolition, Nuclear Weapons Myths, Facts Everyone Should Know in the Nuclear Age, Reasons For Nuclear Weapons Abolition, Suggested Actions, and an appendix with documents. The booklet costs \$3.

The Foundation will announce the most recent winners of its Swackhamer Essay Contest and Lena Chang Scholarships in the next issue of WAGING PEACE WORLDWIDE, the Journal of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.

-----~oOo~-----  
Words of Wisdom  
-----~oOo~-----

"Peace is no mere matter of men fighting or not fighting. Peace, to have meaning for many who have known only suffering in both peace and war, must be translated into bread or rice, shelter, health, and education, as well as freedom and human dignity--a steady better life. If peace is to be secure, long-suffering and long-starved, forgotten peoples of the world, the underprivileged and the undernourished, must begin to realize without delay the promise of a new day and a new life." --Ralph J. Bunche

"Peace starts within each one of us. When we have inner peace, we can be at peace with those around us. When our community is in a state of peace, it can share that peace with neighboring communities, and so on. When we feel love and kindness toward others, it not only makes others feel loved and cared for, but it helps us also to develop inner happiness and peace."  
--The Dalai Lama

-----~oOo~-----  
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR  
-----~oOo~-----

Dear Waging Peace,

It is always good to get your material. Just one point on the latest edition of your e-mail newsletter regarding UK arms sales policy. You are right that a new policy was announced in July but sadly this did not mean that the sale of Hawk jets to Indonesia was canceled. As you will know these are deeply implicated in repression and brutality in East Timor. If you want more information about the reality behind the rhetoric contact Campaign Against the Arms Trade at <mailto:caat@gn.apc.org>  
Hope this is useful, keep up the good work.

Your in Peace,  
Janet Bloomfield

-----~W~  
BOOKS AND ARTICLES  
~W~-----

PROTEST AT MORUROA: First-hand accounts from the New Zealand-based flotilla, ed. By Claudia Pond Eyley. (Tandem, NZ\$39.95).

The book covers the experiences of fourteen New Zealand boats which sailed to Moruroa to protest French nuclear testing. As a participating observer Eyley interviewed 32 participants and supporters of the flotilla as well as the commander of the New Zealand naval vessel Tui, which joined the protest. The book is beautifully presented, with many photographs. (Keith Locke, <mailto:locke@iprolink.org.nz>)  
Order e-mail <mailto:books@oneworld.org.nz>.

LETTERS FROM QUEBEC: Philosophy for Peace and Justice, By Howard Richards (Elliott Chapin, Toronto: 1992)

With empathy and using a holistic approach, Howard Richards interprets fundamental global problems and presents very thoughtful solutions to them. Richards' penetrating insights and revealing anecdotes point

toward a path for living with hope, honesty, rationality, and love. He also validates durable truths as they apply to family, business, and society in general. His book has found use as an introductory philosophy text in US colleges. Info link <http://www.howardri.org>

"SOWING SEEDS OF PEACE," by David Krieger

The 52nd anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima invites us to reflect on our technological capabilities for destruction and our spiritual/moral precepts of respect for the dignity and sacredness of human life. Info link: <http://www.wagingpeace.org/seeds.html>

-----~oOo~-----  
EDITORS  
-----~oOo~-----

Dr. David Krieger, Dr. Christoph Hanterman, Corlei Prieto

-----~oOo~-----  
FEEDBACK  
-----~oOo~-----

PLEASE SEND US YOUR QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS  
<mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org>

-----~END~-----

To subscribe to "The Sunflower," please send a message  
To:majordomo@igc.org  
Subject: <leave empty>  
subscribe sunflower-napf <your email address here>

To unsubscribe to "The Sunflower," just send a message  
To:majordomo@igc.org  
Subject: <leave empty>  
unsubscribe sunflower-napf <your email address here>

Nuclear Age Peace Foundation

\*\*\*\*\*

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123  
Santa Barbara, California, 93108  
phone (805) 965-3443; Fax (805) 568-0466  
e- <mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org>  
web: <http://www.wagingpeace.org>

To: flick  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: 1998 NPT PrepCom  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Felicity:

Can you tell me the dates of the 1998 NPT PrepCom in Geneva? I'm active in the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition and want to explore whether we might get some world religious leaders to participate in an event at that time and place. That's why I need to know the dates.

Thanks,

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

>From flick Fri Sep 5 20:42:22 1997  
>Return-Path: <flick@igc.apc.org>  
>Date: Fri, 5 Sep 1997 20:42:14 -0700 (PDT)  
>X-Sender: flick@pop.igc.apc.org  
>To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
>From: flick@igc.apc.org (flick)  
>Subject: Re: 1998 NPT PrepCom  
>Sender: flick@igc.org

Hi!

as far as I know the dates are 27 April to 8 May 1998.

love felicity

>Dear Felicity:

>

>Can you tell me the dates of the 1998 NPT PrepCom in Geneva? I'm active in  
>the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition and want to explore  
>whether we might get some world religious leaders to participate in an event  
>at that time and place. That's why I need to know the dates.

>

>Thanks,

>

>Howard W. Hallman, Chair

>Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 08 Sep 1997 15:18:26 -0500  
From: John Loretz <jloretz@medglobe.tiac.net>  
Organization: Medicine & Global Survival  
Reply-To: jloretz@tiac.net  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: [Fwd: Re: Virus alert]  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

I saw the message from David McReynolds shortly after I sent this one to Stewart. David is absolutely right and I thought I'd pass along a little more specific info that might help people rest a little easier.

--

John Loretz  
Executive Editor  
Medicine and Global Survival  
126 Rogers St.  
Cambridge, MA 02142  
617-868-9230  
617-576-3422 (fax)  
jloretz@medglobe.tiac.net

M&GS on the World Wide Web:  
<http://www.healthnet.org/MGS>

Also visit the new International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) Web site (<http://www.healthnet.org/IPPNW>) for information about the Abolition 2000 campaign and IPPNW research studies and publications.

Message-ID: <34145C1C.591E@medglobe.tiac.net>  
Date: Mon, 08 Sep 1997 15:12:13 -0500  
From: John Loretz <jloretz@medglobe.tiac.net>  
Reply-To: jloretz@tiac.net  
Organization: Medicine & Global Survival  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Macintosh; I; 68K)  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: Stewart Kemp <nfznsc@gn.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Virus alert  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi Stewart:

Just a brief message to let you know that you can safely ignore any virus alert like this. People with too much time on their hands get these things started and, as you can see, the number of people who respond and clog up the inboxes of their friends and acquaintances multiplies exponentially.

The basic rules of thumb for protecting yourself against viruses spread over the Internet are as follows:

1. Never download and launch a \*program\* (i.e., demo software,

shareware, freeware, etc.) unless you know that it is virus-free -- either because you checked it with up-to-date antivirus software or it came from a reputable site that does its own checking (e.g., a known software company). Acquiring and using antivirus software is a *\*must\** if you are on the Internet.

2. Never download an *\*attachment\** to an e-mail message as a binary (or source) file unless you know and trust the sender. It is easy for someone to attach an infected file to e-mail, but it can't do anything to your hard drive until you open it. Make sure your e-mail reader is not configured to download and open attachments automatically (I don't know of any that do, but I also don't claim to know about everything that's out there).

3. Never open a Microsoft Word file from someone you don't know, without first scanning it with appropriate antivirus software (you should download the file to a floppy and not to your hard drive; lock the floppy and then check the file). There could be a virus written into a Word macro and you would never know this until the damage was done.

4. This is the main point: plain text (ascii) cannot contain viruses and the headers and bodies of all e-mail messages are ascii text. (Some readers will now let you send and receive html, but html is not a scripting language and can't be used to write virus code. I do not know of any e-mail readers that let you send/receive messages with Java applets in them, and if that ever happens all bets might be off.) In other words, simply reading your e-mail cannot infect your computer, as long as you follow the above precautions about downloading.

By the way, these bogus alerts come through about once a month and I have yet to see or hear of anyone actually receiving the "infected" message.

Hope this relieves some anxiety.

--

John Loretz  
Executive Editor  
Medicine and Global Survival  
126 Rogers St.  
Cambridge, MA 02142  
617-868-9230  
617-576-3422 (fax)  
jloretz@medglobe.tiac.net

M&GS on the World Wide Web:  
<http://www.healthnet.org/MGS>

Also visit the new International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) Web site (<http://www.healthnet.org/IPPNW>) for information about the Abolition 2000 campaign and IPPNW research studies and publications.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 08 Sep 1997 21:54:04 -0200  
From: International Peace Bureau <ipb@gn.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: FW: UN Reform/Disarmament: critique  
To: "'ABOLITION-CAUCUS'" <ABOLITION-CAUCUS@IGC.APC.ORG>,  
    "'Gensuikyo'" <antiatom@twics.com>,  
    "'Weiss, Cora'" <srfnyusa@IGC.APC.ORG>

-----  
From: Jan Lonn[SMTP:jlonn@undp.org]  
Sent: jeudi, 4. septembre 1997 12:51  
To: ipb@gn.apc.org  
Cc: Jan Lonn  
Subject: UN Reform and Disarmament

## UN REFORM AND DISARMAMENT

The establishment of a new Department for Disarmament and Arms Regulation was among the unexpected proposals in the UN reform package which was presented by Kofi Annan on 16 July, 1997.

A Department for Disarmament Affairs existed between 1983 and 1992 when it was downgraded by Boutros-Ghali into an Office for Disarmament, later renamed to the Centre for Disarmament which became a part of the Department for Political Affairs.

The role and priorities of the UN in promoting disarmament has been hotly debated in the UN over the past years with mostly developing countries insisting to keep the elimination of nuclear weapons as a priority item and the north with the nuclear powers at the lead seeking to shift the emphasis to non-proliferation and conventional arms. The disarmament priorities of Kofi Annan largely reflect the northern priorities and never mention the abolition of nuclear weapons as a goal and responsibility of the new department.

At his pressconference on 16 July Kofi Annan explained his motives as follows:

"I think disarmament is one of the crucial issues facing the world today. I am not dealing only with issues of weapons of mass destruction, but we will also be dealing with arms regulation, and we will need to be able to track the movement of lethal weapons, which these days get into hands which most of us would be worried about when we knew who those individuals were. We should also be able to track the movement of the small arms and the kinds of weapons that have really caused havoc in the Great Lakes region of Africa, in Albania and in other places around

the world. We should also be able to work with governments to develop the political will for the banning of land-mines, for example. I think the United Nations should have a strong focal point that will work with Member States and move them in the right direction to tackle some of these disarmament issues."

The department will be headed by an Under-Secretary-General and that is the only mentioning of additional resources for the new department. If it stops with that it will become the smallest department of the UN with few possibilities to take on additional tasks.

The establishment of the disarmament department belongs to the very few proposals in the largely pro-US reform package that is questioned by the US administration. In an interview August 6, 1997, Bill Richardson, the US Permanent Representative to the UN stated: "We just don't feel that establishing a new bureaucratic layer or creating a new title is in any way going to better the internal situation for disarmament questions in the United Nations. We already have an organization. Why heap another on top of it. That's our opinion in terms of the disarmament department."

Few reactions has come from other states but it is not to be excluded that the new department may also be questioned by developing countries who may feel that it is given a largely northern biased mandate of dealing with with small arms which may develop into inspection and intrusion into the sovereignty of third world countries.while the major powers are left off the hook.

Upgrading disarmament to a separate department is logical as disarmament was kept as a separate programme area in the medium term plan adopted by the General Assembly in 1996 through the firm insistence of the non-aligned countries. Most other major programme areas are either separate departments or directly under the responsibility of an Under-Secretary-General.

It is critical that the anti-nuclear peace movement makes its voice heard in the UN reform process. UN reform, which include the restoration of the disarmament department, will be a major issue during the 1997 General Assembly. Kofi Annan is expected to be the first speaker in the general debate which has not happened before. A Committee of the Whole is likely to be established which will begin its work immediately on his reform package after the conclusion of the general debate. Fundamental issues are at stake as at the core of the reform process is an attempt to appease the US with the hope of getting some backpayments of its 1,3 billion debt to the UN. Most of the elements in the reform package build on proposals from

the US and other industrialized countries at the same time as there are additions aimed to win the support of different other constituencies, including developing countries.

It is important for Abolition 2000 members to act for elimination of nuclear weapons to become a firm priority of the new department for disarmament as this is included in the priorities established by the UN General Assembly. And if peace organizations do not act to restore the balance in the UN disarmament work there is a risk that the whole upgrading of disarmament will be in jeopardy as it will be seen as yet another move to impose a northern agenda on the UN. It would be serious if the mandate as proposed by Kofi Annan for the new department is not challenged by Abolition 2000 members as considerable progress has been made in putting abolition of nuclear weapons on the UN agenda through the ICJ advisory opinion and the recent resolutions of the General Assembly calling for a nuclear weapons convention.

Also absent from the issues to be dealt with by the new department are new types of weapons of mass destruction, new dangerous and destabilizing weapon technologies, laser weapons and militarization of the space, etc. If weapon developments which drastically shift the security balance in favour of a few great powers are not addressed the disarmament work of the UN will not be seen as fair and contribute to genuine security.

The reform proposals for disarmament are well in line with the tendency of eroding the UN capacity in the economic area in favour of the dominance of the World Bank and making the UN concentrate on humanitarian and social issues instead of addressing root causes and equity issues in the global economic context. And the call for abolition of nuclear weapons is part and parcel of the campaign for a more just and equitable world based on international law and a United Nations which is working in the interest of all its member states, not only the privileged few.

Advocates of nuclear disarmament should consider making a strong presentation in connection with the UN reform process:

1. Supporting the upgrading of disarmament to a separate department in the UN to work in accordance with universally established UN mandates.
2. Insisting that abolition of nuclear weapons must become a priority topic of the new department in adherence to General Assembly resolutions and that new and destabilizing weapon technologies as well must be dealt with energetically.

APPENDIX:

>From UN Secretary General Kofi Annans report "Renewing the United Nations: A Programme for Reform", presented 16 July, 1997:

Disarmament and Regulation of Armaments

122. Disarmament is a central issue on the global agenda. With the end of the superpower rivalry, nations everywhere have come to recognize their stake in the success of multilateral negotiations and monitoring of weapons developments. As a consequence, the United Nations has taken centre stage in the worldwide effort to limit both weapons and conflict. Within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament and the General Assembly, significant advances have been made in the establishment and consolidation of multilateral legal instruments and nuclear weapon-free zones. A valuable role has also been played by the Disarmament Commission.

123. The momentum towards nuclear disarmament has increased significantly with the signing of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and its endorsement by the General Assembly; the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT); the establishment of the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone; efforts to bring fully in force the Treaty of Bangkok, which establishes a Nuclear-Weapon Free Zone in South East Asia; and the strengthening of NPT safeguards by the International Atomic Energy Agency. Other positive developments have been the entry into force of the Chemical Weapons Convention and the strengthening of the prohibition against biological weapons. Recent progress in the effort to reduce and eliminate land mines is also of crucial importance to the United Nations.

124. The emergence of new dangers and actors has added new urgency to the tasks that the United Nations is called upon to play in the area of disarmament. In the post-Cold War period, there is a growing threat from the spread of nuclear weapons technology and material, as well as a wider interest in acquiring biological and chemical weapons and delivery means for such weapons. Regional warlords, criminal syndicates and various terrorist groups have, during recent years, become involved in trading with and acquisition of weapons of mass destruction. The extensive use and destructive power of landmines in areas of armed conflict and the flow of conventional weapons and small arms into the hands of civilians have become items in the international agenda and have often to be addressed in the context of peacekeeping operations.

125. A managerial reorganization of Secretariat capacities will now be effected so that a structure will be in place to respond effectively to the priorities of Member States in the disarmament

area. A new Department for Disarmament and Arms Regulation will be established replacing the Centre for Disarmament Affairs. It will be based in New York to ensure effective interaction with the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Office of the Secretary-General and relevant United Nations departments. Since the Conference on Disarmament meets in Geneva for 3-4 months every year, it will require continuing support. Therefore, existing staff capacity to support the Conference on Disarmament, the monitoring of multilateral disarmament treaties and conventions, fellowship and training programmes and UNIDIR will continue to be maintained in Geneva. The Director-General of the United Nations offices in Geneva will continue to act as the Secretary-General for the Conference on Disarmament, reporting directly to the Secretary-General.

Action 6: A Department for Disarmament and Arms Regulation, headed by an Under-Secretary-General, will be established to develop policies and proposals and to coordinate them with the entities concerned.

126. Taking into account new developments and trends indicated above, Member States may consider it appropriate to review the current multilateral negotiating or deliberative structures and their agendas with a view to updating and rationalizing them.

Recommendation: That the General Assembly undertake a review of the work of the Disarmament Commission and the First Committee with a view to updating, rationalizing and streamlining their work.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: "HAP list server" <hap99-list@IGC.APC.ORG>  
Date: Mon, 08 Sep 1997 21:53:48 -0200  
From: International Peace Bureau <ipb@gn.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: FW: 2000 -UN Year for NW Abolition?  
To: "ABOLITION-CAUCUS" <ABOLITION-CAUCUS@IGC.APC.ORG>

-----  
From: Jan Lonn[SMTP:jlonn@undp.org]  
Sent: jeudi, 4. septembre 1997 16:33  
To: ipb@gn.apc.org  
Subject: 2000: Year for Abolition of Nuclear Weapons

## PROPOSAL FOR THE UN TO DECLARE THE YEAR 2000 AS THE INTERNATIONAL YEAR FOR ABOLITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Disarmament and the abolition of nuclear weapons has been on the UN agenda ever since the first session of the UN General Assembly in 1946. The very first resolution adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1946 set the target of elimination of nuclear weapons.

Despite the recent resolutions of the General Assembly adopted calling for the conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention and upholding the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice no progress has been made for the initiation of multilateral negotiations for the abolition of nuclear weapons. Simultaneously the disarmament priorities of the nuclear powers and industrialized countries has started to be more actively advocated by the UN secretariat and the Secretary General. The much welcome proposal to restore disarmament to a separate department regrettably include a workplan which actively advocates for the elimination of some weapons, but not of nuclear weapons which is seen as a problem of non-proliferation.

