

To: mark.brown@ecunet.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Statement of religious leaders on CTBT
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Mark:

At our meeting today we decided to go ahead with the release of the statement by religious leaders on the CTBT on next Monday or Tuesday. In our release we want to include statements by several religious leaders indicating that now that India has conducted nuclear tests it is more important than ever for the Senate to ratify the CTBT. This will enable the U.S. to play a stronger leadership role in getting other nations to ratify the treaty and in pressing India to join the CTBT after all. We would not claim that the signers of the statement offer this view, but that this is an added concern.

Would it be possible to have a sentence or two from Bishop Anderson along these lines? We would give it to Rabinowitz to work into the news release. It's possible we would want to get back to you with editing suggestions if necessary to make the several statements harmonize.

If something is possible, you can reach me via e-mail at mupj@igc.org or by phone/fax at 301 896-0013.

Shalom,
Howard

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

Message-ID: <352670E2.54E9@igc.apc.org>

Date: Sat, 04 Apr 1998 09:41:54 -0800

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

Organization: Methodists United for Peace with Justice

X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.02 (Win95; I; 16bit)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: "Rev. Dr. Riad Jarjour" <mecccypr@spidernet.com.cy>

Subject: Statement on Nuclear Abolition

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Dear Dr. Jarjour:

As co-convener of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, I want to share with you the attached statement on "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition", signed by Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International. It is addressed to delegates of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee, which meets in Geneva from April 27 to May 8, 1998. The statement makes the religious and moral case for abolition of nuclear weapons and offers ideas on how the NPT Preparatory Committee can make progress toward that objective.

We are seeking additional signers of the statement. Would you be willing to sign? Would you also be willing to circulate the statement among members of the Middle East Council of Churches and request them to sign?

For each signer we want to know title (Rev., Dr., etc.), name, organizational title (such as general secretary), name of organization, mailing address, telephone, fax number, and e-mail address.

We want to present the list of signers to the delegates when they convene in Geneva on April 27. Because I will be preparing this list in the United States before heading for Geneva, I would like to have the names by Monday, April 20. You can contact me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org or by fax at +1 301 896-0013. My phone number is the same.

If you need further information about this statement from the perspective of the World Council of Churches, you might get in touch with Dwain Epps (dce@wcc-coe.org) or Salpy Eskidjian (ses@wcc-coe.org).

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Methodists United for Peace with Justice

###

ACT NOW FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION

A Statement Addressed to the
Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee

The time has come to rid planet Earth of nuclear weapons -- all of them, everywhere. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)

Preparatory Committee has a remarkable opportunity at its upcoming meeting to set the course resolutely for the achievement of this goal.

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. This was quite apparent in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The same result would probably occur in any further use, and indeed would be worse because of the increased destructive power of modern nuclear weapons.

When used as an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt. It loses sight of the inviolable connection between means and end by failing to recognize that just ends cannot be achieved through wrongful means.

During the past 50 years the production and testing of nuclear weapons has proven grievously harmful to individuals and the environment in the vicinity of mining operations, processing plants, production facilities, and test sites. Numerous locales are burdened with lingering radioactivity and deadly waste products that will take decades to clean up. Some sites may never be restored to safe occupancy.

Psalm 24 teaches, "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and those who dwell therein." The First Book of Moses, also known as Genesis, indicates that God made Earth available to humankind to till and keep, that is, to use for mutual benefit and to

preserve. Because production and use of nuclear weapons causes grave harm to Earth and its inhabitants, we as good stewards of God's Earth have an obligation to rid the world of this perilous threat.

Numerous religious bodies have condemned nuclear weapons and have called for their abolition. Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemn as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See before the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 15, 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino stated: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....This is a moral challenge, a legal challenge and a political challenge. That multiple-based challenge must be met by the application of our humanity."

In principle the nations of Earth agree on the need to eliminate nuclear weapons. Indeed, they have made a strong commitment in Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) "to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear

disarmament." After reviewing this article at the request of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice unanimously agreed 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."

Now is the time to take this obligation seriously. We call upon the members of the NPT Preparatory Committee to make the 1998 session a notable landmark in the journey toward the abolition of all nuclear weapons.

First, we ask the delegates to call resolutely upon the nuclear weapon states to embark upon a series of steps along the road leading to nuclear abolition. There is broad consensus among study commissions, retired generals and admirals, scientists, and other civilian experts on what these steps should be. They include:

- Declare a policy of no first use amongst themselves and non-use in relation to non-nuclear weapon states.
- Cease all research, development, production, and deployment of new nuclear weapons.
- Refrain from modernizing the existing nuclear arsenal and increasing the number of deployed nuclear weapons.
- Take all nuclear forces off alert and remove warheads from delivery vehicles.
- Achieve faster and deeper bilateral reduction of nuclear weapons by the

United States and Russia.

It would be appropriate for the NPT Preparatory Committee to require the nuclear weapon states to provide annual progress reports on how they are carrying out such measures.

Second, we ask the delegates to take the lead in commencing the process of developing a nuclear weapons convention to outlaw and abolish all nuclear weapons. One appropriate method would be to establish a working group of the NPT Preparatory Committee for this purpose. Although the nuclear weapons states should be part of this process, other nations need not wait until they are willing to become engaged. Rather as stewards of God's Earth, non-nuclear weapon states can begin the task of developing a nuclear weapons convention that specifies a fair and effective program to abolish all nuclear weapons.

We appeal to delegates to the NPT Preparatory Committee to consider what is best for the whole Earth and its inhabitants when they vote on issues of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. Loyalty to all humankind exceeds that of loyalty within political blocs of nations. We urge delegates to act now decisively and courageously for the benefit of all the peoples of Earth.

Godfried Cardinal Danneels, President Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, General Secretary

Pax Christi International World Council of Churches

March 1998

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

Message-ID: <3526700F.79F3@igc.apc.org>

Date: Sat, 04 Apr 1998 09:38:23 -0800

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

Organization: Methodists United for Peace with Justice

X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.02 (Win95; I; 16bit)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: "Rev. Felipe Adolf" <info@clai.org>

Subject: Statement on Nuclear Abolition

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Dear Rev. Adolf:

As co-convener of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, I want to share with you the attached statement on "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition", signed by Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International. It is addressed to delegates of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee, which meets in Geneva from April 27 to May 8, 1998. The statement makes the religious and moral case for abolition of nuclear weapons and offers ideas on how the NPT Preparatory Committee can make progress toward that objective.

We are seeking additional signers of the statement. Would you be willing to sign? Would you also be willing to circulate the statement among members of the Consejo Latinoamericano de Iglesias and request them to

sign? For each signer we want to know title (Rev., Dr., etc.), name, organizational title (such as general secretary), name of organization, mailing address, telephone, fax number, and e-mail address.

We want to present the list of signers to the delegates when they convene in Geneva on April 27. Because I will be preparing this list in the United States before heading for Geneva, I would like to have the names by Monday, April 20. You can contact me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org or by fax at +1 301 896-0013. My phone number is the same.

If you need further information about this statement from the perspective of the World Council of Churches, you might get in touch with Dwain Epps (dce@wcc-coe.org) or Salpy Eskidjian (ses@wcc-coe.org).

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Methodists United for Peace with Justice

###

ACT NOW FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION

A Statement Addressed to the
Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee

The time has come to rid planet Earth of nuclear weapons -- all of them, everywhere. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)

Preparatory Committee has a remarkable opportunity at its upcoming meeting to set the course resolutely for the achievement of this goal.