If we could get the UN General Assembly to declare the year 2000 as the International Year for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons it would be a tremendous advantage in moving the UN in the right direction, increase the pressure on the nuclear powers and isolate them, establish a basis for partnership between the UN and Abolition 2000 and help to raise the issue to the top of the political agenda in many countries.

It would help to inject a sense of urgency for the nuclear issue into the UN machinery and give legitimacy to the nuclear disarmament campaigning.

Even though a number of countries can be expected to vote against it will not make the year less important. The international community will have to use the tools at its disposal to delegitimize those who are in violation of international law and the imperatives of humanity and cling to weapons of mass destruction

The programme of the year should be the implementation of UN resolutions and efforts to conclude a nuclear weapons convention.

I can see two major problems for this effort:

First it will be resisted by the nuclear powers and their friends. But this is nothing new and should not stop us. In 1982 the General Assembly declared 1983 as the International Year of Mobilization for Sanctions Against Apartheid despite the negative votes of a core group of western states lead by the US and UK.

Second there already exist two proposals approved by the ECOSOC for declaring 2000 as the Year for the Culture of Peace and as the Year of Thanksgiving. That a year has several designations has happened before, but three designations is more than usual.

The proposal would have to be made by a group of countries in a draft resolution to be introduced in the 1st committee of the General Assembly.

It seems that ECOSOC is the right place to start when it comes to international years, however that would not apply for a year for the elimination of nuclear weapons as it is a political issue.

Whether it could succeed or not depend on if we can get a number of countries to sponsor a resolution and if a political will could be mobilized to support it from non-aligned countries.

As the efforts to convene the fourth special session of the General Assembly on disarmament has not been succesful and the resistance to all meaningful negotiations from the nuclear powers has hardened, the declaration of 2000 as International Year for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons may be a way of demonstrating that the nuclear powers can not exercise a veto on the political agenda of the UN.

If we cannot succeed with the year 2000, alternatives could be 1999 or 2001.

Jan Lonn

To: "John Burroughs" <jburroughs>  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: UN Conference on Disarmament  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

In May you commented on a letter I sent to President Clinton that I should pay more attention to the Conference on Disarmament and how the P-5 are blocking formation of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament within a timebound framework. Would you please elaborate on this issue and suggest what we in the U.s. might do to influence the Clinton Administration?

Thanks,

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

To: acronymn@gn.apc.org  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Conference on Disarmament  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Rebecca:

I greatly appreciate the detailed reports you provided from the NPT PrepCom sessions in New York in the spring and your reports from the Conference on Disarmament (CD), such as the one of August 30.

The recent communication from the Abolition 2000 NPT Working Group about the 1998 NPT PrepCom in Geneva and possible NGO involvement led me to wonder whether it would be desirable to have some kind of event in which world religious leaders would make the moral case for nuclear abolition. I have begun explorations in that direction. I'm also wondering whether the first session of the Conference on Disarmament in 1998 might serve as an alternative or whether something might occur in both places.

Can you tell me when the CD will meet in 1998? Will it be in Geneva? I would also be interested in your views about the usefulness of having such an event for world religious leaders, the preferred format, and the best timing in the course of the CD and NPT PrepCom sessions.

With best regards,

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

To: acronym@gn.apc.org  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Conference on Disarmament  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Rebecca:

I greatly appreciate the detailed reports you provided from the NPT PrepCom sessions in New York in the spring and your reports from the Conference on Disarmament (CD), such as the one of August 30.

The recent communication from the Abolition 2000 NPT Working Group about the 1998 NPT PrepCom in Geneva and possible NGO involvement led me to wonder whether it would be desirable to have some kind of event in which world religious leaders would make the moral case for nuclear abolition. I have begun explorations in that direction. I'm also wondering whether the first session of the Conference on Disarmament in 1998 might serve as an alternative or whether something might occur in both places.

Can you tell me when the CD will meet in 1998? Will it be in Geneva? I would also be interested in your views about the usefulness of having such an event for world religious leaders, the preferred format, and the best timing in the course of the CD and NPT PrepCom sessions.

With best regards,

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

To: dce@wcc-coe.org  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Request for advice  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Mr. Epps:

As part of the Abolition 2000 network, we are in contact with NGOs which conducted forums and lobbied delegates at the NPT PrepCom in New York last April. They are planning to do the same when the NPT PrepCom reconvenes in Geneva toward the end of April 1998.

It occurs to me that it might be desirable for world religious leaders to be present for some kind of event in Geneva at the time of NPT PrepCom and make the moral case for the global abolition of nuclear weapons. It could be a public forum to which delegates are invited or some other kind of gathering.

I'm also wondering whether the reconvening of the UN Conference on Disarmament in Geneva in early 1998 might also be a time for a similar event. There might be a choice of which conference to relate to, or perhaps deal with both of them.

With that in mind I would appreciate your advice on whether leadership of the World Council of Churches might be a major participant in such an endeavor. If so, what is the best way of making an approach? Also, with your knowledge of international conferences, I would appreciate your ideas on how such an event could be best structured and carried out.

My Catholic contacts tell me that the Vatican seems to be showing a willingness to make a more forthright stand against nuclear weapons. The Dalai Lama is a leading signer of a Citizens Pledge for Nuclear Abolition. Representatives of other world religions should also be brought in.

I'd like to call you in a couple of days to discuss this matter, but first I wanted to lay out the basic idea so that you can give it some thought.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036  
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013

To: sean@gn.apc.org  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: UN Conference on Disarmament  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Can you tell when the UN Conference on Disarmament is scheduled to meet in January 1998?

Thanks,

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

To: crramey  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Endorsement of fast, ad  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Clayton:

Methodists United for Peace with Justice endorses the "Call for a National Interfaith Fast for Sanity". We are willing to be a signer of the ad for "An Interfaith Call to Restore Sanity and Compassion to the National Agenda".

With best regards,

Howard

Return-Path: <DCulp@nrdc.org>  
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 1997 13:42:37 -0400  
From: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)  
Subject: New Nuclear Testing Web Site  
To: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)  
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

The San Antonio (Texas) Express-News has a new, well-designed web site on nuclear testing. It is a special report entitled "Nuclear Legacy." It includes the recent National Cancer Institute study and photos of nuclear tests. They did a good job on the topics they cover.

<<http://www.express-news.net/unauth/nuke/>>

|                     |                        |  |
|---------------------|------------------------|--|
| David Culp          | E-mail: dculp@nrdc.org |  |
| Plutonium Challenge | Tel. +1 (202) 289-2388 |  |
| Washington, D.C.    | Fax +1 (202) 289-1060  |  |

Return-Path: <disarmament@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 1997 17:24:32 -0400  
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
To: maureen eldredge <meldredge@igc.apc.org>, bridget@fcnl.org  
CC: Bridget Moix <bridget@fcnl.org>, NABbasic@aol.com, dkimball@clw.org,  
jsmith@clw.org, cdavis@clw.org, disarmament@igc.org, kathy@fcnl.org,  
bruce.hall@wdc.greenpeace.org, mupj@igc.org, meldredge@igc.org,  
paprog@igc.org, btiller@psr.org, ledwidge@psr.org, dculp@nrdc.org,  
vision@igc.org, wandwill@clark.net, tcollina@ucsusa.org,  
73744.3675@compuserve.com  
Subject: Re: next NWWG meeting  
References: <2.2.16.19970916151527.38b7daac@pop.igc.org>

maureen eldredge wrote:

>  
> Please add Subcritical tests to the agenda, they are supposed to do one that  
> day.  
> -M

I certainly agree that this should be on the agenda and . . .

Please add the expected Domenici CTB hearings. We need to discuss these both in the context of CTBT ratification work AND Stockpile Stewardship. I don't know if I'll be there since I'm still not totally ready for my trip to Russia and I'm leaving Saturday.

However, I hope to have some CTB materials - intended to be used prior to and for the "roll-out", and to try to find more folks interested in doing CTBT work.

After I return from Russia, and the roll-out happens (which may be anytime from next week to the beginning of October sometime - at least that's what I hear from folks really in the know,) the Clearinghouse will put out a thorough Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Now Activist Packet that will include all the great press we're hoping to get with the elusive roll-out.

If people want copies of either/ both of these sets of material to send to your activist please let me know. Likewise, if you have fact sheets or other materials that you would like to include, please send them to me.

Please, also put on the agenda a discussion of the CTBT-organize list-serve. If I'm not there, David can explain this. I hope that everyone working on CTBT ratification will join, and suggest key activist in the field that should be in the loop as well.

Soon to be in search of the truth at Novaya Zemlya (not) - Kathy

Kathy Crandall  
Disarmament Clearinghouse Coordinator

1101 14th Street NW #700  
Washington, DC 20005  
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232  
FAX: 202 898 0172  
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 1997 22:53:32 +0200 (CET)  
From: Martin Kalinowski <dh3m@HRZPUB.th-darmstadt.de>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: letter on subcriticals from INESAP participants  
To: inesap@fy.chalmers.se  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igcb.igc.org id NAA23096

Dear friends,

The following letter to President Bill Clinton was sent by 15 participants of the INESAP 1997 Conference in Shanghai to protest against the announced subcritical test in the USA.

In short due you will hear more about our successful conference.

Best regards, Martin

-----  
1997 INESAP CONFERENCE  
International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation  
Challenges and Opportunities for a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World  
September 8-10, 1997, Fudan University, Shanghai

September 10, 1997

President William Clinton  
The White House  
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue  
Washington, DC USA

Fax: 001-202-456-2461 (2 pages)

Dear President Clinton,

We, the undersigned, write from Fudan University in Shanghai, China, where for the last three days we have taken part in the Third International Conference of International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation.

One year ago today, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), prohibiting "any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion." Since then the United States and more than 150 other countries have signed the Treaty, and the U.S. has pledged, in accordance with Article 18 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, to refrain from any action that would defeat its objects and purpose. As stated in the Preamble, the objective of the CTBT is "to contribute effectively to the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects [and] to the process of nuclear disarmament..."

During our conference we learned that the United States is preparing to conduct its second "subcritical" nuclear test, code-named Holog, later this month, underground at the Nevada Test Site. According to a public statement by a U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) official, Holog will be "important for understanding performance" of nuclear weapons. Subcritical tests involve chemical explosive and weapons grade plutonium. In our view, they violate the spirit if not the letter of the CTBT. This would especially apply if complete weapons configurations were tested, a possibility DOE has explicitly kept open. Further, subcritical tests signal an unrelenting U.S. commitment to nuclear weapons. We believe that subcritical tests are acts of bad faith, provocative to other States, that jeopardize prospects for its global entry into force.

We are deeply concerned that the subcritical tests and the huge "Stockpile Stewardship" program of which they are part, are making it possible for the U.S. to continue modernizing its nuclear arsenal, even under a CTBT. This is also contrary to the Article VI Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty obligation to eliminate nuclear weapons, an obligation affirmed unanimously by the International Court of Justice in July 1996. U.S. failure to meet its Article VI obligation threatens the long-term viability of the nonproliferation regime.

We call on you as the leader of the world's most advanced military power to reverse the dangerous and destabilizing effects of a renewed nuclear research, development and testing program. We urge you to cancel Holog and any other subcritical tests. We appeal to you to begin negotiations on a treaty to eliminate nuclear weapons. The world is watching, and waiting.

For a nuclear weapon free world,

Signatures:

Reiner Braun, on behalf of International Network of Engineers and Scientists  
for Global Responsibility (INES)

Jacqueline Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation, USA

Merav Datan, USA

Surendra Gadekar, India

Martin Kalinowski, Germany

George Lewis, USA

Allison Macfarlane, USA

Luis Masperi, Argentine Physical Society, Argentina

Vijai Nair, India

Abdul Nayyar, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan

Marco Martinez Negrete, Mexico  
Goetz Neuneck, Germany  
Reuven Pedatzur, Israel  
Juergen Scheffran, Germany  
Alice Slater, USA

---

---

Martin Kalinowski, IANUS, c/o Institut fuer Kernphysik  
Schlossgartenstr. 9, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany  
Tel.: +49-6151-163016 FAX: +49-6151-166039  
Internet, private: KALINOWSKI@HRZPUB.TH-DARMSTADT.DE  
Internet, group: IANUS@HRZPUB.TH-DARMSTADT.DE  
<http://www.th-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/welcome.htm> and [.../inesap.htm](http://www.th-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/inesap.htm)

---

---

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
Date: Tue, 16 Sep 1997 23:49:27 +0200 (CET)  
From: Martin Kalinowski <dh3m@HRZPUB.th-darmstadt.de>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: message of INESAP to Tashkent Conference  
To: inesap@fy.chalmers.se  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id OAA25655

Dear friends,

At the INESAP 1997 Conference in Shanghai it was agreed to collectively send a greeting address to the International Conference on Central Asia Nuclear Weapon Free Zone in Tashkent, Uzbekistan. Please find the text attached.

Best regards, Martin

-----  
INESAP  
International Network  
of Engineers and Scientists  
Against Proliferation

To Abdulaziz Kamilov  
Minister of Foreign Affairs  
of the Republic of Uzbekistan

Message to  
the International Conference „Central Asia - Nuclear Weapon Free Zone“

The participants of the 1997 Conference of the International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation (INESAP), meeting in Shanghai, China, September 8-10, send our warmest greetings to the distinguished delegates to the International Conference on „Central Asia - Nuclear Weapon Free Zone“, being held in Tashkent, September 14-16, 1997.

We fully support and endorse the efforts of the people and governments of Kazakstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan to create a nuclear weapons free zone in Central Asia.

At every stage of the nuclear weapon fuel cycle and testing, nuclear weapons have contaminated the environment and harmed the lives of people throughout the world for far too long. Central Asia has also suffered seriously from the damage and consequences of nuclear testing. The bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki have convinced us that these terrible weapons of mass destruction and genocide must never be used again. Nuclear weapons do not contribute to our security and they threaten our health, peace and survival.

Your efforts to add your beautiful Central Asian Region to those in the Pacific, Central and South America, Africa and South-East Asia, which have already been declared nuclear-weapon-free zones, well contribute to the establishment of more nuclear weapon free zones in the world.

We heartily welcome your initiative, which will constitute a major contribution to the growing movement to abolish nuclear weapons altogether, to promote the international goal of a Nuclear Weapons

Convention, and to make the whole Earth nuclear-weapon free.

=====  
Martin Kalinowski, IANUS, c/o Institut fuer Kernphysik  
Schlossgartenstr. 9, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany  
Tel.: +49-6151-163016 FAX: +49-6151-166039  
Internet, private: KALINOWSKI@HRZPUB.TH-DARMSTADT.DE  
Internet, group: IANUS@HRZPUB.TH-DARMSTADT.DE  
<http://www.th-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/welcome.htm> and [.../inesap.htm](http://www.th-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/inesap.htm)  
=====

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Wed, 17 Sep 1997 19:01:31 -0400  
From: disarmament@igc.org  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Op-Ed Test Ban Treat Now  
To: ctb-followers@igc.org

The Christian Science Monitor, September 17, 1997

"Ratify Test Ban Treaty Now"

By Tom Zamora Collina

Something happened Aug. 16 on or near Novaya Zemlya, the Arctic island where Russia used to conduct its nuclear tests.

Was it an underwater earthquake, as Russia says? Or was it a clumsy attempt to violate the recently signed Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)?

Although recent US Air Force information indicates the event occurred underwater, implying the event was an earthquake, there is still no official determination. The Pentagon says it's "reached no conclusions at this point."

Meanwhile, the Clinton administration is planning to submit the CTBT to the Senate in the next few weeks, and the debate on whether the US should ratify this pact has begun.

Opponents of the CTBT say the Russian event shows the treaty isn't verifiable. An odd conclusion, given that the treaty is not yet in force and its monitoring systems not fully in place.

Even so, the existing web of seismic stations and intelligence gathering did detect the event, allowing the Clinton administration to query Moscow and investigate further. If anything, this episode demonstrates that the test-ban monitoring system works - but only up to a point.

What the Russian event really shows is that living with a treaty that has been signed but is not in force is inherently problematic.

Over 140 nations - including the US, Russia, China, France, and Britain - have signed the treaty, but few have ratified it. Without the necessary ratifications the treaty can't be enforced or verified. We have a ban on nuclear testing with no legal means to check out ambiguous events.

Getting the treaty fully in force would improve the situation greatly. Take the Russian "event" as an example. Were the treaty in force with a completed monitoring system, we could have had better information up front from a wider network of seismic and other monitoring stations worldwide, reducing ambiguity.

If the information from the expanded monitoring system were still inconclusive, the CTBT allows for on-site inspections to clarify what took place. Any party to the treaty could request such an inspection from the treaty's executive council, which would need to approve the request by a three-fifths vote. If a violation were found, the matter

could be referred to the UN for action.

Compare this with our current situation, where the US has limited information to go on and no legal basis to visit the suspect site.

In the words of the Pentagon, the Russian event "indicates that we need to have the kinds of transparency that treaty offers to us. We not only need to get ratification on the US side, but we also need to get it on the Russian side."

The Russian event demonstrates the need to enforce the CTBT as soon as possible. Ambiguous events like this will continue (a similar situation occurred at the Russian test site in January 1996) and are more likely to go unresolved without the CTBT in place, eroding international confidence in the test ban regime. The CTBT is too important to US and international efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons to allow this to happen.

Bringing the CTBT into force will not be easy. Forty-four specific nations must ratify, including the five nuclear powers and India, which has said it will not sign. All the more reason to start now with ratification by the US Senate.

President Clinton needs to send the treaty to the Senate without delay, and the Senate must approve it next spring for there to be any possibility of enacting the treaty by the end of 1998. The time to act is now.

\* Tom Zamora Collina is director the arms control and international security program at the Union of Concerned Scientists.

\*\*\*\*\*

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005  
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232  
FAX: 202 898 0172  
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

To: 72124.3602@compuserve.com  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Stamp money  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Phil:

We are starting to mail out information about the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Therefore, I need more stamps. Please provide me a check payable to Postmaster in an amount of \$64. You can charge this to the Rubin grant.

Thanks,

Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 18 Sep 1997 12:50:21 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Joseph Gerson <afscamb@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: New England Nuclear Weapons Abolition Conference, October 24-26  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc3.igc.apc.org id MAA02442  
X-Sender: afscamb@pop.igc.org (Unverified)

Please post the following information regarding the October conference.

REAPING WHAT WE SOW  
Organizing for a Nuclear Free Century of Peace

The New England Organizing Conference  
for Nuclear Weapons Abolition

Boston College - October 24-26, 1997

Initiated by the American Friends Service Committee

The danger of nuclear war continues to haunt the Post-Cold War era. The Clinton Administration's Nuclear Posture Review opted for the status quo. Since then it has reiterated that preparations for nuclear war remain "a cornerstone of our strategy". In March 1996, the U.S. and China exchanged nuclear threats. More recently the U.S. deployed yet another nuclear weapon and began "subcritical" nuclear weapons tests. There are very real dangers of Russian nuclear accidents and stockpile leakage, of possible proliferation and non-state nuclear terrorism. Across the U.S., and globally, people are dying from the fallout of the nuclear weapons and power production cycles and from diversion of limited resources to the military economy.

The relative silence of the peace movement has meant that a generation is being educated and socialized with little knowledge of the dangers posed by nuclear weapons, limited exposure to the exercise of peoples' power, and less experience in political organizing and nonviolent action. There is a growing international movement for nuclear weapons abolition. The nuclear powers have reiterated their commitment to complete nuclear disarmament with the extension of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. The World Court has ruled on the illegality of the use and threatened use of nuclear weapons, and the elite Canberra Commission endorsed abolition and identified essential steps to achieve it. NGOs have published the draft text for a nuclear weapons abolition convention, and more than 700 NGOs have endorsed the Abolition 2000 statement calling for negotiation, by the year 2000, of a nuclear weapons abolition treaty. The intellectual, scientific, moral and diplomatic foundations for nuclear weapons abolition have been established. Manifestations of popular will and grassroots organizing are now essential to abolish nuclear weapons. To revitalize organizing and popular education for nuclear weapons abolition in New England, the American Friends Service Committee has initiated an

organizing conference: Reaping What We Sow - Organizing for a Nuclear Free Century of Peace, cosponsored by organizations from across New England and elsewhere in the U.S. The conference will provide essential information and analysis while focusing on models and campaigns for organizing in alliance with movements for economic, social and environmental justice.

>From the Abolition 2000 Statement:

A secure and livable world... requires that we achieve a world free of nuclear weapons and redress environmental degradation and human suffering that is the legacy of fifty years of nuclear weapons and production... We call upon states...to... conclude by the year 2000 negotiations on a nuclear weapons abolition convention that requires the phased elimination of all nuclear weapons within a timebound framework with provisions for effective verification and enforcement...

A world free of nuclear weapons is a shared aspiration of humanity. This goal cannot be achieved in a non-proliferation regime that authorizes the possession of nuclear weapons by a small group of states. Our common security requires the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. Our objective is definite and unconditional abolition of nuclear weapons.

New York, April 1995

## CONFERENCE SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

Friday Evening - October 24, 1997

THE IMPERATIVE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS ABOLITION:  
BEYOND ARMS CONTROL

4:30 PM - 6:30 PM - Conference Registration

6:30 PM - Plenary

- From Abolition to Abolition - Betty Burkes
- U.S. Hegemony & Its Continuing Use of Nuclear Weapons - Joseph Gerson
- The Choice Before Us: Global Proliferation or Complete Nuclear Weapons Abolition - Dr. Joseph Rotblat

Honoring Nobel Peace Prize Recipients Working for Nuclear Weapons Abolition

8:45 PM - 9:15 PM - Small Groups

Saturday Morning - October 25, 1997

ENVISIONING A NUCLEAR FREE WORLD

9:00 AM - Plenary

- Confronting the Impacts of Uranium Mining and Milling on the Navajo People

- Anna Rondon
- The Nuclear Power/Nuclear Weapons Nexus - Zia Mian

### Honoring Leading Organizers of the Nuclear Freeze Movement

- What Is Organizing? - Frances Crowe, Randy Kehler, David McCauley

11:00 AM - 12:30 PM - Workshops

12:30 PM - 1:30 PM - LUNCH/Small Groups

### Saturday Afternoon

#### OVERCOMING OBSTACLES TO A NUCLEAR FREE WORLD

1:30 PM - 3:30 PM - Plenary

- Organizing for Abolition 2000 - Karina Wood
- Organizing in Communities of Faith - Clayton Ramey
- Who Are Our Allies and How Do We Make Common Cause With Them? - Ellen David Friedman

3:30 PM - 5:00 PM - Workshops

5:00 PM - 6:00 PM - Small Groups

6:00 PM - Reception

### Sunday - October 26, 1997

#### NEXT STEPS: SYNTHESIS AND POST-CONFERENCE ORGANIZING

11:00 AM - 1:30 PM - Plenary and Small Groups

#### Workshops:

- Abolition 2000 Organizing (Jackie Cabasso - Western States Legal Foundation, Karina Wood - Peace Action, Bruce Martin - AFSC)
- Abolition, the Internet and the World Wide Web (John Loretz - IPPNW & Greater Boston PSR)
- Arms Sales: Making the Links (To be announced)
- Asia-Pacific: Arc of Renewed Nuclear Dangers (Joseph Gerson - AFSC)
- Campus Organizing (Being organized by Peace and Justices Studies students at Tufts University)
- Health Effects of Preparations for Nuclear War (Dr. David Rush - Greater Boston PSR)
- Historic Uses of Nuclear Weapons - A Background Workshop (Gary Goldstein - Tufts University)
- Making Common Cause Across Race Lines (Willie Brown - AFSC, Mario Davila - AFSC and others to be announced)
- Making Common Cause With Organized Labor on National Budget Priorities (Andrea Cole - Locals 34, 35 & 217 Hotel & Restaurant Workers Union, Ellen

- David Friedman - Vermont NEA, Al Marder - New Haven Peace Commission, Laura Unger - Campaign on Contingent Work)
- NATO Expansion: Undermining Prospects for Nuclear Disarmament (Cora Weiss - Peace Action)
- NGOs & UN Access in the NTP Review Process (Alice Slater - Global Resource Action Center for the Environment)
- (Not so) Depleted Uranium (Judy Skotniki and Ruth Weizenbaum - Grassroots Action for Peace)
- Nukes & National Budget Priorities (Being organized by Massachusetts Peace Action)
- Organizing in Communities of Faith (Clayton Ramey - Fellowship of Reconciliation and others to be announced)
- Organizing Across the Weapons/Energy Nexus (Sean Donahue - N.H. Peace Action, Patti Lynn and Matt Wilson - Massachusetts Citizens for Safe Energy)
- Prophetic Witness & Civil Disobedience (John Schuchardt - House of Peace)
- What Educators Can Do (Elise Boulding - co-founder Consortium on Peace Research, Education and Development, Lani Gerson - Newton Public Schools, Paul Joseph - Tufts University Peace & Justice Studies Program)
- World Court - Building From the Decision (John Burroughs - Western States Legal Defense Foundation)
- Women's Approaches to Organizing (Being organized by Mass. WILPF)
- Veterans Organizing for Peace and Justice (Being organized by Paul Atwood - Joiner Center at U. Mass. Boston)

#### Co-Sponsors:

Albert Schweitzer Fellowship  
 Arlington Street Church - Boston  
 Jack H. Backman Human Rights Action Committee  
 Bloomfield Citizens for Global Security  
 Boston Research Center for the 21st Century  
 Boston College Department of Sociology  
 Boston Mobilization for Survival  
 Brandeis University Peace and Conflict Studies Program  
 Cambridge Peace Commission  
 Coalition for a Strong United Nations  
 CPPAX  
 Fourth Freedom Forum  
 Fellowship of Reconciliation  
 Global Resource Action Center for the Environment  
 Grassroots Actions for Peace  
 Greater New Haven Peace Council  
 House of Peace  
 Humane Society of the US  
 Interfaith Cooperative Ministry of New Haven  
 Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies  
 Institute for Peace and International Security  
 Joiner Center - University of Massachusetts Boston  
 Lawyers' Alliance for World Security - MA Chapter  
 Massachusetts Citizens for Safe Energy  
 New England War Tax Resistance  
 New Haven Peace Commission  
 Peace Action Cambridge

Peace Action Connecticut  
Peace Action Maine  
Peace Action Massachusetts  
Peace Action New Hampshire  
People's Action for Clean Energy  
Physicians for Social Responsibility - Central MA  
Physicians for Social Responsibility - Greater Boston  
Prince of Peace Plowshares  
Social Responsibility Committee - Unitarian Society of Hartford  
Third World Scholars Consortium  
Traprock Peace Center  
Tufts University Peace and Justice Studies Program  
Women's Action for New Directions  
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Boston Chapter  
Women's International Initiative for Peace and Justice  
World Federalists of New England

#### Plenary Speakers:

Betty Burkes is President of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, founder of Fighting Racism and Educating for Ethnic Diversity.

Frances Crowe is AFSC Field Organizer emeritus and played a key role in launching the nuclear Freeze Movement.

Ellen David Friedman is an organizer for the National Education Association in Vermont.

Joseph Gerson is the author of *With Hiroshima Eyes* and the Regional Program Coordinator of the American Friends Service Committee in New England.

Randy Kehler, Co-founder and first National Coordinator of the Nuclear Freeze Campaign now associated with the Working Group on Electoral Democracy.

David McCauley, a key organizer for the Nuclear Freeze in Vermont, currently Chief of Staff for MA State Senator David Magnani.

Zia Mian is Research Associate at the Center for Energy and Environmental Studies, Princeton University.

Clayton Ramey is Peace and Disarmament Coordinator of the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Anna Rondon is the Coordinator of the Southwest Indigenous Uranium Forum and a long-time Native American activist.

Joseph Rotblat is President of the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs and the 1995 Recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize.

Karina Wood is the National Disarmament Director of Peace Action.

#### Registration Information:

Your early registration will help to ensure that there will be sufficient space for all conference participants. The registration fee is \$30, with scholarships available. This does not include meals. Students are welcome to participate free of charge.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ email: \_\_\_\_\_

**Workshops:**

Based on the initial list of workshops, I am most interested in attending (List three.)

1. \_\_\_\_\_

2. \_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_

**Accommodations:**

I can provide hospitality for (number) \_\_\_\_\_ participants.

Please arrange accommodations for me:

\_\_\_\_\_ In a private home.

\_\_\_\_\_ In a relatively inexpensive hotel or inn.

\_\_\_\_\_ My registration fee of \$30 is enclosed.

\_\_\_\_\_ Please contact me about scholarship assistance.

\_\_\_\_\_ I am a student. (Please bring student ID card.)

\_\_\_\_\_ Enclosed is my tax deductible contribution of \$\_\_\_\_\_ to help meet the costs of the conference.

Total enclosed: \$\_\_\_\_\_

Make checks payable to: AFSC - Peace & Economic Security Program.

Mail to: AFSC, 2161 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, MA 02140

For more information, contact:

American Friends Service Committee at above address or

AFSCCAMB@igc.apc.org

(617) 661-6130

Fax: (617) 354-2832



>From meldredge Fri Sep 19 11:59:17 1997

Return-Path: <meldredge@igc.apc.org>

Date: Fri, 19 Sep 1997 11:58:44 -0700 (PDT)

X-Sender: meldredge@pop.igc.org

To: kathy@fcnl.org, wandwill@clark.net, ledwidge@psr.org, NABbasic@aol.com, vision@igc.org, kathy@fcnl.org, disarmament@igc.org, jsmith@clw.org, mupj@igc.org, paprog@igc.org, dculp@nrdc.org, dkimball@clw.org, btiller@psr.org, bridget@fcnl.org, bruce.hall@wdc.greenpeace.org, cdavis@clw.org, 73744.3675@compuserve.com, tperry@ucsusa.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org

From: maureen eldredge <meldredge@igc.apc.org>

Subject: SUBCRITICAL test letter

Sender: meldredge@igc.org

This draft borrows heavily from the letter sent to the Senate on June 10, signed by many NWWG and Monday Lobby groups. I've made some modifications to reflect recent events. Please get me comments by Tues., signons by Wednesday Noon.

Thanks,

M

DRAFT-DRAFT-DRAFT-DRAFT-DRAFT

Dear President Clinton:

As Peace, Disarmament, Religious, and Environmental groups with hundreds of thousands of members across the country, we remain strongly opposed to the continued program of subcritical tests being conducted by the Department of Energy (DOE). The most recent test, which occurred on Sept. 18th, comes on the heels of the Russian "seismic event" which has raised international concerns about the verification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). The continuation of the US program of subcritical testing will be detrimental to US efforts to stem proliferation of nuclear weapons and to secure the international implementation of the CTBT.

The US will set the pace for future progress on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Conducting underground experiments involving chemical high explosives and nuclear weapons-grade plutonium, at the Nevada Test Site is a continuing provocation to the international community. DOE's "Green Book" (1996) states that these experiments are "to provide data for nuclear design laboratory programs," contrary to DOE's claims that the subcritical tests are to assist in understanding aging weapons. The tests send the message that the US is more interested in advancing nuclear weapons expertise than in advancing non-proliferation and disarmament goals.

Worse, the subcritical experiments set a dangerous precedent for other nations to conduct similar experiments. The recent incident near or at the Russian test site of Novaya Zemlya clearly demonstrates this point. How can we be sure that other nations

would not use subcritical tests for nuclear weapons development?

We urge you to take international leadership to build support and trust in the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty that you signed a year ago. The US should set a global standard against conducting nuclear weapons activities at nuclear test sites. You should demonstrate your commitment to upholding the emerging CTBT regime by canceling the subcritical tests and seeking agreement with Russia and China to permanently close the world's remaining nuclear test sites. The window of opportunity to remove the threat of nuclear weapons is shrinking. It is time to act boldly and make fundamental changes to the US nuclear weapons program.

Sincerely,

\*\*\*\*\*

Maureen Eldredge  
Program Director  
The Military Production Network  
1801 18th St. NW, Suite 9-2  
Washington, DC 20009  
202-833-4668/fax: 202-234-9536

A national alliance of watchdog organizations  
working on DOE's nuclear weapons complex.

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>  
Date: Fri, 19 Sep 1997 16:22:08 -0700 (PDT)  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
From: Majordomo@igc.org  
Subject: Welcome to ctbt-organize  
Reply-To: Majordomo@igc.org

--

Welcome to the ctbt-organize mailing list!

Please save this message for future reference. Thank you.

If you ever want to remove yourself from this mailing list, you can send mail to <Majordomo@igc.org> with the following command in the body of your email message:

unsubscribe ctbt-organize

If you try to unsubscribe from this mailing list, and your request is rejected, then send mail again to <Majordomo@igc.org> with the following command in the body of your email message:

unsubscribe ctbt-organize mupj@igc.apc.org

If you ever need to get in contact with the owner of the list, (if you have trouble unsubscribing, or have questions about the list itself) send email to <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org> . This is the general rule for most mailing lists when you need to contact a human.

Messages you wish to go to the list should be addressed to:

ctbt-organize@igc.org

Here's the general information for the list you've subscribed to, in case you don't already have it:

This is a list for those working on ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Information from field organizers will be shared here to facilitate coordinated progress on CTBT ratification.

For further information, please contact:

Kathy Crandall at the Disarmament Clearinghouse:

1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005

TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 FAX: 202 898 0172

<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

The Disarmament Clearinghouse is a project of:

Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Plutonium Challenge, and Women's Action for New Directions

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Mon, 22 Sep 1997 14:43:36 -0400  
From: disarmament@igc.org  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org  
Subject: President Clinton's remarks atUN  
To: ctb-followers@igc.org

Subject: text of Clinton's remarks

September 22, 1997

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT TO THE 52ND SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary  
(New York, New York)

---

For Immediate Release  
September 22, 1997

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT  
TO THE 52ND SESSION OF  
THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

United Nations  
New York, New York

10:50 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: When we met here last year, I was honored to be the first of 146 leaders to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, our commitment to end all nuclear tests for all time -- the longest-sought, hardest-fought prize in the history of arms control. It will help to prevent the nuclear powers from developing more advanced and more dangerous weapons. It will limit the possibilities for other states to acquire such devices. I am pleased to announce that today I am sending this crucial treaty to the United States Senate for ratification. Our common goal should be to enter the CTBT into force as soon as possible, and I ask for all of you to support that goal....

END                    11:09 A.M. EDT

From: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005

Tel: 202 898 0151 ext 232  
Fax:202 898 0172  
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

Return-Path: <acronym@gn.apc.org>  
Date: Tue, 23 Sep 1997 12:56:32 GMT  
X-Sender: acronym@gn.apc.org  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
From: acronym@gn.apc.org (Rebecca Johnson)  
Subject: Re: Conference on Disarmament

Dear Howard,

Thank you for your message. My apologies for a delayed response as I was travelling in China and couldn't get on email. I'm now in NZ doing a speaking tour, so will manage to pick up email (I hope) every few days.

I don't have the exact 1998 CD dates to hand, but would expect it to meet around Jan 21 to March 30 and then again around May 13 to end June, and then late July to early September. The NPT Conference is scheduled for 28 April to 8 May.

I think the idea of a joint message from several different religious leaders (preferably not just different Christian denominations) on the moral case against nuclear weapons would be very helpful.

Would you think about trying to get the religious leaders to Geneva as well, to meet with delegations? Let me know what you have in mind and I'll do my best to offer some suggestions for the best way/timing/format etc.

Best wishes,  
rebecca

>Dear Rebecca:

>

>I greatly appreciate the detailed reports you provided from the NPT PrepCom  
>sessions in New York in the spring and your reports from the Conference on  
>Disarmament (CD), such as the one of August 30.