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. This was quite apparent in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The same result would probably occur in any further use, and indeed would be worse because of the increased destructive power of modern nuclear weapons.

When used as an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt. It loses sight of the inviolable connection between means and end by failing to recognize that just ends cannot be achieved through wrongful means.

During the past 50 years the production and testing of nuclear weapons has proven grievously harmful to individuals and the environment in the vicinity of mining operations, processing plants, production facilities, and test sites. Numerous locales are burdened with lingering radioactivity and deadly waste products that will take decades to clean up. Some sites may never be restored to safe occupancy.

Psalm 24 teaches, "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and those who dwell therein." The First Book of Moses, also known as Genesis, indicates that God made Earth available to humankind to till and keep, that is, to use for mutual benefit and to

preserve. Because production and use of nuclear weapons causes grave harm to Earth and its inhabitants, we as good stewards of God's Earth have an obligation to rid the world of this perilous threat.

Numerous religious bodies have condemned nuclear weapons and have called for their abolition. Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemn as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See before the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 15, 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino stated: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....This is a moral challenge, a legal challenge and a political challenge. That multiple-based challenge must be met by the application of our humanity."

In principle the nations of Earth agree on the need to eliminate nuclear weapons. Indeed, they have made a strong commitment in Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) "to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear

disarmament." After reviewing this article at the request of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice unanimously agreed 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."

Now is the time to take this obligation seriously. We call upon the members of the NPT Preparatory Committee to make the 1998 session a notable landmark in the journey toward the abolition of all nuclear weapons.

First, we ask the delegates to call resolutely upon the nuclear weapon states to embark upon a series of steps along the road leading to nuclear abolition. There is broad consensus among study commissions, retired generals and admirals, scientists, and other civilian experts on what these steps should be. They include:

- Declare a policy of no first use amongst themselves and non-use in relation to non-nuclear weapon states.
- Cease all research, development, production, and deployment of new nuclear weapons.
- Refrain from modernizing the existing nuclear arsenal and increasing the number of deployed nuclear weapons.
- Take all nuclear forces off alert and remove warheads from delivery vehicles.
- Achieve faster and deeper bilateral reduction of nuclear weapons by the

United States and Russia.

It would be appropriate for the NPT Preparatory Committee to require the nuclear weapon states to provide annual progress reports on how they are carrying out such measures.

Second, we ask the delegates to take the lead in commencing the process of developing a nuclear weapons convention to outlaw and abolish all nuclear weapons. One appropriate method would be to establish a working group of the NPT Preparatory Committee for this purpose. Although the nuclear weapons states should be part of this process, other nations need not wait until they are willing to become engaged. Rather as stewards of God's Earth, non-nuclear weapon states can begin the task of developing a nuclear weapons convention that specifies a fair and effective program to abolish all nuclear weapons.

We appeal to delegates to the NPT Preparatory Committee to consider what is best for the whole Earth and its inhabitants when they vote on issues of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. Loyalty to all humankind exceeds that of loyalty within political blocs of nations. We urge delegates to act now decisively and courageously for the benefit of all the peoples of Earth.

Godfried Cardinal Danneels, President Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, General Secretary

Pax Christi International World Council of Churches

March 1998

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

Message-ID: <35267159.7C75@igc.apc.org>

Date: Sat, 04 Apr 1998 09:43:53 -0800

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

Organization: Methodists United for Peace with Justice

X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.02 (Win95; I; 16bit)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: "Rev. Valamotu Palu" <pcc@pactok.peg.apc.org>

Subject: Statement on Nuclear Abolition

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Dear Rev. Palu:

As co-convener of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, I want to share with you the attached statement on "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition", signed by Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International. It is addressed to delegates of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee, which meets in Geneva from April 27 to May 8, 1998. The statement makes the religious and moral case for abolition of nuclear weapons and offers ideas on how the NPT Preparatory Committee can make progress toward that objective.

We are seeking additional signers of the statement. Would you be willing to sign? Would you also be willing to circulate the statement among members of the Pacific Conference of Churches and request them to sign?

For each signer we want to know title (Rev., Dr., etc.), name, organizational title (such as general secretary), name of organization, mailing address, telephone, fax number, and e-mail address.

We want to present the list of signers to the delegates when they convene in Geneva on April 27. Because I will be preparing this list in the United States before heading for Geneva, I would like to have the names by Monday, April 20. You can contact me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org or by fax at +1 301 896-0013. My phone number is the same.

If you need further information about this statement from the perspective of the World Council of Churches, you might get in touch with Dwain Epps (dce@wcc-coe.org) or Salpy Eskidjian (ses@wcc-coe.org).

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Methodists United for Peace with Justice

###

ACT NOW FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION

A Statement Addressed to the
Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee

The time has come to rid planet Earth of nuclear weapons -- all of them, everywhere. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)

Preparatory Committee has a remarkable opportunity at its upcoming meeting to set the course resolutely for the achievement of this goal.

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. This was quite apparent in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The same result would probably occur in any further use, and indeed would be worse because of the increased destructive power of modern nuclear weapons.

When used as an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt. It loses sight of the inviolable connection between means and end by failing to recognize that just ends cannot be achieved through wrongful means.

During the past 50 years the production and testing of nuclear weapons has proven grievously harmful to individuals and the environment in the vicinity of mining operations, processing plants, production facilities, and test sites. Numerous locales are burdened with lingering radioactivity and deadly waste products that will take decades to clean up. Some sites may never be restored to safe occupancy.

Psalm 24 teaches, "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and those who dwell therein." The First Book of Moses, also known as Genesis, indicates that God made Earth available to humankind to till and keep, that is, to use for mutual benefit and to

preserve. Because production and use of nuclear weapons causes grave harm to Earth and its inhabitants, we as good stewards of God's Earth have an obligation to rid the world of this perilous threat.

Numerous religious bodies have condemned nuclear weapons and have called for their abolition. Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemn as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See before the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 15, 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino stated: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....This is a moral challenge, a legal challenge and a political challenge. That multiple-based challenge must be met by the application of our humanity."

In principle the nations of Earth agree on the need to eliminate nuclear weapons. Indeed, they have made a strong commitment in Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) "to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear

disarmament." After reviewing this article at the request of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice unanimously agreed 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."

Now is the time to take this obligation seriously. We call upon the members of the NPT Preparatory Committee to make the 1998 session a notable landmark in the journey toward the abolition of all nuclear weapons.

First, we ask the delegates to call resolutely upon the nuclear weapon states to embark upon a series of steps along the road leading to nuclear abolition. There is broad consensus among study commissions, retired generals and admirals, scientists, and other civilian experts on what these steps should be. They include:

- Declare a policy of no first use amongst themselves and non-use in relation to non-nuclear weapon states.
- Cease all research, development, production, and deployment of new nuclear weapons.
- Refrain from modernizing the existing nuclear arsenal and increasing the number of deployed nuclear weapons.
- Take all nuclear forces off alert and remove warheads from delivery vehicles.
- Achieve faster and deeper bilateral reduction of nuclear weapons by the

United States and Russia.

It would be appropriate for the NPT Preparatory Committee to require the nuclear weapon states to provide annual progress reports on how they are carrying out such measures.

Second, we ask the delegates to take the lead in commencing the process of developing a nuclear weapons convention to outlaw and abolish all nuclear weapons. One appropriate method would be to establish a working group of the NPT Preparatory Committee for this purpose. Although the nuclear weapons states should be part of this process, other nations need not wait until they are willing to become engaged. Rather as stewards of God's Earth, non-nuclear weapon states can begin the task of developing a nuclear weapons convention that specifies a fair and effective program to abolish all nuclear weapons.