>

>The recent communication from the Abolition 2000 NPT Working Group about the  
>1998 NPT PrepCom in Geneva and possible NGO involvement led me to wonder  
>whether it would be desirable to have some kind of event in which world  
>religious leaders would make the moral case for nuclear abolition. I have  
>begun explorations in that direction. I'm also wondering whether the first  
>session of the Conference on Disarmament in 1998 might serve as an  
>alternative or whether something might occur in both places.

>

>Can you tell me when the CD will meet in 1998? Will it be in Geneva? I  
>would also be interested in your views about the usefulness of having such  
>an event for world religious leaders, the preferred format, and the best  
>timing in the course of the CD and NPT PrepCom sessions.

>

>With best regards,

>

>Howard W. Hallman, Chair

>Methodists United for Peace with Justice

>  
>  
>  
>

email: [acronym@gn.apc.org](mailto:acronym@gn.apc.org)

The Acronym Institute  
24, Colvestone Crescent  
London E8 2LH  
England

telephone (UK +44) (0) 171 503 8857

fax (0) 171 503 9153

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Tue, 23 Sep 1997 11:16:19 -0400  
From: disarmament@igc.org  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org  
Subject: APO 09/23 0349 Clinton Faces Test Ban Battle  
To: ctb-followers@igc.org

WASHINGTON (AP) -- Many Senate conservatives will need convincing before the Clinton administration gains the two-thirds majority it will need to ratify a global ban on nuclear testing.

President Clinton took the first step Monday in what promises to be a long lobbying battle, announcing in a speech to the United Nations General Assembly that he is sending the treaty to the Senate for ratification.

The treaty is designed to brake the emergence of new nuclear-armed nations and the development of new types of nuclear weapons in the handful of countries that already have them. It was completed last year and signed by 146 nations, including the five declared nuclear powers: the United States, Russia, China, Britain and France.

A key obstacle for the administration will be Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Helms opposed ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention in April and insisted on concessions from the administration merely to move the measure forward. The Senate ratified the chemical weapons pact 74-26.

Mark Thiessen, spokesman for the committee, said he doubts Helms will call for hearings this year.

"I wouldn't describe it as a front-burner issue," Thiessen said. There is no rush, he said, because "it's unlikely the treaty is going to come into force in the next year."

Skeptical lawmakers question whether treaty compliance can be verified, are wary of nonparticipants such as North Korea and Iraq and worry about the reliability of the U.S. arsenal without benefit of test explosions.

"We have to be assured before we approve this treaty that it is clearly going to help protect security rather than the other way around," said Sen. Thad Cochran, R-Miss. "If it creates a more dangerous environment and is an

incentive  
for others to cheat and steal a march on the rest of the world, and puts  
us at  
risk, then we would make a bad mistake to approve the treaty."

Cochran's Senate Governmental Affairs subcommittee on international  
security  
and proliferation plans a hearing next week on whether the United States  
can  
count on its nuclear weapons to work without live testing.

Even one of the treaty's backers, Sen. Joseph Biden, D-Del., ranking  
Democrat  
on Helms' Foreign Relations Committee, concedes the treaty will involve  
sacrifices for the United States.

"This treaty will pinch," Biden said in a recent Senate floor speech.  
"It  
will hurt. But the treaty will pinch other countries far more than it  
pinches  
us, and the world will be a safer place."

Clinton needs two-thirds of those voting in the Senate -- 67 members  
if all  
100 senators vote -- to ratify the treaty. In the most recent test vote  
on the  
issue, the Senate a year ago defeated 53-45 a measure sponsored by Sens.  
Jon  
Kyl, R-Ariz., and Harry Reid, D-Nev., to allow a resumption of nuclear  
testing.

Of the members who participated in that vote and are still in the  
Senate, the  
tally is a narrow 43-40 in favor of a continued test ban.

John Isaacs of the pro-arms reduction Council for a Livable World  
said  
Clinton should be able to count on all 45 Democrats supporting the  
treaty,  
meaning he would need 22 Republicans.

Sen. Pete Domenici, R-N.M., says his Senate Appropriations energy and  
water  
subcommittee will hold hearings on the treaty next month. Though  
officially  
undecided, Domenici has a keen home-state interest in ratification. A  
continued  
test ban means the United States will rely more heavily on its three  
nuclear  
testing and research laboratories. Two of those, Los Alamos and Sandia,  
are in  
Domenici's home state. The third is Lawrence Livermore National in  
California.

"There are certainly benefits to a comprehensive test ban, but there  
are also  
costs and risks," Domenici said.

Eight of the 146 signatory nations have ratified the treaty,  
according to the  
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency: Croatia, Estonia, Israel, the  
Marshall

Islands, Mexico, Micronesia, Peru and Ukraine.

Of the three nondeclared nuclear powers -- Israel, India and Pakistan -- only Israel has signed. India is demanding that nuclear states commit to eliminating their arsenals; Pakistan, long a tense rival of India's, won't sign unless India does.

The treaty will likely be honored by all signers. But its enforcement, verification and on-site inspection provisions cannot go into effect until all 44 countries that have nuclear weapons or nuclear reactors sign the treaty. Of those 44, India, Pakistan and North Korea have not signed.

From: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005  
Tel: 202 898 0150 ext.232  
Fax: 202 898 0172  
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

To: dce@wcc-coe.org  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Follow-up inquiry  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Mr. Epps:

I'm wondering if you have an opportunity to talk with your colleagues about my inquiry of September 12 regarding the possibility of convening a public forum of international religious leaders in Geneva to speak in favor of nuclear disarmament. This might occur at the beginning of the the next session of the UN Conference on Disarmament in January 1998 and the start of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty Review Commission toward the end of April. It could happen at either or both events.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013

To: crramey, dgracie@afsc.org  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Forum for world religious leaders  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Clayton and David:

I would like to report where I in exploring the possibility of a forum for world religious leaders to speak out for nuclear disarmament in conjunction with the NPT PrepCom in Geneva next April. I'm also thinking that the convening of the UN Conference on Disarmament in January could be a time for such event. It could be both or either/or.

At suggestion of staff of the National Council of Churches, I e-mailed to Dwayne Epps at the World Council of Churches (WCC) in Geneva an inquiry about getting WCC leadership involved in such an event. In a follow-up telephone conversation, he said it might be feasible and would talk to colleagues about it. I'm waiting his response.

David Robison says that the Pontifical Commission on Justice and Peace is examining the Vactican's position on nuclear disarmament and seems to be open to more forthright statements in favor. Jerry Powers of the U.S. Catholic Conference says that the Pope is an abolitionist. He indicates that as a national unit, they can't help us make contact with Rome. He suggests that Cardinal Danielle, president of Pax Christi International might be a good contact. I haven't talked with David Robison about this approach. First, I want to get a positive response from the WCC and find out what their relationship is with the Catholic Church, for they might have some good contacts.

If these two worldwide Christian bodies are interested, I want us to reach out to world leaders of other faiths. I welcome your advice including yours, Clayton, on the Moslem world community. The Nuclear Weapons Peace Foundation got the Dalai Lama's signature on their Citizens Pledge, so they might help on involving this important world religious leader.

I've had a couple phone conversations with Alice Slater about this, and she would welcome some kind of religious leaders forum at the NPT PrepCom. For instance, she suggests that it might occur at 4:00 p.m. or so on Sunday, April 27 followed by a reception. I've had brief e-mail exchange with Rebecca Johnson, who thinks it's a useful idea.

If my WCC contacts and outreach to the Catholic Church move in the right direction, I want to get in touch with David Atwood at the Quaker office in Geneva, as David Gracie suggested, for he can offer counsel and perhaps help with arrangements.

I will appreciate any other ideas the two of you might offer.

With best regards,

Howard Hallman

To: 72124.3602@compuserve.com  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Request for payment  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Phil:

My work under the Rubin grant has required no travel or no printing expenses as anticipated and less expenditures for communications than predicted. Therefore, I am transferring funds from these budget items to personnel, increasing it to a total of \$9,000.

With that accomplished, I am requesting a payment for consulting services as follows:

|             |         |
|-------------|---------|
| August 1997 | 1 day   |
| September   | 10 days |

|       |                           |
|-------|---------------------------|
| Total | 11 days @ \$200 = \$2,200 |
|-------|---------------------------|

We have a grant request pending with the Ploughshares Fund, whose board meets on September 29. If we receive that grant, it is likely to be effective on October 1, and we can continue the work for nuclear abolition now funded by the Rubin Foundation.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

X-Authentication-Warning: igc2.igc.apc.org: majordomo set sender to owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org using -f

Date: Wed, 24 Sep 1997 09:07:35 -0700 (PDT)

From: NGO Committee on Disarmament <disarmtimes@igc.apc.org>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: millennium logjam

To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

Those who have been considering a campaign asking the U.N. to declare the year 2000 as a ceremonial year for nuclear disarmament might do well to consider the following plank of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines Action Plan for a quick entry into force of the treaty just concluded in Oslo:

"The International Campaign to Ban Landmines will press the U.N. to proclaim the year 2000 as International Year of the Eradication of Landmines."

Peacefully,  
Roger Smith  
NGO Committee on Disarmament

To: aslater@igc.apc.org, LCNP@AOL.COM  
From: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Draft letter to President Clinton  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

To: Alice Slater, Alyn Ware

I have drafted the following letter to President Clinton to lay out the kind of policies on nuclear disarmament that we would like the United States to support at the UN General Assembly, Conference on Disarmament, and NPT PrepCom. I am circulating the draft to the Nuclear Weapons Working Group of the Monday Lobby for comments. I would also like to have your comments in the next few days. After I get agreement on wording from several key organizations, I'll put in on abolition-caucus for broader circulation.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman  
phone/fax: 896-0013

Draft  
September 24, 1997

Please offer comments to Howard Hallman.  
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013. E-mail: mupj@igc.apc.org

The Honorable William J. Clinton  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

On a number of occasions you have expressed a desire to see the total elimination of nuclear weapons on Earth. In your second inaugural address you offered a vision of a land of new promise where "our children will sleep free from the threat of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons." This vision has wide public support, as indicated in a poll conducted last spring that revealed that 84 percent of American voters would feel safer knowing that no country had nuclear weapons.

Already there are global conventions for the elimination of chemical and biological weapons. In the survey 87 percent of the respondents agreed that the United States should negotiate a similar agreement to eliminate nuclear weapons. In the next eight months three international bodies will be meeting and will have opportunities to take significant steps toward accomplishing this goal. We hope that under your leadership the United States will play a constructive role in these gatherings.

The first occasion is the 52nd Session of the United Nations General Assembly, now meeting in New York. It is our understanding that the General Assembly will consider a resolution similar to the one proposed by Malaysia and adopted last December that (1) notes the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice that "there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control" and (2) "calls upon all states to fulfill that obligation immediately by commencing negotiations of a nuclear weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deploying,

stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination." We ask that the United States drop its opposition to such a resolution and strongly endorse it.

The second occasion will be the reconvening of the UN Conference on Disarmament in Geneva in January 1998. Previously some participants have proposed that the Conference establish an ad hoc committee to commence multi-lateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Likely this proposal will come up again. We favor this approach. Therefore, we ask that the United States support creation of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament.

The third occasion will be meeting of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee in Geneva in April 1998. In preparation for this meeting we recommend that the United States take several good faith actions that begin to respond to the obligations under Article VI of the NPT. Specifically we urge that the United States begin to carry out "immediate steps" recommended by the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons:

- Take nuclear weapons off alert
- Remove warheads from delivery vehicles
- End deployment of non-strategic nuclear weapons
- Achieve agreement with other nuclear weapon states for reciprocal no first use

At the meeting of the NPT PrepCom we ask that the United States support efforts to establish a working group to begin negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention. Such a group could work out a division of responsibility with the ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament of the Conference on Disarmament, for there are many tasks to perform in moving toward the goal of nuclear abolition.

None of these multi-lateral efforts would preclude the United States and Russia from working out a START III agreement that would substantially reduce the world's two largest nuclear arsenals. Indeed, such bilateral reductions can set the stage for total elimination by all parties under a nuclear weapons convention.

Mr. President, as you lead the United States on this journey, we promise to help build public support for such bold measures. As previously indicated, the American people are already inclined in this direction and will welcome your leadership to work out arrangements for global elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework.

Sincerely yours,

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 25 Sep 1997 10:47:45 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: CTB Ratification and the US hi tech program  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc3.igc.apc.org id KAA02977  
X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org

Hi Abolitionists,  
Now that the CTB ratification debate is heating up in the US (and I imagine in other countries as well), I thought I'd post this article on the relationship of the CTB to the US Stockpile Stewardship program. Regards, Alice

## RATIFICATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY - AT WHAT PRICE? By Alice Slater

President Clinton submitted the long sought Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTB) to the Senate for ratification this month, but it falls far short of its description as "comprehensive" and it doesn't ban nuclear tests. Indeed, in July 1997, a so-called "sub-critical" nuclear test was conducted 1000 feet below the desert floor at the Nevada Test Site in which 3.3 pounds of deadly plutonium was blown up with chemical explosives without causing a chain reaction, hence "sub-critical". Another similar nuclear test occurred on September 18th, with four more scheduled for 1998 and more to come, as part of a thirteen year \$60 billion "stockpile stewardship program" which will enable the weaponeers to design new nuclear bombs in computer simulated virtual reality. These computers are not laptops. The program includes the stadium sized \$3.4 billion National Ignition Facility at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, computers as large as houses, and technology for prototyping new weapons and developing virtual manufacturing. The deployment of a new post-cold war nuclear weapon, the B61-11 earth penetrating "bunker buster" has been revealed, and a replacement for nuclear warheads on Trident submarines is in design, with plans for missile flight tests in 2002 and 2003.

Clinton's 1995 announcement supporting CTB negotiations was coupled with a promise to deliver on the stewardship program, ostensibly to secure the "safety and reliability" of the US arsenal. Yet in 1992, Clinton decided not to end a nine month moratorium, declaring that our weapons were safe and reliable and that the costs of resumed testing outweighed the benefits.

Noted retired weapons designers, Ray Kidder (Livermore) and Richard Garwin (Los Alamos), agree that we can maintain the arsenal's safety and reliability without the costly stewardship program. Kidder argues that the underground tests will raise international distrust of our good faith intentions to comply with the CTB and both Garwin and Kidder propose that the better option would be to maintain the capability to re-manufacture existing weapons, without the need for new designs which could create the need for ever more tests. Indeed, during the debate on whether to extend the 1992 moratorium, the Congressional Record revealed that since 1950 there were 32 airplane crashes with nuclear bombs aboard, and although two of the

crashes resulted in the scattering of plutonium (over Thule Greenland and Palomares Spain), none of the weapons ever exploded! Then why this deal with the labs?

Clinton promised to provide the Pentagon and the weaponeers the ability to design new nuclear weapons in order to buy their acquiescence for Senate ratification of the CTB. History presents a sad parallel. In 1963, when President Kennedy sought ratification of the Partial Test Ban Treaty, Deborah Shapely notes, in *Promise and Power: The Life and Times of Robert McNamara*, that:

"The foes of the test ban in Congress, who were ready to do battle with Kennedy and expected to gain momentum from military testimony, were disappointed. The chiefs did testify for the treaty, because in the locked room they had demanded an enormous price: more funding for the weapons labs, preparation to test quickly in case the Soviets violated the agreement, and other conditions. The net effect was to strengthen the weapons labs, expand U.S. underground testing, and continue the arms race."

The irony here is that continued design capacity for a new generation of nuclear weapons, in exchange for Pentagon support for CTB ratification, will undermine its international entry into force. For the CTB to become a binding agreement, the 44 nations with nuclear reactors on their soil must become signatories. (This unusual requirement is an acknowledgment of the bomb-making capacity of nations in possession of commercial reactors.) Countries such as India and Pakistan announced that they will not sign the CTB as long as the US continues its provocative program. Using our advanced technology to design nuclear weapons serves as an invitation to less developed countries to test and develop nuclear arsenals by more antiquated methods.

India, reacting to the July 1997 sub-critical test, stated that its opposition to the CTB as "not genuinely comprehensive" was vindicated as the pact contained "loopholes ... exploited by some countries to continue their testing activity, using more sophisticated and advanced techniques", and is a discriminatory non-proliferation measure that does not contribute to global nuclear disarmament. China also expressed its concern to the US.

The American public is clearly opposed to such activities. A recent poll by Celinda Lake of Lake Sosin Snell and Associates indicates that 87% of all Americans think we should negotiate a treaty to eliminate nuclear weapons just as the world has done for chemical and biological weapons. And 84% said they would feel safer if they knew for sure that all countries, including the US had eliminated their nuclear arsenals.

Public concern is increasingly echoed by some of our most distinguished scientists and military leaders. The National Academy of Sciences called for much deeper cuts in the arsenal, going down to 1000 bombs and then to a few hundred each for Russia and the US. General Lee Butler, Commander of US Air Force and Navy strategic nuclear forces from 1992 to 1994, has been joined by a number of other high ranking military leaders in saying that the continued possession of nuclear weapons increases international insecurity because the very existence of nuclear arsenals in some nations provides an incentive to other nations to acquire them. This warning, coupled with

overwhelming public concern, should be a signal to the Clinton administration to support a true CTB unencumbered by the baggage of the proposed \$60 billion recipe for nuclear proliferation. Economists have calculated in 1995 that a passive curatorship program of the arsenal, while it awaits dismantlement, would cost only \$100 million a year. It's time to end this final chapter of the Cold War. (Copies of the Abolition 2000 public opinion poll on nuclear weapons are available at [GRACE](#))

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Fri, 26 Sep 1997 13:49:33 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: NPT Working Group Minutes, strategies  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc3.igc.apc.org id NAA15403  
X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org

## Minutes

Abolition 2000 Working Group for the NPT, New York  
September 22, 1997  
From: Alice Slater

Present: Sonya Ostrom, (Peace Action), Mary Ellen Singsen (Scarsdale Campaign for Peace through Common Security), Anne Zanes (Peace Links), Gary Ferdman (Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities) Alyn Ware (Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy), Tina Bell (NY Metro WILPF & Oxford Research Group), Nureet Ben Hara (NGO Committee on Disarmament), Alice Slater (GRACE), Bobbi Linfield (Professional Network for Social Responsibility), John Klotz (The Sierra Club), Chris Nye (War Resisters League)

1. LETTER TO AMBASSADOR STRULAK: The group reviewed and approved a letter to Ambassador Strulak, the Chair of the 1998 PrepCom requesting broader NGO participation at the PrepCom. The proposals for participation were developed in discussion by Alice with Douglas Roche, former Canadian Ambassador for the UN. The letter is listed below:

Sign-on letter for NGO participation at NPT in Geneva

Ambassador Tadeusz Strulak  
Foreign Ministry's Department of the UN  
Al. J. Szucha 23, 00580  
Warsaw Poland

Dear Ambassador Strulak,

The Abolition 2000 Network for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons would like to congratulate you on your assumption of the chairmanship of the second Preparatory Committee Meeting for the NPT Review, to be held in Geneva in 1998. We wish you much success in moving the world closer to the promise of the NPT for nuclear disarmament. Abolition 2000, now supported by over 700 organizations, came into being at the 1995 Non-Proliferation Treaty Review and Extension Conference when more than 60 NGOs from every continent met to adopt our founding document, the Abolition Statement, which is enclosed for your information. Impelled by the lack of urgency on the part of the nuclear powers to honor the promise of the NPT's Article VI, the men and women gathered there joined forces to put nuclear abolition on the world's agenda.