We appeal to delegates to the NPT Preparatory Committee to consider what is best for the whole Earth and its inhabitants when they vote on issues of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. Loyalty to all humankind exceeds that of loyalty within political blocs of nations. We urge delegates to act now decisively and courageously for the benefit of all the peoples of Earth.

Godfried Cardinal Danneels, President Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, General Secretary

Pax Christi International World Council of Churches

March 1998

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

Message-ID: <352671F9.74FE@igc.apc.org>

Date: Sat, 04 Apr 1998 09:46:33 -0800

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

Organization: Methodists United for Peace with Justice

X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.02 (Win95; I; 16bit)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: "Rev. Dr. Monrelle T. Williams" <cccbdos@ns.ndl.net>

Subject: Statement on Nuclear Abolition

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Dear Dr. Williams:

As co-convener of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, I want to share with you the attached statement on "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition", signed by Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International. It is addressed to delegates of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee, which meets in Geneva from April 27 to May 8, 1998. The statement makes the religious and moral case for abolition of nuclear weapons and offers ideas on how the NPT Preparatory Committee can make progress toward that objective.

We are seeking additional signers of the statement. Would you be willing to sign? Would you also be willing to circulate the statement among members of the Caribbean Conference of Churches and request them to sign?

For each signer we want to know title (Rev., Dr., etc.), name, organizational title (such as general secretary), name of organization, mailing address, telephone, fax number, and e-mail address.

We want to present the list of signers to the delegates when they convene in Geneva on April 27. Because I will be preparing this list in the United States before heading for Geneva, I would like to have the names by Monday, April 20. You can contact me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org or by fax at +1 301 896-0013. My phone number is the same.

If you need further information about this statement from the perspective of the World Council of Churches, you might get in touch with Dwain Epps (dce@wcc-coe.org) or Salpy Eskidjian (ses@wcc-coe.org).

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Methodists United for Peace with Justice

###

ACT NOW FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION

A Statement Addressed to the
Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee

The time has come to rid planet Earth of nuclear weapons -- all of them, everywhere. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)

Preparatory Committee has a remarkable opportunity at its upcoming meeting to set the course resolutely for the achievement of this goal.

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. This was quite apparent in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The same result would probably occur in any further use, and indeed would be worse because of the increased destructive power of modern nuclear weapons.

When used as an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt. It loses sight of the inviolable connection between means and end by failing to recognize that just ends cannot be achieved through wrongful means.

During the past 50 years the production and testing of nuclear weapons has proven grievously harmful to individuals and the environment in the vicinity of mining operations, processing plants, production facilities, and test sites. Numerous locales are burdened with lingering radioactivity and deadly waste products that will take decades to clean up. Some sites may never be restored to safe occupancy.

Psalm 24 teaches, "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and those who dwell therein." The First Book of Moses, also known as Genesis, indicates that God made Earth available to humankind to till and keep, that is, to use for mutual benefit and to

preserve. Because production and use of nuclear weapons causes grave harm to Earth and its inhabitants, we as good stewards of God's Earth have an obligation to rid the world of this perilous threat.

Numerous religious bodies have condemned nuclear weapons and have called for their abolition. Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemn as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See before the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 15, 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino stated: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....This is a moral challenge, a legal challenge and a political challenge. That multiple-based challenge must be met by the application of our humanity."

In principle the nations of Earth agree on the need to eliminate nuclear weapons. Indeed, they have made a strong commitment in Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) "to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear

disarmament." After reviewing this article at the request of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice unanimously agreed 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."

Now is the time to take this obligation seriously. We call upon the members of the NPT Preparatory Committee to make the 1998 session a notable landmark in the journey toward the abolition of all nuclear weapons.

First, we ask the delegates to call resolutely upon the nuclear weapon states to embark upon a series of steps along the road leading to nuclear abolition. There is broad consensus among study commissions, retired generals and admirals, scientists, and other civilian experts on what these steps should be. They include:

- Declare a policy of no first use amongst themselves and non-use in relation to non-nuclear weapon states.
- Cease all research, development, production, and deployment of new nuclear weapons.
- Refrain from modernizing the existing nuclear arsenal and increasing the number of deployed nuclear weapons.
- Take all nuclear forces off alert and remove warheads from delivery vehicles.
- Achieve faster and deeper bilateral reduction of nuclear weapons by the

United States and Russia.

It would be appropriate for the NPT Preparatory Committee to require the nuclear weapon states to provide annual progress reports on how they are carrying out such measures.

Second, we ask the delegates to take the lead in commencing the process of developing a nuclear weapons convention to outlaw and abolish all nuclear weapons. One appropriate method would be to establish a working group of the NPT Preparatory Committee for this purpose. Although the nuclear weapons states should be part of this process, other nations need not wait until they are willing to become engaged. Rather as stewards of God's Earth, non-nuclear weapon states can begin the task of developing a nuclear weapons convention that specifies a fair and effective program to abolish all nuclear weapons.

We appeal to delegates to the NPT Preparatory Committee to consider what is best for the whole Earth and its inhabitants when they vote on issues of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. Loyalty to all humankind exceeds that of loyalty within political blocs of nations. We urge delegates to act now decisively and courageously for the benefit of all the peoples of Earth.

Godfried Cardinal Danneels, President Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, General Secretary

Pax Christi International World Council of Churches

March 1998

Return-Path: <stoessl@erols.com>

Received: from smtp3.erols.com (smtp3.erols.com [207.172.3.236])

by igcb.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id NAA14596

for <mupj@igc.apc.org>; Sat, 4 Apr 1998 13:44:59 -0800 (PST)

From: stoessl@erols.com

Received: from mm (207-172-90-15.s269.tnt12.ann.erols.com [207.172.90.15])

by smtp3.erols.com (8.8.8/8.8.5) with SMTP id QAA25164;

Sat, 4 Apr 1998 16:43:40 -0500 (EST)

Message-ID: <3526AA82.2041@erols.com>

Date: Sat, 04 Apr 1998 16:47:46 -0500

Reply-To: stoessl@erols.com

X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-KIT (Win95; I)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: Alan Baughcum <alan.baughcum.@usdoj.gov>,

Andrea Grill <grilla@ojp.usdoj.gov>, Betsy Stoessl <stoessl@erols.com>,

Carlee Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>,

Ellen Silverberg <esilverberg@bigfoot.com>,

Fran Millhouser <fmillhou@vlinsvr.vsla.EDU>,

James Gregorio <jgregorio@loc.gov>,

Marcella Wolfe <marcella.wolfe@ey.com>,

Naomi Goldman <naomi_g@ix.netcom.com>, Stewart Moss <spmoss@aol.com>,

Sue Jonsberg <jonsberg@erols.com>,

Wendy Reynoso <wxr.rif.si.edu@smtp3.erols.com>

Subject: one more name for list

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

Sue: Thanks for finding Wendy for us. I have one more name that I didn't see on your list: Carlee Hallman's address is mupj@igc.apc.org.

Hope I set this up right. Took as long as a poem.