Now we are writing to seek your assistance to enable our voices to be heard in a meaningful and constructive way during the 1998 PrepCom. At the 1997 PrepCom, only a small number of the NGOs present were permitted to address

the delegates at an unofficial session two days before the conference closed. We received numerous comments from delegates that our information was new and valuable and would have been more useful to them if they had it before their deliberations were virtually completed. Complimenting the NGOs at the end of their presentations, Chairman Patokallio said the comments were "valuable, interesting, knowledgeable and passionate." Mexico thanked the NGOs for their "technical, specialized information." The NAM paper said that NGOs could make a "positive contribution" towards realizing the objectives of the NPT. Enclosed are the NGO presentations for your review as well as our "Sunflower Statement" to the delegates which urged more meaningful NGO participation in the future.

Unfortunately, NGOs had almost no access to the official proceedings and were admitted at only three sessions during the two week meeting. In this post cold war era, when the NPT is so important to prevent new threats of nuclear proliferation, and in light of the demonstrated competence by NGO leaders to contribute to greater understanding of the issues addressed, we request your support for a minimum level of participation as follows:

1. Access to all plenary meetings
2. NGO presentations at the opening debate at a regular session of the PrepComm (We propose a two hour time allotment at the opening debate for 15 NGO speakers for eight minutes each.)
3. Distribution of all documents to the NGO Committee on Disarmament which will further distribute them to NGOs present.

The proposals above, while absolutely necessary, are not sufficient. We would like an opportunity to discuss with you the importance of our attendance at the main committee meetings as well.

NGOs will be arriving in Geneva, many traveling great distances at their own expense, to participate in helping to move the agenda forward. It is important for the health of the democratic process and for the advancement of the NPT's promise that NGOs be permitted the same level of access and ability to share their information, as they have enjoyed at meetings organized to address social, economic, and human rights issues. Dialogue on nuclear disarmament is too important to be engaged in only by government representatives. NGOs have a long and valuable tradition of shedding light on critical global issues and moving us all towards a more peaceful and secure world.

During the two weeks of the PrepCom meeting, Abolition 2000 will organize a series of panel discussion on relevant issues as we did in 1997 in New York. We deeply appreciated your attendance at our panel discussion on the new programs at the nuclear weapons laboratories and hope that you will also find our 1998 panels of interest.

We very much hope that you will support our proposals for greater participation for NGOs at the 1998 PrepCom and help us to broaden the opportunity for dialogue and movement at this meeting towards the swift implementation of the NPT promise for nuclear disarmament.

Sincerely yours,

(List names of Abolition 2000 NPT Working Group Members and other A-2000 NGOs)

PLEASE E-MAIL OR CALL THE GRACE OFFICE BY SEPTEMBER 30TH IF YOU WOULD LIKE YOUR NAME AND ORGANIZATION ON THE LETTER (aslater@igc.apc.org; 212-726-9161)

## 2. STRATEGIES FOR THE PREPCOM

A. South Africa: Nelson Mandela can play a major role in proposing at the 1998 PrepCom that negotiations begin on a nuclear weapons convention. (See background info below) We reviewed our contacts with people connected to South Africa and agreed to speak to the following people:

Congressman Major Owens - Bobbi Linfield

Congressman Ron Dellums - Bobbi Linfield

Wayne Fredericks - Alice Slater

Bob Boehm - Alice Slater

Nigeria contact - John Klotz

[Editors Note: If abolitionists around the world think this is a good idea, please join us in urging Nelson Mandela, through your contacts in South Africa, to propose at the PrepCom that negotiations begin on a NWC.

## BACKGROUND PAPER FOR A SOUTH AFRICAN STRATEGY

Abolition 2000: A Global Network for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons came into being at the 1995 Non-Proliferation Treaty Review and Extension Conference when more than 60 NGOs from every continent adopted our founding document, the Abolition Statement and put nuclear abolition on the world's agenda. While the nuclear powers and their economic partners and allies were insisting on an indefinite and unconditional extension of the 25 year treaty, maintaining the outrageous status quo which had resulted in the proliferation of tens of thousands of more nuclear bombs on the planet since the 1970 treaty's adoption, newly born abolitionists were laying out the steps to nuclear disarmament, beginning with their first demand that negotiations begin immediately and conclude by the year 2000 on a nuclear weapons convention within a timebound framework.

## SOUTH AFRICA'S ROLE TO DATE AT THE NPT

The Non-Aligned Movement, at a meeting in Bandung prior to the conference, was blocked by South Africa in its attempt to obtain consensus for a unified position on conditions for disarmament in exchange for their vote to extend the treaty. South Africa presented a proposal, agreeable to the nuclear powers, and ultimately adopted by the conference after much arm twisting and political pressure, to support certain "principles and objectives" which included the completion of a CTBT no later than 1996, the negotiation of a ban on the production of fissile materials for weapons purposes, and for efforts to reduce nuclear weapons with the "ultimate" goal of eliminating them. The delegates also endorsed a "strengthened" review process with Review Conferences to be held every five years and Preparatory meetings each year beginning in 1997 with a possible fourth PrepCom prior to the first review in 2000.

For the 1997 PrepCom the Non-Aligned Movement met once again to develop a consensus position on nuclear disarmament prior to the first PrepCom under the "strengthened" review process. Once again, South Africa blocked consensus, this time joined by Chile. South Africa at this first PrepCom

proposed a treaty by the year 2000 for negative security assurances for NPT non-nuclear weapons states – promise you won't bomb me if I am a non-nuclear member of the NPT. The paltriness of the South African proposal ironically echoed the call of Abolition 2000, now a burgeoning network of nearly 800 organizations, for a treaty by the year 2000 to eliminate nuclear weapons. In light of a US public opinion poll conducted by GRACE for the Abolition 2000 Network just prior to the PrepCom, which revealed that 87% of all US citizens favored a treaty for the elimination of nuclear weapons just as the world has provided for biological and chemical weapons – and 84% said they would feel safer if no country had nuclear weapons including the US, it seems that the next task is to mobilize that public opinion, which no doubt is a reflection of similar sentiments around the world, to move towards abolition.

One place to start would be in South Africa itself. Over the years, the peace movement has made many grassroots connections to the people of South Africa as we joined with them to end the terrible reign of apartheid in that beleaguered country. Abolitionists are discussing how to activate our contacts in South Africa to urge Nelson Mandela to take a principled stand, at the 1998 PrepCom, for negotiations to begin on a nuclear weapons convention. Mandela is one of the few world leaders on the scene today who could use his personal influence to change the course of history. At a minimum, we should urge him through every channels open to us, not to place South Africa in the "spoilers" role the next time the Non-Aligned Movement meets to develop a consensus to move the disarmament agenda forward.

**ACTION ALERT:** Please request of all your contacts in South Africa that they urge Nelson Mandela to adopt a position at the 1998 NPT PrepCom in Geneva proposing that negotiations begin immediately on a Nuclear Weapons Convention just as the world has done for biological and chemical weapons. Include this information in your newsletters. Share your activity with our Network.

#### NPT STRATEGIES (cont)

B. USA Strategy: Send a letter to President Clinton and to our Senators and Congressman urging them to contact Clinton and request that the US propose at the PrepCom that negotiations begin on a treaty to eliminate nuclear weapons. (John Klotz will draft sample letter)

We will also try to contact organizations and put information in our newsletters about the NPT USA strategy.

Educators for Social Responsibility - Bobbi Linfield

20/20 - Gary Ferdman

[Editors Note: To abolitionists outside the USA, we urge a similar strategy with your heads of state.]

3. CTB RATIFICATION AND STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP (\$60 billion over 13 years for sub-critical tests and computer simulation equipment, ie NIF at Livermore, DAHRT at Los Alamos, which will enable US weapons labs to design new nukes):

President Clinton submitted the CTB treaty to the Senate for ratification on September 22nd. We have already had remarks from Senators Biden and Bingaman that CTB ratification is dependent on giving the weapons labs the \$60 billion stockpile stewardship program.(remarks available upon request). A passive curatorship of the arsenal while it awaits dismantlement will cost about \$100 million.

John Klotz proposed that we try to arrange meetings with Senators who support the CTB and are willing to speak against this "deal". The group volunteered to contact various Senators. [Editor's Note: To USA Abolitionists: Please do likewise in your states and contact NPT Working Group on your progress [aslater@igc.apc.org](mailto:aslater@igc.apc.org)]

4. TARGETING US PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES: John Klotz suggested that we make a special effort to contact candidates thinking of running for President and set up meetings with them on US nuclear policy. [Editors Note: To US Abolitionists: Please do likewise in your states and contact NPT Working Group on your progress [aslater@igc.apc.org](mailto:aslater@igc.apc.org)]

5. CASSINI: Tina Bell requested that we fax letters to Clinton's Science Advisor, Dr. John Gibbons (202-456-6021) urging the cancellation of Cassini. Tina said that WILPF is visiting UN missions in New York urging them to protest the launch, now scheduled for October 13th.

6. MALAYSIAN RESOLUTION: Alyn Ware reported that Malaysia will be resubmitting its resolution calling for the negotiation of a nuclear weapons convention in 1997 to the General Assembly. Alyn requested that we write letters to the UN missions requesting their cosponsorship of the resolution and that they speak in support at the Plenary or in the First Committee. (For voting list on last year's resolution and sample letter, contact Alyn at [lcnp@igc.apc.org](mailto:lcnp@igc.apc.org))

7. THE PEACEMAKER: New Yorkers demonstrated at the world premiere of this film about nuclear terrorism and handed out a brochure to inform the public that the only way to insure against nuclear terrorism is to negotiate a treaty for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Brochures are available from the Lawyer Committee on Nuclear Policy if you would like to use this event in your community to educate the public. ([lcnp@aol.com](mailto:lcnp@aol.com))

8. AFSC CONFERENCE, BOSTON, OCTOBER 24-26, 1967: Alice distributed flyers for The New England Organizing Conference for Nuclear Weapons Abolition initiated by AFSC. To register and for information: email at [afscamb@igc.apc.org](mailto:afscamb@igc.apc.org)

OUR NEXT MEETING WILL BE ON MONDAY, OCTOBER 27, GRACE, 15 E. 26 ST., 10TH FLOOR, 12:00 NOON, BROWN BAG LUNCH, COFFEE AND TEA WILL BE PROVIDED  
RSVP: CHRIS WEST, 212-726-9161 OR BY E-MAIL TO [ASLATER@IGC.APC.ORG](mailto:ASLATER@IGC.APC.ORG)

#### REMINDER

PLEASE DON'T FORGET TO RESPOND ON THE LETTER TO AMBASSADOR STRULAK (ITEM 1) IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD YOUR NAME AND ORGANIZATION TO THE LIST OF ABOLITION 2000 NGOS ASKING FOR GREATER PARTICIPATION AT THE NPT IN GENEVA

>From aslater Fri Sep 26 13:46:24 1997  
>Return-Path: <aslater@igc.apc.org>  
>Date: Fri, 26 Sep 1997 13:46:20 -0700 (PDT)  
>X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org  
>To: mupj@igc.apc.org, LCNP@AOL.COM  
>From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>  
>Subject: Re: Draft letter to President Clinton  
>Sender: aslater@igc.org  
>X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc3.igc.apc.org id NAA15238

Thanks for taking the initiative on this Howard. I think it is an excellent letter. I have added my one addition in brackets. Regards, Alice

At 06:57 PM 9/25/97 -0700, mupj@igc.apc.org wrote:

>To: Alice Slater, Alyn Ware

>

>I have drafted the following letter to President Clinton to lay out the kind  
>of policies on nuclear disarmament that we would like the United States to  
>support at the UN General Assembly, Conference on Disarmament, and NPT  
>PrepCom. I am circulating the draft to the Nuclear Weapons Working Group of  
>the Monday Lobby for comments. I would also like to have your comments in  
>the next few days. After I get agreement on wording from several key  
>organizations, I'll put in on abolition-caucus for broader circulation.

>

>With best regards,

>

>Howard W. Hallman

>phone/fax: 896-0013

>

>

>

> Draft

> September 24, 1997

>

> Please offer comments to Howard Hallman.

> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013. E-mail: mupj@igc.apc.org

>

>

>The Honorable William J. Clinton

>The White House

>Washington, DC 20500

>

>Dear Mr. President:

>

>On a number of occasions you have expressed a desire to see the total  
>elimination of nuclear weapons on Earth. In your second inaugural address  
>you offered a vision of a land of new promise where "our children will sleep  
>free from the threat of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons." This  
>vision has wide public support, as indicated in a poll conducted last spring  
>[by Celinda Lake of Lake Sosin Snell Associates,(Clinton knows her and it  
>will carry more weight)]that revealed that 84 percent of American voters  
>would feel safer knowing that no country had nuclear weapons.

>

>Already there are global conventions for the elimination of chemical and  
>biological weapons. In the survey 87 percent of the respondents agreed that  
>the United States should negotiate a similar agreement to eliminate nuclear  
>weapons. In the next eight months three international bodies will be  
>meeting and will have opportunities to take significant steps toward  
>accomplishing this goal. We hope that under your leadership the United  
>States will play a constructive role in these gatherings.

>  
>The first occasion is the 52nd Session of the United Nations General  
>Assembly, now meeting in New York. It is our understanding that the General  
>Assembly will consider a resolution similar to the one proposed by Malaysia  
>and adopted last December that (1) notes the unanimous conclusion of the  
>International Court of Justice that "there exists an obligation to pursue in  
>good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear  
>disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international  
>control" and (2) "calls upon all states to fulfill that obligation  
>immediately by commencing negotiations of a nuclear weapons convention  
>prohibiting the development, production, testing, deploying, stockpiling,  
>transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their  
>elimination." We ask that the United States drop its opposition to such a  
>resolution and strongly endorse it.

>  
>The second occasion will be the reconvening of the UN Conference on  
>Disarmament in Geneva in January 1998. Previously some participants have  
>proposed that the Conference establish an ad hoc committee to commence  
>multi-lateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Likely this proposal  
>will come up again. We favor this approach. Therefore, we ask that the  
>United States support creation of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament  
>within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament.

>  
>The third occasion will be meeting of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)  
>Preparatory Committee in Geneva in April 1998. In preparation for this  
>meeting we recommend that the United States take several good faith actions  
>that begin to respond to the obligations under Article VI of the NPT.  
>Specifically we urge that the United States begin to carry out "immediate  
>steps" recommended by the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear  
>Weapons:

- >
- >· Take nuclear weapons off alert
- >· Remove warheads from delivery vehicles
- >· End deployment of non-strategic nuclear weapons
- >· Achieve agreement with other nuclear weapon states for reciprocal no  
first use

>  
>At the meeting of the NPT PrepCom we ask that the United States support  
>efforts to establish a working group to begin negotiations on a nuclear  
>weapons convention. Such a group could work out a division of  
>responsibility with the ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament of the  
>Conference on Disarmament, for there are many tasks to perform in moving  
>toward the goal of nuclear abolition.

>  
>None of these multi-lateral efforts would preclude the United States and  
>Russia from working out a START III agreement that would substantially  
>reduce the world's two largest nuclear arsenals. Indeed, such bilateral

>reductions can set the stage for total elimination by all parties under a  
>nuclear weapons convention.

>

>Mr. President, as you lead the United States on this journey, we promise to  
>help build public support for such bold measures. As previously indicated,  
>the American people are already inclined in this direction and will welcome  
>your leadership to work out arrangements for global elimination of nuclear  
>weapons within a timebound framework.

>

>Sincerely yours,

>

>

>

Return-Path: <ledwidge@psr.org>  
Date: Fri, 26 Sep 1997 15:45:29 -0400  
From: Lisa Ledwidge <ledwidge@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: ogr.parti@ecunet.org, adaction@ix.netcom.com,  
cob\_washington\_office@ecunet.org, cwu\_washington.parti@ecunet.org,  
pdd@clark.net, bruce.hall@wdc.greenpeace.org, mccwjdb@erols.com,  
mupj@igc.org, network@igc.org, barbara\_green@pcusa.org,  
pogodef@mnsinc.com, tperry@ucsusa.org, uuawo@aol.com,  
paxchristi@igc.org  
CC: meldredge@igc.org  
Subject: [Fwd: Subcritical test Letter]

Please consider signing your group on to the following letter opposing the subcritical nuclear weapons experiments. Deadline is Monday, Sept. 29. Contact Maureen Eldredge (meldredge@igc.org) with your name and organization to sign. Thank you. (Apologies if you receive this twice.)