Betsy

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

Received: (from majordomo@localhost)

by igcb.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) id BAA20997;

Mon, 6 Apr 1998 01:29:52 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from antenna.nl (root@antenna.nl [194.178.64.33])

by igcb.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id BAA20746

for <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>; Mon, 6 Apr 1998 01:28:33 -0700 (PDT)

Received: by antenna.nl with UUCP id AA21717

(5.67b/IDA-1.5 for abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org); Mon, 6 Apr 1998 10:07:22 +0200

Date: Mon, 6 Apr 1998 07:58:47

From: amok@amok.antenna.nl

Message-Id: <199804060807.AA21717@antenna.nl>

Precedence: bulk

Reply-To: amok@amok.antenna.nl

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: report on Dutch government policy

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

X-Link: WINDMAIL for LAN and standalone PC (amok.antenna.nl)

X-Mailer: Pegasus Mail v3.1 (R1a)

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

Dear network,

you may find the following report on Dutch nuclear weapons policy

interesting. Please note that the statement by minister vamn

Mierlo in the Upper House comes from the stenographic record:

this may differ from the final official version (which has not yet

been published).

I am putting this on the network as proof that the Dutch government is still a staunch supporter of NATO nuclear policy. Some of you may find it useful to quote this in your own work.

Karel Koster (6 April 1998)

+++++

RECENT DUTCH GOVERNMENT STATEMENTS ON NATO NUCLEAR POLICY

At a seminar on the future of NATO (NATO 2010: A Strategic Vision) held at the National Defense University in the USA on 10-11 February 1998 the Dutch ambassador to the USA, Joris Vos, made a speech concerning his (and therefore the Dutch government's) view on the future of NATO 's Strategic Concept. In it he stated: "However NATO's article five commitment to collective defence and the transatlantic link and its adherence to the nuclear paragraphs should be maintained. These represent the heart of the organisation and changing them would not only alter NATO's essence and purpose irrevocably, but would also dramatically lessen its appeal for other European countries".

On 24 March the Dutch Upper Chamber debated the defence budget. During that debate Senator Tom Pitstra questioned the minister of foreign affairs van Mierlo on the above statement and on Dutch nuclear policy in general.

According to the (uncorrected) stenographic report of the

debate, Minister van Mierlo replied as follows:

" Senator Pitstra also described the dangers of nuclear weapons. Allowing for his artistic vision, I believe that all of us agree to the dangers of nuclear weapons and the possession of nuclear weapons. In accordance with this the policy of the Dutch government is absolutely directed at reducing the role of nuclear weapons, but as long as they are there, one must adjust one's policy in accordance with this fact. That fact cannot immediately be removed. If it is stated that we are holding on to the nuclear option, then that is so in view of the fact that the weapons are still there. As long as this is so, I think that the Netherlands should hold on to the nuclear option. In that sense the Dutch ambassador in Washington did indeed put forward the correct position. Furthermore, he has also rapidly let me know that he used a terminology which gave a somewhat different picture from the one brought to our attention by Mr. Pitstra. I do not have the literal text at hand. In any case, his choice of words corresponds completely with the position of the Dutch government, knowing that nuclear weapons are a fact of life.

Mr. Pitstra (GreenLeft): I would nevertheless appreciate it if you could give us the literal quote. I also have the text of his speech at hand. We can then see if they correspond.

Minister van Mierlo: Let me have a look. Yes, here it is. It

literally states: "However NATO's article five commitment to collective defence and the transatlantic link and its adherence to the nuclear paragraphs should be maintained."

This is therefore based on the fact that they exist. "Should be maintained", which is not "for now and forever and as long as you wish me to be yours."

Mr. Pitstra (GreenLeft): No, that is a discussion on the strategic vision NATO 2010. Precisely the same sentence states that the nuclear paragraph should be maintained in the 2010 vision. That is what he says.

Minster van Mierlo: He himself emphatically added this; speaking from the assumption that we are stuck with this fact of life until 2010, that it must therefore be part of one's strategy and that it is even more dangerous to have nuclear weapons which are there but which are not part of the strategy.

Mr Pitstra has also spoken about the statement by the political leaders. We are in touch about that. We agree with a large part of that statement, except on the point of 'no first use'. That precisely touches the subject which we discussed just now. It has always been my position that the no-first use concept is a dangerous conceptual mistake for the owner of nuclear weapons. Whoever honestly declares no first use, in fact loses the right to possess nuclear weapons. When it comes down to it, the situation will be so grave that this kind of

promise no longer counts. The weapons will then be used and its deterrent power will have been lost. A war will start at an earlier stage. I have always been a strong opponent of no first use. I also think that, as long as there are nuclear weapons, they belong in the strategy, but we should not turn this into such a closed system that we can no longer get rid of these weapons. That would be a mistake. Hence we can take a small step towards each other."

The Working Group Eurobomb draws the following conclusions from these statements:

- the Dutch government supports existing NATO nuclear doctrine for the foreseeable future.
- There seems to be some flexibility in the government position, because the minister also stated that the Dutch government mostly agrees with the politicians statement (signed by nine leading Dutch politicians, among them ex-premiers van Agt and Lubbers). However, he also made a clear exception regarding the question of 'no first use'. The Dutch government opposes this concept.

Related relevant information

- The NATO expansion/ratification debate in Holland will take place after the national elections on 6 May. It is unclear when, because the necessary legislation is at present at the Raad van

State, an important advisory body. Even the ministry of foreign affairs claims that they do not know when legislation is released into parliament by the Raad. It has to be some time before 31 december because of the NATO decision making process.

- CTBT legislation is in parliament where the foreign affairs committee is studying replies to questions put to the ministry of foreign affairs. Foreign affairs estimates ratification will be between June and December.

Karel Koster

Working Group Eurobomb

PENN - Netherlands

Obrechtstraat 43

3572 EC Utrecht

Netherlands

tel +31-30-2714376

fax +31-30-2714759

e-mail: K.Koster@inter.nl.net

AMOK

Obrechtstraat 43

3572 EC Utrecht

+31 (0) 30 2714376

+31 (0) 30 2714759

Werkgroep Eurobom / Working Group Eurobomb

Part of the international PENN network

Obrechtstraat 43

3572 EC Utrecht

+31 (0) 30 2714376

+31 (0) 30 2714759

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

Message-ID: <35290F2F.2E19@igc.apc.org>

Date: Mon, 06 Apr 1998 10:21:51 -0700

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

Organization: Methodists United for Peace with Justice

X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.02 (Win95; I; 16bit)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: "Rev. Dr. Joan Brown Campbell" <carol@nccusa.org>

Subject: Statement on Nuclear Abolition

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Dear Dr. Campbell:

As co-convener of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, I want to share with you the enclosed statement on "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition", signed by Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International. It is addressed to delegates of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee, which meets in Geneva from April 27 to May 8, 1998. The statement makes the religious and moral case for abolition of nuclear weapons and offers ideas on how the NPT Preparatory Committee can make progress toward that objective.

We invite you to join Dr. Raiser and Cardinal Danneels in signing this statement. We also ask you to circulate the statement among your member churches and invite the heads of communion or other representative to sign. For each signer we would like to have title (Rev., Dr., etc.), name of the person, organizational title (such as bishop,

president, general secretary), name of the religious body, mailing address, telephone, fax number, and e-mail address. In this manner we will be able to show the NPT Preparatory Committee that there is wide support for decisive action leading to the abolition of nuclear weapons.

We have sent this statement to the foreign ministry of all the NPT signatory states. We ask you to send a copy to the head of your government or foreign minister and ask that the U.S. delegation to the NPT Preparatory Committee be supportive of the recommendations offered in the statement. We would appreciate your asking your member churches to likewise contact your government.