Return-Path: <meldredge@igc.apc.org>  
Received: from ppp6-70.igc.org (meldredge@ppp6-70.igc.org)  
by igc3.igc.apc.org (8.8.7/8.8.7) with SMTP id MAA10471;  
Fri, 26 Sep 1997 12:29:08 -0700 (PDT)  
Date: Fri, 26 Sep 1997 12:29:08 -0700 (PDT)  
Message-Id: <2.2.16.19970926153057.3f5f4fb4@pop.igc.org>  
X-Sender: meldredge@pop.igc.org (Unverified)  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (16)  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
To: tomatompn+@igc.org, nabbasic@aol.com, zselden@bens.rog, jdi@clw.org,  
73744.3675@compuserve.com, rajmutalik@igc.org, schlefer@earthlink.net,  
cpaine@nrdc.org, nci@access.digex.net, dculp@nrdc.org,  
shundahi@intermind.net, tcollina@ucsusa.org, ccuff@ESSENTIAL.ORG,  
hn5236@handsnet.org, spusa@spusa.org, davidhart@igc.org  
From: maureen eldredge <meldredge@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Subcritical test Letter  
Sender: meldredge@igc.org

This was going to go today, but in review the letter sent on June 10, I think we need to get many more signatures. Please let me know by noon on Monday, Sept. 29 if your organization can sign on. So far there has been very little response from our community (the excellent actions at NTS and LLNL are the exception) to the second test, which sends the message that we don't much care anymore. Please sign on if you can, we must at least be on record in opposition.

-Thanks,  
Maureen

Friends Committee on National Legislation o Greenpeace o Methodists  
United for Peace and Justice o Military Production Network o Peace  
Action o Physicians for Social Responsibility o Womens Action for  
New Directions o20/20 Vision

# CANCEL THE SUBCRITICAL NUCLEAR TESTS!

September 26, 1997

President William J. Clinton  
The White House  
1000 Pennsylvania Ave, NW  
Washington, DC 20

Dear President Clinton:

As peace, disarmament, religious, and environmental groups with hundreds of thousands of members across the country, we remain strongly opposed to the continued program of subcritical tests conducted by the Department of Energy (DOE) and urge its cancellation. The most recent test, which occurred on Sept. 18th, comes on the heels of the Russian "seismic event" which has raised international concerns about the verification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). The continuation of the US program of subcritical testing will be detrimental to US efforts to stem proliferation of nuclear weapons and to secure the international implementation of the CTBT.

The US will set the pace for future progress on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Conducting underground experiments involving chemical high explosives and weapons-grade plutonium at the Nevada Test Site is a continuing provocation to the international community.

DOE's "Green Book" (1996) states that these experiments are "to provide data for nuclear design laboratory programs," contrary to DOE's recent claims that the subcritical tests are to assist in understanding aging weapons. The tests send the message that the US is more interested in advancing nuclear weapons expertise than in advancing non-proliferation and disarmament goals.

The subcritical experiments set a dangerous precedent which may encourage other nations to conduct similar experiments. The recent incident near or at the Russian test site of Novaya Zemlya clearly demonstrates this point. How can we be sure that other nations would not use subcritical tests for nuclear weapons development?

We urge you to take international leadership to build support and trust in the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty that you signed a year ago. The US should set a global standard against conducting nuclear weapons activities at nuclear test sites. Canceling the subcritical tests and seeking agreement with Russia and China to permanently close the world's remaining nuclear test sites would clearly demonstrate your strong commitment to upholding the emerging CTBT regime. The window of opportunity to remove the threat of nuclear weapons is shrinking. It is time to act boldly and make fundamental changes in the US nuclear weapons program.

Sincerely,

Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Edward (Ned) W. Stowe

Greenpeace  
Bruce Hall

Methodists United for Peace and Justice  
Howard Hallman

Military Production Network  
Maureen Eldredge

Peace Action  
Gordon Clark

Physicians for Social Responsibility  
Robert Tiller

Womens Action for New Directions  
Susan Shaer

20/20 Vision  
Robin Caiola

cc: Secretary Federico Pena

\*\*\*\*\*

Maureen Eldredge  
Program Director  
The Military Production Network  
1801 18th St. NW, Suite 9-2  
Washington, DC 20009  
202-833-4668/fax: 202-234-9536

A national alliance of watchdog organizations  
working on DOE's nuclear weapons complex.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 30 Sep 1997 01:00:00 +0000  
From: IPPNW@OLN.comlink.apc.org (IPPNW Int Aerzte gg Atomkrieg)  
Lines: 56  
Organization: IPPNW Germany  
Orig-To: greencross@mbox300.swipnet.se  
Path: oln.comlink.apc.org  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: Stockholm Conference  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Gateway: ZCONNECT sonne.comlink.apc.org [UNIX/Connect v0.74b4MB06]  
X-ZC-POST: Koertestrasse 10

Diese Nachricht ist weitergeleitet von IPPNW@OLN.comlink.apc.org:

DEUTSCHE SEKTION DER INTERNATIONALEN AERZTE  
FUER DIE VERHUETUNG DES ATOMKRIEGES  
AERZTE IN SOZIALER VERANTWORTUNG  
International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW)

Koertestraße 10,                      Tel: +49 (0)30 693 0244  
D-10967 Berlin 61,                      Fax: +49 (0)30 693 8166

IPPNW@VLBerlin.comlink.de              IPPNW@OLN.comlink.apc.org  
<http://www.ippnw.de>

---

30.09.97

Dear Ms Frohlich,

I don't know if we have met, but I am one of the organisers of the meeting at Burg Schlaining and the Abolition 2000 contact person for Europe.

I am interested in taking part in the Conference in Stockholm Dec 5-7 1997 and would like to make a couple of requests.

Firstly, we would like to discuss how to build on and organise the European Abolition 2000 Network. The suggestion has been made that we try to increase the endorsers list for the Abolition Statement to 1000 by next April for the NPT PrepCom. This requires some hard work and coordination. So I would like to ask the Swedish Peace Council and the NGO Committee on Disarmament if there can be some time and space put aside for a meeting of the European Abolition 2000 Network.

Secondly, we would like to organise a Week of Action in Geneva during the NPT PrepCom. I am working together with the Abolition 2000 NPT Working Group Conveners, Alice Slater, and Felicity Hill on this. I will be writing a concept in the next few days and would like to discuss this at the meeting in Stockholm with interested people. Perhaps you could fit this in under the topic listed in the advance notice: "Preparations for the 2nd PrepCom of the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference".

I am copying this message to the abolition-caucus list server, so that others know of my request.

Looking forward to hearing from you,

Xanthe Hall  
(Co-Director)

---

IPPNW is a member of Abolition 2000  
- a Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons -

---

## CrossPoint v3.1 ##

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 30 Sep 1997 07:45:17 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: 1000 enrollees by Geneva  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org

Dear Friends,

Below is an Abolition 2000 enrollment form and a list of our Working Groups. We would like to move from 700+ enrollees to 1000 by the time we get to the NPT PrepCom in Geneva this April. If you are already enrolled, please pass it on to your various e-mail networks. REMEMBER TO RESPOND TO WAGINGPEACE@NAPF.ORG, not to me.

The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation at that address is keeping the list of signers. They can also provide you with an information packet about the A-2000 Network and hard copies of the sign-on form if you want to work on more organizations. If you don't know whether you've signed on to the Abolition Statement, they will also be able to help you. Many thanks for working on our 1000 NGOs campaign. Regards, Alice

Abolition 2000  
A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

"Sunflowers instead of missiles in the soil will insure peace for future generations"

US Secretary of Defense William J Perry on June 4, 1996, the day the Ukraine officially gave up its nuclear weapons. Russian and Ukrainian defense secretaries joined him in a ceremony planting sunflowers on a former missile site.

The following organization endorses the Abolition 2000 Statement:

Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

We enclose \$100 \_\_\_ \$50 \_\_\_ \$25 \_\_\_ \$other \_\_\_ for network support.

We would like to participate in and/or receive more information about the following Working Group(s): \_\_\_\_\_

Please remember to fill out the form completely to ensure we can contact you in the future!!!

Abolition 2000, c/o David Krieger, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation

1187 Coast Village Road, #123, Santa Barbara, CA 93108  
tel:805.965.3443, fax:805.568.0466, email: [wagingpeace@napf.org](mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org)

**REGIONS AND WORKING GROUPS:** The development of strategies and initiatives occurs through the regions and the working groups. Anyone can participate in the activities of the working groups by contacting the convenor. For more information about the purpose and work of each working group, please contact the convenor.

- 1) Nuclear Weapons Convention: Jurgen Scheffran INESAP, Institut fuer Kernphysik, Schlogartenstrae 9, D-64289 Darmstadt, Germany, Tel: +49-6151-163016, fax: 166039,  
E-mail: [scheffran@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de](mailto:scheffran@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de)
- 2) Non-Nuclear Security Model for Europe: Solange Fernex, (WILPF and Greens, France)  
F-68480 Biederthal, France, Tel: +33-1-89-407183, Fax: 407804
- 3) Chernobyl and Nuclear Power: "For Mother Earth" Lange Steenstraat 16/D, B-9000 Gent, Belgium, Tel: + 32-9-233-73-02, Fax: +32-9-233-8439, E-mail: [fme@int.knooppunt.be](mailto:fme@int.knooppunt.be)
- 4) Media, Communication and Outreach: Janet Bloomfield, 25 Farmadine, Saffron-Walden, Essex, England CB11 3HR, Tel: +44-179-951-6189, Fax: same, call first,  
E-mail: [jbloomfield@gn.apc.org](mailto:jbloomfield@gn.apc.org)
- 5) CTBT and Beyond: Jackie Cabasso (WSLF), 1440 Broadway, Suite 500, Oakland, CA 94612, Tel: +1-510-839-5877, Fax: 839-5397, E-mail: [wslf@igc.apc.org](mailto:wslf@igc.apc.org)
- 6) Fissile Materials: no convenor as yet.
- 7) Overcoming Nuclear Threats/Legal Issues: Rob Green (WCP UK), 2 Chiswick House, High Street, Twyford, Berks RG10 8AG, UK, Tel/Fax: +44-734-340-258,  
E-mail: [robwcpuk@gn.apc.org](mailto:robwcpuk@gn.apc.org)
- 8) NPT Prep Coms: Alice Slater (GRACE), 15 E. 26th St., New York, N.Y. 10010, Tel: +1-212-726-9161, Fax: 726-9160, E-mail: [aslater@igc.apc.org](mailto:aslater@igc.apc.org),  
AND  
Felicity Hill, WILPF/International, Case Postale 28, 1 Rue de Varembo, Geneva,  
Switzerland CH 1211, Tel: +41-22-733-6175, Fax: 740-1063,  
E-mail: [womensleague@gn.apc.org](mailto:womensleague@gn.apc.org)
- 9) Newsletter: Tobias Damjanov, (German Peace Society/DFG-VK, Germany) c/o INES, POB 101707, D-44017 Dortmund, Germany, Tel +49-2327-81987, Fax: 740-1063, E-mail: [dfg-vk.nrw@anarch.ping.de](mailto:dfg-vk.nrw@anarch.ping.de),  
Internet WWW page: <http://cac.psu.edu/~duf/social/ines.html>
- 10) Radiation Health Effects Working Group: Trisha Pritikin, (Hanford Downwinders Coalition), 439 Boynton Ave., Berkeley, CA 94707, USA, Tel/Fax: 1+510-524-0834,  
E-mail: [pritikin@vdm.com](mailto:pritikin@vdm.com),  
AND  
Pamela Meidell (Atomic Mirror), P.O. Box 220, Port Hueneme, CA 93044, Tel: 1+805-985-5073, Fax: 985-7563, E-mail: [pmeidell@igc.org](mailto:pmeidell@igc.org)
- 11) Religious Working Group: Howard Hallman, (Methodists United for Peace with Justice), 16th St. NW, Washington D.C. 20036, USA, Tel/Fax: 1+301-896-0013,  
E-mail: [mupj@igc.apc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.apc.org)

AND

David Gracie (American Friends Service Committee), 1501 Cherry St.,  
Philadelphia,  
PA 19102, USA, Tel: 1+215-241-7162, Fax: 241-7177, E-mail:  
dgracie@afsc.org

AND

Clayton Ramey, (Fellowship of Reconciliation), 521 North Broadway,  
Nyack, N.Y.  
10960, USA, Tel: 1+914-358-4601, Fax: 358-4924, E-mail: cramey@igc.apc.org  
To subscribe to the Religious Working Group E-mail list server,

contact Howard

Hallman.

12) NATO Working Group: Karina Wood, (Peace Action), 1819 H St., N.W.,  
Suite 420,

Washington, D.C. 20006, USA, Tel: 1+202-862-9740 ext. 3044, Fax: 862-9762,  
E-mail: panukes@igc.apc.org

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Tue, 30 Sep 1997 14:32:23 -0400  
From: disarmament@igc.org  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Test Ban Treaty Now  
To: ctb-followers@igc.org

Dear Folks:

Enclosed are some CTBT documents from last week - when the President submitted the CTBT to the Senate for its advice and consent. Many thanks to Daryl Kimball at the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, for finding and posting this material. For those of you with web access be sure to check the Coalition's CTBT Web Site:

<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/ctbindex.htm>

To receive your Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Now! Activist Packet and to participate in the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Now! campaign, please contact:

Disarmament Clearinghouse  
1101 14th Street NW #700  
Washington, DC 20005  
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232  
FAX: 202 898 0172  
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

\*The Disarmament Clearinghouse is a project of:  
Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Plutonium Challenge,  
and Women's Action for New Directions)

\*\*\*\*\*

Congressional Record, Senate - September 25, 1997

REMARKS BY SEN. RUSSELL FEINGOLD (D-WI) ON  
COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY

[Page: S9982]

MR. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to commend President Clinton for submitting the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to the Senate for its advice and consent.

This treaty represents decades of work by eight administrations. Now it is time for the Senate to do its job and ratify the CTBT at the earliest possible date.

Just as the United States was a leader in the development of nuclear weapons, the U.S. has also led the drive to limit nuclear testing. On June 10, 1963, President John F. Kennedy made an historic address at American University during which he announced that the U.S. and the Soviet Union would begin negotiations on a comprehensive test ban

treaty.

President Kennedy said, 'The conclusion of such a treaty, so near and yet so far, would check the spiraling arms race in one of its most dangerous areas. It would place the nuclear powers in a position to deal more effectively with one of the greatest hazards which man faces in 1963, the further spread of nuclear arms.'

In the years since President Kennedy made those remarks, the world has witnessed the end of the Cold War, and the spiraling arms race he spoke of has come to an end.

But the spread of nuclear weapons is still as great a hazard in 1997 as it was in 1963. President Kennedy saw then that banning nuclear testing was an important step in curbing the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Now, 34 years after President Kennedy's speech and 52 years after the first nuclear test, we are finally on the verge of ending all nuclear explosions, including those underground.

I fully agree with President Clinton, who--in announcing the action on this treaty in front of the United Nations General Assembly earlier this week--proclaimed the CTBT as the 'longest-sought, hardest-fought prize in the history of arms control.'

I think President Bush and President Clinton deserve a great deal of credit for making the final push to achieve a total test ban.

In 1992, President Bush decided to place a unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests. President Clinton then extended the moratorium until a comprehensive test ban could be negotiated with the other nuclear powers.

The leadership shown by President Bush and President Clinton created the momentum that led to the passage of the CTBT in the United Nations last year. Had the United States not taken the initiative to halt its nuclear testing first, I doubt that the Senate would have a test ban treaty to consider.

It is critical that the United States not shirk its leadership role now that the CTBT is so close to going into effect. Already, eight states have ratified the CTBT including Japan, which ratified the treaty this past July, and, most recently, the Czech Republic on the 8th of this month.

But obviously the CTBT will be meaningless unless the five major nuclear powers ratify it. Here is where the United States can once again be at the front of the line. The United States has, after all, conducted the lion's share of nuclear tests in the last 50 years--1,030 in all, compared to 715 by the Soviet Union; 45 by the United Kingdom; 210 by France and 45 by China.

But perhaps the greatest challenge to this treaty will be getting the undeclared nuclear powers on board. India and Pakistan have not signed

the CTBT and their absence endangers the entire treaty. As two countries who have been in conflict with each other since becoming independent nations, India and Pakistan may have the most to gain from a ban on nuclear tests.

The United States, along with each of the 145 other nations who have signed the treaty, need to work together to convince India of the wisdom of the comprehensive test ban. India should realize that the CTBT is just another step towards complete nuclear disarmament. Islamabad indicates that once India agrees to the CTBT, Pakistan would also sign. This is an historic opportunity to help facilitate peace in Asia--one that the United States should not miss.

North Korea is another holdout.

But, unlike Pakistan and India, the North Koreans have yet to show a true commitment to greater integration in the international system. Many intelligence analysts from both the United States and South Korea believe that North Korea may already possess a crude nuclear device.

Hopefully, one day, even North Korea will bend to international pressure and accept a test ban.

Despite what critics of the CTBT might say, the treaty is enforceable.

Nuclear explosions of any substantial size are very difficult to hide. This treaty will establish an international monitoring system that incorporates seismological, infrasound, and other technologies. State-of-the-art seismological sensors can detect blasts as small as one kiloton anywhere in the world.

But the treaty also includes provisions for on-site monitoring so inspectors can visit test sites quickly if there is any suspicion that a nuclear blast has occurred.

Events of the last month have illustrated how important it is to have a well-monitored CTBT. On August 16, seismologists detected evidence that Russia may have exploded a nuclear device at its test site in the Arctic. However, there is evidence to back Moscow's claim that the seismic activity was the result of an underwater earthquake, rather than a nuclear test.

The monitoring regime that the CTBT will establish will make it much easier to investigate such incidents and will reduce mutual suspicion between the nuclear powers.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is indeed something that will enhance the security of the United States. In addition to making the nuclear programs of China and Russia more transparent, the test ban will make it significantly more difficult for rogue states like Iran or Iraq to complete development of their own nuclear weapons.

As a complement to the CTBT, the United States and the other nuclear powers should do all they can to ensure that threshold countries do not

have access to advanced technology--such as high-speed computer modeling--that would help them to develop reliable weapons without actually conducting nuclear tests.

Mr. President, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is now in our hands and it is up to the Senate to act.

I hope the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. Helms] will hold hearings on this treaty before the end of the First Session of the 105th Congress so that the full Senate can ratify the CTBT by early next year.