We want to present the complete list of signers to the delegates the NPT Preparatory Committee when they convene in Geneva on April 27. Because I will be preparing this list in the United States before heading for Geneva, I would like to have the names by Wednesday, April 22. You can contact me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org or by fax or phone at +1 301 896-0013.

With best regards,
Howard W. Hallman

###

ACT NOW FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION

A Statement Addressed to the
Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee

The time has come to rid planet Earth of nuclear weapons -- all of them, everywhere. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee has a remarkable opportunity at its upcoming meeting to set the course resolutely for the achievement of this goal.

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. This was quite apparent in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The same result would probably occur in any further use, and indeed would be worse because of the increased destructive power of modern nuclear weapons.

When used as an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt. It loses sight of the inviolable connection between means and end by failing to recognize that just ends cannot be achieved through wrongful means.

During the past 50 years the production and testing of nuclear weapons has proven grievously harmful to individuals and the environment in the vicinity of mining operations, processing plants, production facilities, and test sites. Numerous locales are burdened with lingering radioactivity and deadly waste products that will take decades to clean up. Some sites may never be restored to safe occupancy.

Psalm 24 teaches, "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and those who dwell therein." The First Book of Moses, also known as Genesis, indicates that God made Earth available to humankind to till and keep, that is, to use for mutual benefit and to preserve. Because production and use of nuclear weapons causes grave

harm to Earth and its inhabitants, we as good stewards of God's Earth have an obligation to rid the world of this perilous threat.

Numerous religious bodies have condemned nuclear weapons and have called for their abolition. Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemn as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See before the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 15, 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino stated: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....This is a moral challenge, a legal challenge and a political challenge. That multiple-based challenge must be met by the application of our humanity."

In principle the nations of Earth agree on the need to eliminate nuclear weapons. Indeed, they have made a strong commitment in Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) "to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." After reviewing this article at the request of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice unanimously agreed 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."

Now is the time to take this obligation seriously. We call upon the members of the NPT Preparatory Committee to make the 1998 session a notable landmark in the journey toward the abolition of all nuclear weapons.

First, we ask the delegates to call resolutely upon the nuclear weapon states to embark upon a series of steps along the road leading to nuclear abolition. There is broad consensus among study commissions, retired generals and admirals, scientists, and other civilian experts on what these steps should be. They include:

- Declare a policy of no first use amongst themselves and non-use in relation to non-nuclear weapon states.
- Cease all research, development, production, and deployment of new nuclear weapons.
- Refrain from modernizing the existing nuclear arsenal and increasing the number of deployed nuclear weapons.
- Take all nuclear forces off alert and remove warheads from delivery vehicles.
- Achieve faster and deeper bilateral reduction of nuclear weapons by the United States and Russia.

It would be appropriate for the NPT Preparatory Committee to require the nuclear weapon states to provide annual progress reports on how they are carrying out such measures.

Second, we ask the delegates to take the lead in commencing the process of developing a nuclear weapons convention to outlaw and abolish all nuclear weapons. One appropriate method would be to establish a working group of the NPT Preparatory Committee for this

purpose. Although the nuclear weapons states should be part of this process, other nations need not wait until they are willing to become engaged. Rather as stewards of God's Earth, non-nuclear weapon states can begin the task of developing a nuclear weapons convention that specifies a fair and effective program to abolish all nuclear weapons.

We appeal to delegates to the NPT Preparatory Committee to consider what is best for the whole Earth and its inhabitants when they vote on issues of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. Loyalty to all humankind exceeds that of loyalty within political blocs of nations. We urge delegates to act now decisively and courageously for the benefit of all the peoples of Earth.

Godfried Cardinal Danneels, President Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, General Secretary
Pax Christi International World Council of Churches

March 1998

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

Message-ID: <3529109A.34D2@igc.apc.org>

Date: Mon, 06 Apr 1998 10:27:54 -0700

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

Organization: Methodists United for Peace with Justice

X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.02 (Win95; I; 16bit)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: "Rev. David Gill" <nccasyd@peg.apc.org>

Subject: Statement on Nuclear Abolition

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Dear Rev. Gill:

As co-convener of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, I want to share with you the enclosed statement on "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition", signed by Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International. It is addressed to delegates of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee, which meets in Geneva from April 27 to May 8, 1998. The statement makes the religious and moral case for abolition of nuclear weapons and offers ideas on how the NPT Preparatory Committee can make progress toward that objective.

We invite you to join Dr. Raiser and Cardinal Danneels in signing this statement. We also ask you to circulate the statement among your member churches and invite the heads of communion or other representative to

sign. For each signer we would like to have title (Rev., Dr., etc.), name of the person, organizational title (such as bishop, president, general secretary), name of the religious body, mailing address, telephone, fax number, and e-mail address. In this manner we will be able to show the NPT Preparatory Committee that there is wide support for decisive action leading to the abolition of nuclear weapons.

We have sent this statement to the foreign ministry of all the NPT signatory states. We ask you to send a copy to the head of your government or foreign minister and ask that the Australian delegation to the NPT Preparatory Committee be supportive of the recommendations offered in the statement. We would appreciate your asking your member churches to likewise contact your government.

We want to present the complete list of signers to the delegates the NPT Preparatory Committee when they convene in Geneva on April 27. Because I will be preparing this list in the United States before heading for Geneva, I would like to have the names by Wednesday, April 22. You can contact me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org or by fax or phone at +1 301 896-0013.

With best regards,
Howard W. Hallman
Co-Convener

###

ACT NOW FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION

A Statement Addressed to the
Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee

The time has come to rid planet Earth of nuclear weapons -- all of them, everywhere. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee has a remarkable opportunity at its upcoming meeting to set the course resolutely for the achievement of this goal.

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. This was quite apparent in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The same result would probably occur in any further use, and indeed would be worse because of the increased destructive power of modern nuclear weapons.

When used as an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt. It loses sight of the inviolable connection between means and end by failing to recognize that just ends cannot be achieved through wrongful means.

During the past 50 years the production and testing of nuclear weapons has proven grievously harmful to individuals and the environment in the vicinity of mining operations, processing plants, production facilities, and test sites. Numerous locales are burdened with lingering

radioactivity and deadly waste products that will take decades to clean up. Some sites may never be restored to safe occupancy.

Psalm 24 teaches, "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and those who dwell therein." The First Book of Moses, also known as Genesis, indicates that God made Earth available to humankind to till and keep, that is, to use for mutual benefit and to preserve. Because production and use of nuclear weapons causes grave harm to Earth and its inhabitants, we as good stewards of God's Earth have an obligation to rid the world of this perilous threat.

Numerous religious bodies have condemned nuclear weapons and have called for their abolition. Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemn as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See before the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 15, 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino stated: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....This is a moral

challenge, a legal challenge and a political challenge. That multiple-based challenge must be met by the application of our humanity."

In principle the nations of Earth agree on the need to eliminate nuclear weapons. Indeed, they have made a strong commitment in Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) "to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." After reviewing this article at the request of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice unanimously agreed 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."

Now is the time to take this obligation seriously. We call upon the members of the NPT Preparatory Committee to make the 1998 session a notable landmark in the journey toward the abolition of all nuclear weapons.

First, we ask the delegates to call resolutely upon the nuclear weapon states to embark upon a series of steps along the road leading to nuclear abolition. There is broad consensus among study commissions, retired generals and admirals, scientists, and other civilian experts on what these steps should be. They include:

- Declare a policy of no first use amongst themselves and non-use in relation to non-nuclear weapon states.