This treaty has won near unanimous support in the United Nations. Countries--both Communist and capitalist, developing and developed--have signed this treaty. The CTBT has overwhelming multilateral support and it deserves full bipartisan support in the Senate.

I urge all my colleagues to support the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Let me close with another quote from President Kennedy's speech at American University. 'Genuine peace must be the product of many nations, the sum of many acts. It must be dynamic, not static, changing to meet the challenge of each new generation. For peace is a process--a way of solving problems.'

Mr. President, the CTBT is an important tool in meeting one of today's biggest challenges: ending the threat of nuclear war.

We must meet this challenge.

\*\*\*\*\*

Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty: Time is right for ratification

by the Winston-Salem, NC Journal Now

Thursday, September 25, 1997

President Clinton said while visiting the United Nations in New York this week that he is now ready to seek Senate ratification of the nuclear test-ban treaty that he signed last year. The long-delayed treaty, while relatively modest, is an important step toward the desirable goal of freeing the world of the nuclear-weapons tests that can have such detrimental effects both environmentally and politically.

In his other major pronouncement at the United Nations, Clinton essentially yielded to the wishes of North Carolina's Sen. Jesse Helms and other conservative Republicans. Even though he well knows that the United States ought to act honorably and fairly and pay the back dues it owes the United Nations, Clinton officially voiced the position pushed upon him by Helms and others: that the United States insists on linking payment of the more than \$1 billion it owes to the adoption of certain reforms.

In taking such a stance in defiance of new Secretary General Kofi Annan, who was selected to please the United States, Clinton apparently bowed to the political realities of the U.S. Congress.

Observers can only hope that Clinton was also reflecting political realities and not just optimism in his decision to send the test-ban treaty to the Senate. During the year since he signed the treaty, he has been lobbying Congress to gain support. In an effort to calm those opponents of the treaty who fear that a ban on testing will mean the United States won't be able to keep its nuclear arsenal in working order, he has backed a program of computer and laboratory testing.

No doubt there will be serious confrontation on this issue, as there was on the chemical-weapons treaty that was finally ratified in April. One major issue will be the continuing objections from India. India, which is believed to have nuclear weapons, objects to the treaty on grounds that it doesn't set a timetable for the nuclear powers to get rid of all nuclear weapons. Pakistan has said it will follow India's lead, and a few other rogue states such as North Korea, Iraq and Libya are refusing to sign the treaty.

Despite these holdouts, ratification by the U.S. Senate would be significant. By joining other major nuclear powers in the testing ban, the United States would make a serious political commitment to stop all nuclear tests. A test ban is desirable not only because of the potential environmental harm from nuclear explosions, but also because new rounds of testing could lead to new competition and weapons escalation among the nations of the world, something that no one should want.

The United States hasn't tested nuclear weapons since 1992. We have the edge on other nations in the nuclear arms race anyway, as the only nation to have used the weapons in war. We have tested them many times, and we are the only superpower in the world today.

A test ban makes sense politically and strategically as well as morally, and the Senate should not miss this promising opportunity to rid the world of nuclear weapons tests.

\*\*\*\*\*

The following is the transmittal letter from President Clinton to the Senate on CTBT, released by the White House on Sept. 22 from New York, NY:

September 23, 1997

TO THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

I transmit herewith, for the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (the "Treaty" or "CTBT"), opened for signature and signed by the United States at New York on September 24, 1996. The Treaty includes two Annexes, a Protocol, and two Annexes to the Protocol, all of which form integral parts of the Treaty. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate,

the report of the Department of State on the Treaty, including an Article-by-Article analysis of the Treaty.

Also included in the Department of State's report is a document relevant to but not part of the Treaty: the Text on the Establishment of a Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty Organization, adopted by the Signatory States to the Treaty on November 19, 1996. The Text provides the basis for the work of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty Organization in preparing detailed procedures for implementing the Treaty and making arrangements for the first session of the Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty. In particular, by the terms of the Treaty, the Preparatory Commission will be responsible for ensuring that the verification regime established by the Treaty will be effectively in operation at such time as the Treaty enters into force. My Administration has completed and will submit separately to the Senate an analysis of the verifiability of the Treaty, consistent with section 37 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended. Such legislation as may be necessary to implement the Treaty also will be submitted separately to the Senate for appropriate action.

The conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty is a signal event in the history of arms control. The subject of the Treaty is one that has been under consideration by the international community for nearly 40 years, and the significance of the conclusion of negotiations and the signature to date of more than 140 states cannot be overestimated. The Treaty creates an absolute prohibition against the conduct of nuclear weapon test explosions or any other nuclear explosion anywhere. Specifically, each State Party undertakes not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion; to prohibit and prevent any nuclear explosions at any place under its jurisdiction or control; and to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion.

The Treaty establishes a far reaching verification regime, based on the provision of seismic, hydroacoustic, radionuclide, and infrasound data by a global network (the "International Monitoring System") consisting of the facilities listed in Annex 1 to the Protocol. Data provided by the International Monitoring System will be stored, analyzed, and disseminated, in accordance with Treaty-mandated operational manuals, by an International Data Center that will be part of the Technical Secretariat of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty Organization. The verification regime includes rules for the conduct of on-site inspections, provisions for consultation and clarification, and voluntary confidence-building measures designed to contribute to the timely resolution of any compliance concerns arising from possible misinterpretation of monitoring data related to chemical explosions that a State Party intends to or has carried out.

Equally important to the U.S. ability to verify the Treaty, the text specifically provides for the right of States Parties to use information obtained by national technical means in a manner consistent with generally recognized principles of international law for purposes of verification generally, and in particular, as the basis for an on-site

inspection request. The verification regime provides each State Party the right to protect sensitive installations, activities, or locations not related to the Treaty. Determinations of compliance with the Treaty rest with each individual State Party to the Treaty.

Negotiations for a nuclear test-ban treaty date back to the Eisenhower Administration. During the period 1978-1980, negotiations among the United States, the United Kingdom, and the USSR (the Depository Governments of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT)) made progress, but ended without agreement. Thereafter, as the nonnuclear weapon states called for test-ban negotiations, the United States urged the Conference on Disarmament (the "CD") to devote its attention to the difficult aspects of monitoring compliance with such a ban and developing elements of an international monitoring regime. After the United States, joined by other key states, declared its support for comprehensive test-ban negotiations with a view toward prompt conclusion of a treaty, negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban were initiated in the CD, in January 1994. Increased impetus for the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty by the end of 1996 resulted from the adoption, by the Parties to the NPT in conjunction with the indefinite and unconditional extension of that Treaty, of "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament" that listed the conclusion of a CTBT as the highest measure of its program of action.

On August 11, 1995, when I announced U.S. support for a "zero yield" CTBT, I stated that:

". . . As part of our national security strategy, the United States must and will retain strategic nuclear forces sufficient to deter any future hostile foreign leadership with access to strategic nuclear forces from acting against our vital interests and to convince it that seeking a nuclear advantage would be futile. In this regard, I consider the maintenance of a safe and reliable nuclear stockpile to be a supreme national interest of the United States.

"I am assured by the Secretary of Energy and the Directors of our nuclear weapons labs that we can meet the challenge of maintaining our nuclear deterrent under a CTBT through a Science Based Stockpile Stewardship Program without nuclear testing. I directed the implementation of such a program almost 2 years ago, and it is being developed with the support of the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This program will now be tied to a new certification procedure. In order for this program to succeed, both the Administration and the Congress must provide sustained bipartisan support for the stockpile stewardship program over the next decade and beyond. I am committed to working with the Congress to ensure this support.

"While I am optimistic that the stockpile stewardship program will be successful, as President I cannot dismiss the possibility, however unlikely, that the program will fall short of its objectives. Therefore, in addition to the new annual certification procedure for our nuclear weapons stockpile, I am also establishing concrete, specific safeguards that define the conditions under which the United States can enter into

a CTBT . . ."

The safeguards that were established are as follows:

The conduct of a Science Based Stockpile Stewardship program to ensure a high level of confidence in the safety and reliability of nuclear weapons in the active stockpile, including the conduct of a broad range of effective and continuing experimental programs.

The maintenance of modern nuclear laboratory facilities and programs in theoretical and exploratory nuclear technology that will attract, retain, and ensure the continued application of our human scientific resources to those programs on which continued progress in nuclear technology depends.

The maintenance of the basic capability to resume nuclear test activities prohibited by the CTBT should the United States cease to be bound to adhere to this Treaty.

The continuation of a comprehensive research and development program to improve our treaty monitoring capabilities and operations.

The continuing development of a broad range of intelligence gathering and analytical capabilities and operations to ensure accurate and comprehensive information on worldwide nuclear arsenals, nuclear weapons development programs, and related nuclear programs.

\*\*\*\*\*

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005  
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232  
FAX: 202 898 0172  
<disarmament@igc.apc.org>

Return-Path: <atwood@pop.unicc.org>  
Date: Mon, 13 Oct 1997 17:01:15 +0100  
X-Sender: atwood@pop.unicc.org  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
From: atwood@pop.unicc.org (David Atwood)  
Subject: Re:  
Cc: edibal@iprolink.ch, ipb@gn.apc.org

Dear Howard Hallman:

Thank you for your various messages to me. Apologies for not responding earlier.

Now that I have joined the Abolition server, I have begun to gather the information on the plans for the NPT PrepCom next May. The Special NGO Committee for Disarmament itself will be involved in assisting the organization of activities here in Geneva during the PrepCom.

Let me sent you some preliminary thoughts on your idea. I think that a strong religious voice concerning the need to abolish nuclear weapons is vital. How best to focus that voice on decision-makers is always difficult to determine. In principle, the idea of having a gathering of world religious leaders in Geneva is an attractive idea. I believe that the impact of such a gathering would be greater at the time of the PrepComm than at the start of the CD session in January. Attention will be more focused at that time.

What exactly would these world religious leaders do while here? How best to use their presence? I think that something early in the first week would be likely to attract more delegate participation than on Sunday afternoon, when delegations will only be arriving in Geneva. An event near the UN during the luncheon period (13.00 - 15.00) might be a chance to stage a public event to which delegates were invited.

I am sorry to hear that the WCC doesn't feel it can take part to any real extent, although the offer of space at the Ecumenical Center, not far from the Palais des Nations, is an important one. If you were to demonstrate that you were able to attract some major religious figures to Geneva for this, I suspect it would be hard for the WCC and for Konrad Reiser not to see it as important to get involved in. I guess they just can't handle the organizing.

I suppose an important question to be answered would be what kind of message would you wish these leaders to give. The NPT PrepComm is a key process and there will be important things to urge states to do there. But a general nuclear disarmament message risks being politely heard and then dismissed as rather irrelevant to the business at hand. So, I have a little trouble matching up a gathering of such an august group and the normal conduct of business of these PrepComms, however much it has been possible to turn them in to sessions of substance.

We are quite limited here in Geneva in our ability to offer organizational assistance for such an effort. To go forward with such an idea, what is

your estimate of what would be required in terms of cost and organization? What would you require locally to make this happen? A critical element would be to get a measure of what would be required in terms of inviting such world religious leaders and putting together the programme and of making the local arrangements? Putting on something here in Geneva could be effective in this regard provided this basic organizational capacity can be arranged.

Another consideration, more modest but also less organizationally demanding and costly, would be to organize some kind of multi-faith service at some time during the PrepComm. Daniel Ibanez-Gomez of the Peace Council (he lives in Wisconsin) has done this effectively in Geneva, Brussels, and Oslo for the International Campaign to Ban Landmines. He is planning to organize such a service in Ottawa at the time of the Treaty signing in December. This adds a good dimension to the NGO presences around such events and does attract some delegate participation.

I have to say that our local NGO capacity is extremely limited. We shall be enhancing that capacity for the PrepComm. But for an event such as you are suggesting to be do-able, I believe that you will need to feel confident that you are able to pull together the requisite organizational capacity to do the advance work as well as the local arrangements, although surely in this ecumenical setting there may be some willing to get behind this.

I would be happy to talk with you about this further. Basically, I think the idea has possibilities and could be quite an effective element. I am sending my response to you also to Colin Archer at the International Peace Bureau and to Edith Ballantyne at the Womens International League for Peace and Freedom, as they may also have comments to make to you.

With every good wish.

David Atwood

>Dear David Atwood:

>

>I am writing to you at the suggestion of David Gracie of the AFSC. He and I  
>along with Clayton Ramey of the FOR (in the US) are co-conveners of the  
>Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, which is part of the  
>Abolition 2000 Network.

>

>As you may know, Abolition 2000 intends to bring together a number of NGOs  
>in Geneva at the next meeting of the NPT Preparatory Committee, scheduled  
>for April 28 to May 8, 1998. They will conduct a series of forums and make  
>contact with delegates in order to influence the outcome of the meeting.

>

>This may also be an opportunity bring together world religious leaders to  
>make the moral case for abolition of nuclear weapons. We would like your  
>advice and assistance on this matter.

>

>Several weeks ago I wrote to Dwayne Epps at the World Council of Churches,  
>asking him if top leadership of WCC might be involved. I had a brief

>telephone conversation with him, but I caught him in the midst of the  
>Central Committee meeting. He said he'd get back in touch with me, but I  
>haven't heard from him.  
>  
>My friends in the Catholic Church believe that the Pontifical Commission on  
>Justice and Peace is examining the matter of nuclear weapons anew. They  
>further note that the Pope is an abolitionist according to statements he has  
>made.  
>  
>The Dalai Lama has made strong statements favoring nuclear disarmament.  
>Leaders of other faiths have done likewise.  
>  
>Do you think it would be possible to put together some kind of gathering in  
>which these world leaders or their representatives would participate? For  
>example, one suggestion is to have a forum at 4:00 p.m. on Sunday, April 27,  
>the day before the NPT PrepCom meeting commences, and follow the forum with  
>a reception for delegates. No doubt there are other possibilities.  
>  
>  
>It is conceivable that a similar event could be organized toward the end of  
>January 1998 when the Conference on Disarmament reconvenes.  
>  
>We are open to various possibilities and therefore will benefit greatly from  
>whatever counsel you can offer.  
>  
>To reply you can reach me via e-mail at [mupj@igc.apc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.apc.org) or by phone in the  
>U.S. at 301 896-0013.  
>  
>With best regards,  
>  
>Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
>Methodists United for Peace with Justice.  
>  
>  
>

---

David C. Atwood  
Associate Representative  
Disarmament and Peace Programme  
Quaker United Nations Office  
13, avenue du Mervelet  
1209 Geneva  
Switzerland  
Tel: +41-22-748 4802 or switchboard 748 4800)  
FAX: +41-22-748 4819)  
E-mail: [atwood@pop.unicc.org](mailto:atwood@pop.unicc.org)

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>

Date: Sat, 30 Aug 1997 01:18:01 GMT

From: acronym@gn.apc.org (Rebecca Johnson)

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Geneva update

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id SAA01268

X-Sender: acronym@gn.apc.org

## GENEVA UPDATE

### CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

#### Summary

The Conference on Disarmament (CD) heard the preliminary reports from the four special coordinators appointed at the end of June on the issues of landmines and three aspects of the CD's structure and functioning: the agenda, possible further expansion, and improving the ways the CD works. No further decisions were taken on ad hoc committees. This summer has seen a great changeover of ambassadors and delegation members. While some turnover is inevitable, it is clear that a number of capitals are using the present impasse to re-assess the resources they put into the CD.

At the weekly plenaries, the time is divided between government statements, mostly covering old ground, and thoughtful, sometimes humorous farewell speeches from outgoing ambassadors. US President Clinton's decision on 18 August, to join the Ottawa Process and participate in the Oslo meeting to finalise a total ban on the production, export and use of landmines, was formally welcomed in a statement from Kofi Annan, the UN Secretary-General.

The four special coordinators appointed on 26 June reported back from their consultations on 28 August. Ambassador John Campbell of Australia identified four possible options for future work on anti-personnel landmines (APL) but reported that CD members wanted to see the outcome of the Ottawa Process before deciding how to address the landmines issue in the Conference. Campbell's request to continue as special coordinator for landmines during the intersessional period, in order to prepare for a decision early in 1998, was not greeted with enthusiasm by the G-21 Group of Non-Aligned States, and is unlikely to be agreed.

As Special Coordinator on 'the improved and effective functioning of the CD', Ambassador Mounir Zahran of Egypt reported that CD members wanted generally to retain the present rules of procedure, group system and rule of consensus in decision-making. Zahran identified four issues on which further discussion would be needed: whether to make a distinction between matters of substance and procedure when applying the consensus rule; whether the agenda and programme of work should be adopted each year, as at present, or less frequently, on a biennial basis or longer; whether to provide a more descriptive annual report from the CD to the UN General Assembly; and whether to permit greater involvement of NGOs in the work of the Conference, such as allowing them to deliver statements at plenary meetings.

Ambassador Harald Kreid of Austria, Special Coordinator on CD expansion,

reported that while no delegations opposed further expansion in principle, there was much disagreement over timing, scope and selection criteria. In particular, he noted the importance to several delegations of ensuring the optimum number for conducting negotiations, with balanced political and geographical representation. After describing the various considerations put forward, Kreid concluded that "at this stage a decision on the question of expansion appears premature."

The Special Coordinator on the review of the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament, Ambassador Péter Náray of Hungary, gave an overview of two 'main schools of thought' on the agenda, and then summarised the particular attitudes towards each individual item on the agenda adopted this year. The first school of thought (clustered round the non-aligned states) stresses the necessity for nuclear disarmament to remain 'the absolute priority on any future Agenda of the CD'. As this group advocates a strong relationship between the final document of the first special session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament (UNSSOD I, 1978), the 'decatalogue' and the CD's agenda, they consider that major changes to the priorities can only be introduced by a new special session on disarmament. The Non-Aligned Movement had proposed a fourth special session on disarmament to be held in 1999, but after the UN Disarmament Commission failed to agree on its agenda in April, it looks as if the United States will be successful in preventing the special session from being held before the year 2001.

The second school of thought (clustered around the Western group), argues that 'the agenda should be brought in line with the profound changes which have occurred in the world'. They believe that the present agenda is 'anachronistic and should be replaced by a new, updated, streamlined, forward-looking and realistic' agenda, focusing on items with a real potential for substantive or preparatory negotiations. They subscribe to the 'notion of balance between nuclear and conventional items' and tend towards the view that the priority now is to start negotiations on banning the production of fissile materials for explosive purposes (fissban) and on landmines.

There is no expectation that work can begin this year on any of the issues before the CD: fissban; nuclear disarmament; landmines; prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS); negative security assurances (NSA) from the nuclear weapon states (NWS) to the non-nuclear weapon states (NNWS); or transparency in armaments and the registration of conventional weapons (TIA).

The more optimistic among the diplomats and observers hope that the CD can use its time now to build consensus so that work on one or two key issues could begin in 1998. Their wishes do not look likely to be realised. As debate on the work programme during the two-day plenary at the end of the second part of this session showed, [footnote, the verbatim record of this important plenary has now been published, as CD/PV.770, 26 June 1997.] there are at least four factions vying for dominance. Simply characterised, at opposite poles are the NWS (with the exception of China), who say 'anything but nuclear disarmament', and a group of delegations within the G-21 group of non-aligned states, who insist 'first and foremost, negotiate a time-table for nuclear disarmament'. These delegations are akin to the 'group of like-minded states' which opposed the indefinite extension of the NPT in 1995, but in the CD, India plays a prominent role. Then there are

the NNWS from the Western Group, Eastern Europeans and some non-aligned states who argue for the CD to fulfil the Shannon mandate and start negotiating a fissban as a first step.

The demand for fissban negotiations became blurred at the beginning of 1997 by the United States' determination to have the CD deal with the issue of landmines, perceived by many as an early attempt to divert support from the Ottawa Process and maintain 'big power' solidarity with China and Russia. Although the Clinton administration appeared to want a fissile materials cut-off treaty (FMCT) as well, the consequence of its initiative on landmines was that attention and pressure were diverted from the fissban issue. In his plenary address on 31 July, the Deputy Director of the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), Ralph Earle II, claimed that "The CD has a window of opportunity to negotiate a fissile material cutoff and a ban on APL." However, in the view of many other delegations, neither they nor the Conference have the resources to negotiate two detailed agreements simultaneously.

Those for and against the CD addressing landmines cut right across the boundaries drawn by the nuclear issue. To add to the complications, the opponents to the CD taking up landmines in 1997 comprised both advocates of a total ban, which preferred the fast-track Ottawa approach, and governments who wanted to retain the right to make and use landmines, at least in some circumstances. Countries which advocated the total prohibition of landmines production, export, stockpiling and use were unenthusiastic about doing it in the CD, because they considered that the structure and procedures of the Conference would hinder the rapid and effective achievement of such a ban.

Now that the Ottawa Process looks certain to conclude a total ban accepted by some 80-100 countries, the CD may end up dropping the landmines issue, leaving it to the Convention on Certain Weapons (CCW) and the Ottawa Process to fill in the holes between them. Alternatively, the Conference may decide on a role for itself in negotiating a step by step process towards a total ban, as promoted by Britain, France and the United States, beginning with a verifiable ban on exports that would include all major producers, including countries such as China and Russia, which have no present intention of signing the Ottawa treaty.

Fissban still deadlocked

Despite the rhetoric of support from a number of western countries, the fissban seems further away than ever. Most of the non-aligned (and many other NNWS, privately) do not see much point in a fissban that does not address the existing stockpiles of plutonium and highly enriched uranium. At the very least they want the convention to be able to audit the quantities and locations of storage. The NWS, India and Israel oppose the inclusion of stocks, although India's position has recently shifted. Instead of rejecting consideration of stocks per se, India now argues that negotiations on any fissban must be within a framework of commitment to the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Several levels of compromise would have to occur before the CD will be in a position to open negotiations on a fissban next year. The NWS, particularly the United States, would need to agree to some mechanism for addressing the

wider issues of nuclear disarmament in the CD. The G-21, especially India, would need to accept initial discussions on this without a mandate to negotiate the time-bound elimination of nuclear weapons. Both sides would need to accept that the question of whether stockpiles will be addressed or excluded will need to be discussed during the negotiations and cannot be settled before negotiations start. The NWS could help the process along by opening discussions among themselves on transparency and accounting, with a view to resolving some of the political and technical questions that will arise. If it were possible for the states concerned to compromise their positions sufficiently, fissban negotiations could then get started. But unless the underlying political problems are resolved, the multilateral negotiations will be difficult and time-consuming, with the likelihood of duplicating the entry-into-force problems that beset the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in 1996.

The different attitudes towards existing stocks of fissile materials and India's demand to place a fissban in the context of a time-bound framework for nuclear disarmament reveal fundamentally different perceptions of the purpose of halting fissile material production. It will not be possible to conclude a multilateral fissban successfully without resolving the competing interests of those who seek non-proliferation as a step towards nuclear disarmament and those who advocate non-proliferation as a means of freezing the nuclear status quo at current levels.

In an attempt to revive the prospects of the neglected cut-off, Ralph Earle asserted the importance of the FMCT in "the overall process of nuclear disarmament". He cited the importance of codifying the voluntary policy declarations by the NWS into a legal and verifiable obligation, "making the reversal of those policies far more difficult." Earle also urged the CD to "consider the reinforcing impact that an FMCT would have on parallel efforts to dismantle nuclear warheads, to place fissile material that is determined to be excess to national security requirements under safeguards and to achieve even deeper nuclear weapons reductions leading toward their eventual elimination. These efforts could be harmed if unsafeguarded fissile material production is not banned." He concluded by emphasising that "without a cut-off treaty, the chances of achieving the ultimate goal of nuclear disarmament would be decreased significantly." But for most of the non-aligned states the problem lies not only in new production, but in the fissile material being retained for 'national security requirements', begging fundamental questions about the nuclear haves and have-nots.

Though many accept Earle's arguments on the benefits of a fissban, there is real scepticism about the motives of the NWS and the limitations of a basic cut-off treaty. Their cynicism has been fuelled by the recent disclosure of US Department of Energy documents which indicate the extent of US nuclear weapon modernisation programmes under the CTBT, signed in September 1996.[footnote: Christopher E Paine and Matthew G McKinzie, End Run: the US Government's Plan for Designing Nuclear Weapons and Simulating Nuclear Explosions under the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, Natural Resources Defense Council, Washington D.C., August 1997]

Landmines

The pressure to deal with landmines in the CD has relaxed considerably. It

is clear to all that the Ottawa Process is on track to finalise a draft 'Convention on the prohibition of the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of anti-personnel mines and on their destruction' by December. Whatever happens in the CD now will not materially affect the Ottawa Process. At the CD plenary on 21 August, the United States announced its intention to participate fully in the Oslo meeting of the Ottawa Process, scheduled for September. Katherine Crittenberger said that in view of the growth in support for the Ottawa process and to "take advantage of the momentum behind the Ottawa process" the US had decided to participate in the Oslo meeting and would "work to secure an agreement that achieves our humanitarian goals while protecting our national security interests." Crittenberger also reiterated the US support for step-by-step negotiations in the CD.

The US move was welcomed in a statement from UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, but prompted a sharp response from China's Ambassador Sha Zukang, who indicated that China would have to rethink whether the CD should be enabled to play any role in restricting APL. On the reported understanding that the P-5 would 'stick together' against the Ottawa process, China had compromised its early position of complete opposition to landmines being addressed in the CD, and had shown flexibility towards the proposal for a phased, step-by-step approach, beginning with a ban on exports and transfers. First France and Britain, and now the United States, had deserted the P-5 solidarity to join the Ottawa process. Under intense pressure from public opinion and a well-organised landmines campaign, the US had found it increasingly difficult to hold out against the Ottawa Process. By joining now, it may hope to exert influence on the emerging treaty, especially with regard to the scope and entry-into-force provisions.

In its present form, the draft landmines convention which will be considered at Oslo categorically prohibits the use and production of anti-personnel mines (APM) 'under any circumstances'. There has been considerable discussion of exceptions for particular circumstances, as a number of countries including the United States prefer, but this has been fiercely resisted by the majority of Ottawa participants. According to the present draft, mines will be able to be transferred or retained only for the development and teaching of mine detection, clearance and destruction. The convention will include an obligation to destroy all anti-personnel mines and provide for certain rights and responsibilities of international cooperation and assistance. In its present form the convention does not place heavy emphasis on verification, but relies on transparency measures and procedures for consultations and clarification in the event of questions concerning compliance. Transparency measures would involve the declaration by participating states of the types, quantities and locations of mines and minefields, the status of programmes for decommissioning or converting mine production facilities and for destroying existing mines. Entry into force would be on the basis of ratification by 40 states, but this provision may come under heavy pressure in Oslo.

Ambassador John Campbell of Australia, appointed Special Coordinator for the CD on landmines, has been consulting with delegations about the possibilities for the CD to work on landmines in 1998. In his two reports to the CD, on 14 and 28 August, Campbell identified four possible options for dealing with APL in the CD:

i) a comprehensive mandate along the lines proposed by Japan and Hungary on 15 May (CD/1455), with the objective of negotiating an effective, legally-binding international agreement to ban the use, stockpiling, production and transfer of APL;

ii) a phased or step-by-step approach under an overall comprehensive objective, such as that proposed by the UK on 30 January (CD/1443), starting most probably with a ban on exports, imports and transfers of APL;

iii) a partial approach, according to which an ad hoc committee would consider discrete issues, such as exports and transfers and/or verification, but without the overall declared objective of seeking the total elimination of landmines.

iv) an ad hoc committee 'simply to review and discuss the world situation regarding landmines', but with no negotiating mandate.

Of these four options, Campbell said, the mandate with the most support was option ii), for a phased approach, beginning with consideration of a ban on exports, imports and transfers. However, it was clear from his consultations that there was no point in pushing for a decision on a mandate before the outcome of the Ottawa Process is known. Most delegations would prefer to decide on a specific mandate in early 1998.

Campbell concluded that, from 55 bilateral consultations, "a clear majority of delegation members of the Conference are in favour, or are at least not opposed to, appropriate work commencing in the CD on landmines." He also noted that at least two delegations needed further instructions and that two remained opposed to work in the CD.

Unofficial soundings among many of the delegations suggest that while overt opposition may be limited to a few, among those whom Campbell characterised as 'at least not opposed to' the CD taking up the issue of landmines, there is less enthusiasm than the Special Coordinator's report seems to indicate.

\* Very few seem to regard the Japan/Hungary comprehensive mandate feasible for the CD at this time.

\* As Campbell noted, if the CD is to address landmines, the phased approach has more backing than others. The United States, Britain and France are particularly strong advocates of starting this step-by-step option. Russia has said it could accept this approach. China had begun to acquiesce in this approach, but may revert to its earlier opposition in view of the US 'defection' to the Ottawa process.

\* There is also some support for an experts group to be set up by the CD to consider verification and technical issues concerning various levels of APL restrictions and prohibitions.

However, two other groups of views will need to be accommodated.

\* Mexico continues to argue that the CD should prioritise nuclear disarmament and not work on landmines at all, a position supported to a greater or lesser degree by a significant number of other G-21 states.

\* China appeared at one time to be flexible towards the option of working on an export ban, but its fundamental position is that the CCW remains the

correct forum for addressing landmines. China also argues that the priority should be de-mining, mine-clearance and rehabilitation of the injured, which is best done by other international organisations. China's view is shared by a number of other countries, none of whom are enthusiastic about the CD taking up landmines at all.

In addition to China and Russia, there are a significant number of governments which consider mines to be an essential component of their armoury. Few if any will expose themselves in outright opposition to the CD taking on landmines. At present, the persistent refusal by some of the NWS to consider the G-21 demand for an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament provides the non-aligned members of the CD with both cause and excuse for refusing an ad hoc committee on landmines.

#### Nuclear disarmament

Earle condemned linkages drawn between one area of work, such as fissban or landmines, and another, particularly nuclear disarmament. However, he acknowledged for the first time that there was a conceptual distinction between the demand for a nuclear disarmament committee, backed by all members of the G-21, and the demand that the immediate task of such a committee should be to negotiate the elimination of nuclear weapons in a time-bound framework or by a set date, a position advocated by 26 of the G-21's members (29 states, now that 'Zaire' has been dropped from the CD).

Once again, Earle reiterated the US view that "The only realistic way to pursue nuclear reductions is through the bilateral START process and eventually through a process involving other nuclear weapon states." France and Britain, which do not engage in the START process, have long argued the same. Russia, which until early 1997 gave support (or at least non-opposition) to the G-21 call for a nuclear disarmament committee, is now reported to be opposed, sharing the US view that the CD could derail or jeopardise the START process. However, the START process is presently imperilled by the failure of the Duma to ratify START II. China has consistently given support to the G-21 demands and also voted in favour of the Malaysian resolution to the UN General Assembly in December 1996 (51/45M).

The special coordinator's report on the agenda from Náray again underlined that for a significant number of countries, nuclear disarmament remains the absolute priority for work in the CD. This has been reiterated time and again in official documents, working papers and plenary statements from the G-21. 'Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament' is presently item 1 on the CD agenda. Some delegations have suggested deleting the first part, so that the agenda item would simply cover nuclear disarmament. Some would favour merging this with agenda item 2, on 'prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters'. Some Western countries argued for a new agenda item covering 'non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament' to 'better reflect existing realities and the progress made in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation'. However, most of the G-21 would oppose this, fearing a shift in focus to the threshold states and away from the obligations of the declared NWS to negotiate the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

While the new governments in Britain and France may be more flexible on establishing nuclear disarmament talks in the CD, Russia's position on

nuclear weapons issues has been hardening over the past two years. The key to any possibility of movement on this issue remains the United States. Although all recent public statements have reiterated US government opposition to a CD role on nuclear disarmament, there are indications that the question is the subject of debate among sections of the Administration. As with the zero yield decision in the CTBT negotiations or the recent shift towards the Ottawa Process, the fact that a clear message against multilateral involvement in nuclear disarmament is being currently broadcast on all wavelengths does not preclude a future compromise. If the US changes position, it is likely to do so without much warning, choosing a time when conditions on Capitol Hill are more favourable. At that time it would expect to carry Britain and France, but may encounter stronger opposition from Russia.

The final part of the CD's 1997 session began on 28 July and will close on 12 September.

## BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

The Ad Hoc Group of States Parties to the 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction (BWC), met in Geneva from 14 July to 1 August to continue their work on strengthening verification. Following five previous meetings, held between 1995 and 1997, the Ad Hoc Group now for the first time has a rolling text for a draft protocol. The draft protocol, which covers confidence building and transparency, compliance measures and exchange of information for peaceful purposes and international cooperation, will be the subject of further negotiations in the Ad Hoc Group from 15 September to 3 October.

### Cuba accuses the United States

The States Parties to the BWC, of which there are presently 138, held a formal consultative meeting on 25 and 27 August to consider an allegation by Cuba of a suspected violation by the United States in 1996. The importance of this allegation lies not only in its serious subject matter, but because it is the first test of the procedures adopted at the Second Review Conference for consultations and clarifications among States Parties. The future credibility of the emerging verification regime may depend on the way in which Cuba's allegation and the evidence from both countries are treated in this test case.

Cuba alleged that on 21 October 1996 a small US-registered fumigation aircraft, normally used for crop spraying for narcotics eradication, was seen by a Cuban plane releasing a 'white or greyish mist' while flying high over Matanzas Province, in the western region of Cuba. Two months later, the potato plantations in that region were found to be infested by an insect blight called 'Thrips palmi karny', which, according to the complaint, had not been known in Cuba before then. The infestation later affected fields of corn, beans, pumpkins, cucumbers and other crops.

The United States 'unambiguously denies' the allegation. In his statement to the BWC Parties on 25 August, US representative Donald A Mahley agreed the presence of the aircraft, but argued that it was configured so as to

render it "incapable of carrying or dispensing insects as the Cuban government has alleged." He said that the plane was en route to Colombia via Grand Cayman after undergoing maintenance. The pilot released a plume of visible smoke as a safety precaution because he was not certain whether the Cuban civilian plane, which was flying below him, was aware of his presence. The US provided considerable technical evidence to back up its case that the plane could not have sprayed any infestation and that the Thrips palmi could not have survived in the plane's fuel-saturated tank system in any case.

The US argued that, though the Thrips palmi insect was indigenous to Asia, it had affected a number of Caribbean islands since 1985, and therefore could have spread to Cuba by wind dispersion or by inadvertently being carried in cargo from ships and aircraft from infected countries or islands. Some parts of Florida have also been affected by Thrips infestations. Mahley said that while the US had "no reason to doubt the accuracy" of Cuba's claim that the Thrips infestation had only been detected in the western province after December 1996, "it is not possible to determine conclusively the first appearance of an insect because of environmental and propagational variables." He concluded: "Simple failure of border quarantine is an obvious possible source of infestation, as is Hurricane Lili or numerous earlier windstorms. But one is absolutely certain -- the current infestation in Cuba was not caused by a cloud dispensed from a US aircraft overflying Cuba on October 21, 1996 or at any other time."

Cuba registered its first complaint with the US on 26 December, 1996, asking for clarification. Since then, there have been several exchanges on this subject between the two countries. Dissatisfied with the answers it had received, Cuba formally registered its complaint of a potential violation of the BWC with the UN Secretary-General on 29 April 1997 (A/52/128). The US rebutted the allegation on 6 May. Cuba submitted its counter-arguments and provided supplementary information on 27 June (A/52/213).

On 25 August, Cuba and the United States each gave their statements of evidence to the BWC parties. After two days of consultations between the two countries, mediated by the United Kingdom, which chaired the meeting, a deadline of 27 September was set for any states parties to- raise questions or make submissions regarding the Cuban and US arguments and evidence. These would then be incorporated into a report by 31 December 1997.

ends

email: acronym@gn.apc.org  
The Acronym Institute  
24, Colvestone Crescent  
London E8 2LH  
England  
telephone (UK +44) (0) 171 503 8857  
fax (0) 171 503 9153