- Cease all research, development, production, and deployment of new nuclear weapons.
- Refrain from modernizing the existing nuclear arsenal and increasing the number of deployed nuclear weapons.
- Take all nuclear forces off alert and remove warheads from delivery vehicles.
- Achieve faster and deeper bilateral reduction of nuclear weapons by the United States and Russia.

It would be appropriate for the NPT Preparatory Committee to require the nuclear weapon states to provide annual progress reports on how they are carrying out such measures.

Second, we ask the delegates to take the lead in commencing the process of developing a nuclear weapons convention to outlaw and abolish all nuclear weapons. One appropriate method would be to establish a working group of the NPT Preparatory Committee for this purpose. Although the nuclear weapons states should be part of this process, other nations need not wait until they are willing to become engaged. Rather as stewards of God's Earth, non-nuclear weapon states can begin the task of developing a nuclear weapons convention that specifies a fair and effective program to abolish all nuclear weapons.

We appeal to delegates to the NPT Preparatory Committee to consider what is best for the whole Earth and its inhabitants when they vote on issues of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. Loyalty to

all humankind exceeds that of loyalty within political blocs of nations.

We urge delegates to act now decisively and courageously for the benefit
of all the peoples of Earth.

Godfried Cardinal Danneels, President Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, General
Secretary

Pax Christi International World Council of Churches

March 1998

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

Message-ID: <35291139.4E31@igc.apc.org>

Date: Mon, 06 Apr 1998 10:30:33 -0700

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

Organization: Methodists United for Peace with Justice

X-Mailer: Mozilla 2.02 (Win95; I; 16bit)

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: "Rev. Robert Mills" <ccchurch@web.apc.org>

Subject: Statement on Nuclear Abolition

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Dear Rev. Mills:

As co-convener of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, I want to share with you the enclosed statement on "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition", signed by Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International. It is addressed to delegates of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee, which meets in Geneva from April 27 to May 8, 1998. The statement makes the religious and moral case for abolition of nuclear weapons and offers ideas on how the NPT Preparatory Committee can make progress toward that objective.

We invite you to join Dr. Raiser and Cardinal Danneels in signing this statement. We also ask you to circulate the statement among your member churches and invite the heads of communion or other representative to sign. For each signer we would like to have title (Rev., Dr., etc.), name of the person, organizational title (such as bishop, president, general secretary), name of the religious body, mailing address, telephone, fax number, and e-mail address. In this manner we will be able to show the NPT Preparatory Committee that there is wide support for

decisive action leading to the abolition of nuclear weapons.

We have sent this statement to the foreign ministry of all the NPT signatory states. We ask you to send a copy to the head of your government or foreign minister and ask that the Canadian delegation to the NPT Preparatory Committee be supportive of the recommendations offered in the statement. We would appreciate your asking your member churches to likewise contact your government.

We want to present the complete list of signers to the delegates the NPT Preparatory Committee when they convene in Geneva on April 27. Because I will be preparing this list in the United States before heading for Geneva, I would like to have the names by Wednesday, April 22. You can contact me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org or by fax or phone at +1 301 896-0013.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman

Co-Convener

###

ACT NOW FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION

A Statement Addressed to the
Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee

The time has come to rid planet Earth of nuclear weapons -- all of them, everywhere. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee has a remarkable opportunity at its upcoming meeting to set the course resolutely for the achievement of this goal.

weapon states to embark upon a series of steps along the road leading to nuclear abolition. There is broad consensus among study commissions, retired generals and admirals, scientists, and other civilian experts on what these steps should be. They include:

- Declare a policy of no first use amongst themselves and non-use in relation to non-nuclear weapon states.
- Cease all research, development, production, and deployment of new nuclear weapons.
- Refrain from modernizing the existing nuclear arsenal and increasing the number of deployed nuclear weapons.
- Take all nuclear forces off alert and remove warheads from delivery vehicles.
- Achieve faster and deeper bilateral reduction of nuclear weapons by the United States and Russia.

It would be appropriate for the NPT Preparatory Committee to require the nuclear weapon states to provide annual progress reports on how they are carrying out such measures.

Second, we ask the delegates to take the lead in commencing the process of developing a nuclear weapons convention to outlaw and abolish all nuclear weapons. One appropriate method would be to establish a working group of the NPT Preparatory Committee for this purpose. Although the nuclear weapons states should be part of this process, other nations need not wait until they are willing to become engaged. Rather as stewards of God's Earth, non-nuclear weapon states can begin the task of developing a nuclear weapons convention that specifies a fair and effective program to abolish all nuclear weapons.

We appeal to delegates to the NPT Preparatory Committee to

consider what is best for the whole Earth and its inhabitants when they vote on issues of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. Loyalty to all humankind exceeds that of loyalty within political blocs of nations.

We urge delegates to act now decisively and courageously for the benefit of all the peoples of Earth.

Godfried Cardinal Danneels, President Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, General Secretary

Pax Christi International World Council of Churches

March 1998

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>

Received: from loas.clark.net (root@loas.clark.net [168.143.0.13])

by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id JAA27812;

Mon, 6 Apr 1998 09:57:44 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from local.clw.org (clw.org [204.245.159.2])

by loas.clark.net (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id MAA01198;

Mon, 6 Apr 1998 12:50:43 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Mon, 6 Apr 1998 12:50:43 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from CLW/SpoolDir by local.clw.org (Mercury 1.21);

6 Apr 98 12:29:47 -0500

Received: from SpoolDir by CLW (Mercury 1.21); 6 Apr 98 12:24:36 -0500

Received: from clw13.clw.org by local.clw.org (Mercury 1.21);

6 Apr 98 12:24:34 -0500

X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.4

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: dkimball@clw.org

From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)

Subject: Albright on CTBT

Message-ID: <13F448BD3869@local.clw.org>

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

TO: Coalition members and friends

FR: Daryl Kimball, Director

RE: Albright on CTBT and other topics, 4/3/98

The following is a summary and excerpt of the Sec. Albright's address to a group of newspaper editors.

You can obtain the complete version at <<http://www.usia.gov/current/news/latest>>

DK

The following is the State Department transcript:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Office of the Spokesman

April 2, 1998

As Delivered

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF STATE MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT TO THE
AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS
AND QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

J.W. Marriott Hotel

Washington, D.C.

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: Thank you very, very much for that introduction,

Vice President Seaton, about to be President. It is a pleasure to be

here. President Rowe and members of ASNE, special guests and friends, I am delighted to be here. It is a beautiful spring day. And I hope you are all in such a good mood that you will ask me easy questions after my speech.

I want to begin by thanking you for having me back. I greatly enjoyed our discussion last year. Since then, much has happened that has put being Secretary of State into perspective for me. For example, one national magazine selected me among the 25 most intriguing people in America -- alongside a cloned sheep.

... For me, it was a memorable first year, with more ups than downs, but plenty of both. Month by month, the outlines of the new era, the new rules of the diplomatic game are being defined. Obvious Cold War threats have been replaced by a viper's nest of more subtle perils from poison gas to ethnic violence to disruptions in the global economy.

If Americans are to be secure in such a world, we must seize the opportunity that history has presented to bring nations closer together around basic principles of democracy, free markets, law and a commitment to peace. This is not an effort we undertake with a scorecard and a stopwatch in hand. But every time a conflict is settled or a nuclear weapon dismantled, every time a drug kingpin is arrested or a country begins to observe global rules of trade, the ties that bind the international system together are strengthened. America's place is at the center of this system. And our challenge is

to see that the connections around the center, between the regions and among the most prominent nations, are strong and sure.

We must also help other nations become full partners by lending a hand to those trying to build democracy, emerge from poverty or make peace with their neighbors. That is why we are working so hard to build a Europe whole and free; to prepare for the second Summit of the Americas in Chile later this month; and to maintain productive relations with a newly democratic Russia and a rapidly changing China. And that is why we are doing all we can to get the Middle East peace process back on track; to aid the development of democratic institutions in Central and Eastern Europe; and as the President's dramatic trip demonstrates, to recognize and support the new promise of Africa.

All this requires a lot of heavy lifting. To succeed, we must -- and we will -- insist that others do their fair share. We will have to build new institutions and adapt old ones. And we must summon the will to isolate and the strength to defeat those who run roughshod over the rights of others.

Today, I would like to focus especially on five challenges that will help determine whether we continue to move ahead towards our strategic goal....

[AND ON THE CTBT:]

... Another historic choice for the Senate this year will be whether to approve the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty -- the CTBT.

The Administration strongly supports this agreement, which would ban nuclear test explosions of any size, for any purpose, for all time.

In the past, trillions of dollars have been spent developing ever more powerful nuclear weapons. The CTBT will reduce the likelihood and the ability of nations to begin a new and ever more dangerous nuclear arms race in the future.

And without testing, rogue states will find it harder to develop the kinds of weapons that worry us the most -- compact and efficient weapons that could be delivered not only by missile, but by a small plane entering our airspace or a speedboat entering one of our ports.

Over the years, the United States has conducted hundreds more nuclear tests than any other country. We are at the high end -- the flattened far slope -- of the nuclear weapons learning curve. By cutting power to the main escalator up this curve, we will make ourselves and the entire world more secure.

Some Senators may seek to delay the Treaty's ratification, arguing that because of a handful of holdout nations, it will not enter into force any time soon. But it is precisely because some nations are resisting the Treaty that our leadership in approving it is so important. We don't want to give the naysayers another excuse not to

act; we want to turn up the heat.

And the way to do that is for the United States to lead the way in ratifying the CTBT, just as we did last year in approving the Chemical Weapons Convention -- which led, in turn, to ratification of that agreement by Russia, China, Iran and Pakistan.

There could be no greater gift to the future, and no better start to a new century, than a world in which the Comprehensive Test Ban is law around the equator and from pole to pole.

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: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>

Received: (from majordomo@localhost)

by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) id LAA21879;

Mon, 6 Apr 1998 11:36:06 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from kds5.kivex.com ([204.177.32.2])

by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id LAA12442

for <ctbt-organize@igc.org>; Mon, 6 Apr 1998 11:00:41 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from psrcomm4.psr.org (pc40.psrus.org [204.177.54.40])

by kds5.kivex.com (8.8.8/8.8.7-KIVEX) with SMTP id NAA29449

for <ctbt-organize@igc.org>; Mon, 6 Apr 1998 13:58:04 -0400 (EDT)

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

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

Date: Mon, 06 Apr 1998 14:03:33 -0400

From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Message-ID: <352918F5.FE8@igc.apc.org>

Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse

Precedence: bulk

Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org

Subject: Your Senators at Home

To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win95; I)

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

To: CTBT-Organizers

From: Disarmament

Subject:

Senators' schedulers

Date:

Mon, 6 Apr 1998 10:18:00 -0400

From:

ctbt@2020vision.org (Marie Rietmann)

REACHING OUT TO YOUR SENATORS

The most effective means of getting your message to your Senator is to deliver it in person. *The April 6-20 spring recess provides an excellent opportunity for that.*

Many Senators make public appearances, such as town hall meetings or cable TV and radio call-in shows where you can raise the issue of the nuclear test ban treaty. Campaign events such as coffees or other informal gatherings are also appropriate places to discuss the issue.

Constituents can call those listed below who are responsible for scheduling Senators' in-state events to get this information. Tell them you are a constituent and you want to hear the Senator's views. If asked what your interests are, be as broad as possible. For the nuclear test ban treaty, you can say you are interested in international issues.

Following are key Senators whose support we are seeking. Offices listed are Senate offices unless otherwise noted.

ARIZONA

McCain Senate office: Ann Hamilton, Phoenix - 602/952-2410

McCain campaign: Philadelphia - 602/604-9898

COLORADO

Campbell Senate office: Ginnie Kontnik, Denver during April recess -
303/866-1900

Campbell campaign: Denver - 303/757-3811

Allard: Mike Ciletti, Englewood - 303/220-7414

DELAWARE

Roth: Susie Cohen, DC - 202/224-2441

IDAHO

Kempthorne: Julie Harwood, Boise - 208/334-1776

INDIANA

Lugar: Jeff Hillicker, DC - 202/224-4814

Coats: Rob Wynkoop, Indianapolis - 317/226-5555

IOWA

Grassley Senate office: Rebecca Shimkus, DC - 224-3744

Grassley campaign: Des Moines - 515/246-0775

KANSAS

Brownback Senate office: Denise Coatney, Topeka - 785/233-2503

Brownback campaign: Topeka - 785/357-0307

Roberts: Maggie Ward, DC - 202/224-4774

KENTUCKY

McConnell: Larry Cox, Louisville - 502/582-6304

MAINE

Snowe: Gail Kelly, Bangor - 207/945-0432

Collins: Kimberly Hamlin, DC office - 202/224-2523

MICHIGAN

Abraham: Jim Neill, DC - 202/224-4822

MISSISSIPPI

Lott: Hardy Lott, DC - 202/224-3135

MISSOURI

Bond Senate office: Melissa Johnson, Jefferson City - 573/634-2488

Bond campaign: St. Louis - 314/863-1998

NEBRASKA

Hagel: Heidi Cashkey, Omaha - 402/758-8981

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Gregg: Sharon Clifford, DC - 202/224-3324

NEW MEXICO

Domenici: Lyndon Armstrong, DC - 202/224-6621

NEW YORK

D'Amato Senate office: Lecia Corbisiero, DC - 202/224-6542

D'Amato campaign: Mineola - 516/294-7180

OHIO

DeWine: Barbara Briggs, Xenia - 937/376-3080

OREGON

Smith: Sue Keenon, DC - 202/224-3753

PENNSYLVANIA

Specter Senate office: Pat Haag, DC has overall responsibility -
202/224-4254

Each regional office handles scheduling in that region

Specter campaign: Philadelphia - 215/751-1998

Santorum: Nancy Garver, Pittsburgh - 412/562-0533

RHODE ISLAND

Chafee: Steve Hourahan, Providence - 401/528-5294

SOUTH CAROLINA

Thurmond: Holly Richardson, DC - 202/224-5972

TENNESSEE

Frist: Donna Randolph, Nashville - 615/352-9411

Thompson: Bobby Murphy, Nashville - 615/736-5129

UTAH

Hatch: Linda Gibbons, Salt Lake City - 801/524-4380

Bennett: Dixie Minson, Salt Lake City - 801/524-5933

VIRGINIA

Warner: Eileen Mandel, DC - 202/224-2023

WASHINGTON

Gorton: Joann Poysky, Bellevue - 425/451-0103

WYOMING

Thomas: Kathy Wise, DC - 202/224-6441

Enzi: Jonathon Downing, DC - 202/224-3424

For more information, please contact:

Marie Rietmann, 20/20 Vision, 1828 Jefferson Place NW, Washington, DC

20036Phone: 202/833-2020 email: ctbt@2020vision.org

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>

Received: from loas.clark.net (root@mail.clark.net [168.143.0.10])

by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id MAA29414;

Mon, 6 Apr 1998 12:04:24 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from local.clw.org (clw.org [204.245.159.2])

by loas.clark.net (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id PAA04395;

Mon, 6 Apr 1998 15:01:53 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Mon, 6 Apr 1998 15:01:53 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from CLW/SpoolDir by local.clw.org (Mercury 1.21);

6 Apr 98 14:36:56 -0500

Received: from SpoolDir by CLW (Mercury 1.21); 6 Apr 98 14:35:58 -0500

Received: from clw13.clw.org by local.clw.org (Mercury 1.21);

6 Apr 98 14:35:51 -0500

X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.4

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: dkimball@clw.org

From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)

Subject: U.K. & France Ratify CTBT

Message-ID: <13F6794C6060@local.clw.org>

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

TO: Coalition members and friends

FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: U.K. and France deposit CTBT instruments of ratification

Today, Britain and France formally deposited their instruments of ratification for the CTBT at the United Nations. Further details to follow.

The following is an early article from the Times of London.

Onward!

DK

London Times April 6, 1998

France and Britain are first to ratify test ban treaty

BY MICHAEL EVANS, DEFENCE CORRESPONDENT

BRITAIN and France are to take an historic step "towards global nuclear disarmament" today by becoming the first nuclear powers to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, The Times has learnt.

The two countries are to make a joint announcement to underline their "common agenda" and to send a strong signal to the other nuclear powers and the so-called threshold nuclear states.

In a ceremony at the United Nations in New York later today, Sir John Weston, Britain's Permanent Representative at the UN, and his French counterpart, will deposit the "instruments of ratification" and make a

joint statement. The other nuclear powers, the United States, Russia and China, are still in the process of ratifying the treaty, which has been signed by 149 countries.

Tony Lloyd, the Foreign Office Minister, said that the treaty provided a "strong moral framework" which, it was hoped, would discourage putative nuclear states from pursuing their ambitions to build up arsenals.

He said Britain would try to dissuade the new Indian Government from going ahead with its threat to pursue a nuclear weapons programme. London would be urging Delhi to "recognise their responsibilities in their own region", Mr Lloyd said in an interview with The Times. Pakistan has made it clear that it will sign the treaty if India does.

India and Pakistan have signed neither the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty nor the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. The other countries with nuclear ambitions, North Korea, Iran and Iraq, have signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty which automatically bans non-nuclear states from testing.

Britain is now committed to maintaining a nuclear deterrent in the form of the four Trident ballistic missile submarines without ever again conducting tests at the American underground facility in Nevada.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty does not come into force until 44 "named" countries have ratified it. These are the 44 that have a civilian nuclear power industry. However, Mr Lloyd said that it would be

"almost unthinkable" for Britain or any of the other nuclear powers to resume testing in the period before the treaty was implemented. The treaty was open for signature in September 1996. If the 44 have not ratified it within three years from that date, a review conference will decide what action to take.

The announcement by Britain and France will bring to 13 the number of countries to have ratified the treaty. Mr Lloyd said that ratification was "a significant step on the road to global nuclear disarmament".

An international monitoring system is already in place, capable of detecting any nuclear explosion involving a yield of one kiloton or more.

There is also a rigorous inspection regime that allows spot checks in any country suspected of conducting nuclear tests. Mr Lloyd said it was "inconceivable" that any country would be able to carry out a nuclear test without being detected. "There can be no easy cheating," he said.

The minister said that the next challenge was to improve enforcement of the treaty covering the ban on biological weapons, and to agree on nuclear fissile material limits.

<http://www.the-times.co.uk/news/pages/Times/frontpage.html?2334541>

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: <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: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <ipb@iprolink.ch>

Received: from mail.iprolink.ch (rsge1.iprolink.ch [194.41.63.1])

by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id FAA01245

for <mupj@igc.apc.org>; Tue, 7 Apr 1998 05:35:04 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from 218lan118.iprolink.ch (218lan118.iprolink.ch [193.189.218.118])

by mail.iprolink.ch (ipl/ipl) with SMTP id OAA15536

for <mupj@igc.apc.org>; Tue, 7 Apr 1998 14:35:00 +0200

Received: by 218lan118.iprolink.ch with Microsoft Mail

id <01BD6232.2D4C3DA0@218lan118.iprolink.ch>; Tue, 7 Apr 1998 14:33:48 +-200

Message-ID: <01BD6232.2D4C3DA0@218lan118.iprolink.ch>

From: International Peace Bureau <ipb@iprolink.ch>

To: "'mupj@igc.apc.org'" <mupj@igc.apc.org>

Subject: NPT reception

Date: Tue, 7 Apr 1998 12:03:24 +-200

MIME-Version: 1.0

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

Dear Howard,

Somebody called from the Swiss mission today to confirm the arrangements =
for the reception and their support. They will be in touch with the UN =
restaurant and arrange to get the tax reduction.

I hope all is well with you, and look forward to seeing you in Geneva.

Best wishes,

Jo Tyler

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>

Received: from loas.clark.net (root@loas.clark.net [168.143.0.13])

by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id GAA09983;

Tue, 7 Apr 1998 06:26:17 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from local.clw.org (clw.org [204.245.159.2])

by loas.clark.net (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id JAA02510;

Tue, 7 Apr 1998 09:23:14 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Tue, 7 Apr 1998 09:23:14 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from CLW/SpoolDir by local.clw.org (Mercury 1.21);

7 Apr 98 08:58:07 -0500

Received: from SpoolDir by CLW (Mercury 1.21); 7 Apr 98 08:57:23 -0500

Received: from clw13.clw.org by local.clw.org (Mercury 1.21);

7 Apr 98 08:57:19 -0500

X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.4

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: dkimball@clw.org

From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)

Subject: more on UK/France & CTBT

Message-ID: <1408D53266BF@local.clw.org>

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

TO: Coalition members and friends

FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: more on UK/France & CTBT

Below is the statement by President Clinton released yesterday; comments by White House spokesperson Mike McCurry on the matter, which led off the daily briefing; and a late-edition AP article on the British/French CTBT ratification announcement.

DK

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

The White House

For Immediate Release

April 6, 1998

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

British and French Ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

Today, France and Great Britain deposited their instruments of ratification for the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) with the Secretary General of the United Nations in New York, thus becoming the first nuclear weapon states to ratify the CTBT.

I applaud this milestone in the global effort to reduce the nuclear threat and build a safer world. In particular, I want to thank Prime Minister Blair and President Chirac and the parliaments of Great Britain and France

for their leadership in paving the way towards early entry into force of this historic Treaty.

The CTBT has now been signed by 149 states, including all five nuclear weapon states. In my State of the Union address, I asked the Senate to give its advice and consent to the CTBT this year. The CTBT is in the best interests of the United States because its provisions will significantly further our nuclear nonproliferation and arms control objectives and strengthen international security.

#

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

April 6, 1998

PRESS BRIEFING

BY MIKE McCURRY

The Briefing Room

1:25 P.M. EDT

MR. McCURRY: Good afternoon, everybody. Two items to start with.

First, we'll have a statement from the President shortly, if we haven't put it out already, welcoming the fact that France and Great Britain have deposited their instruments of ratification for the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty with the Secretary General of the United Nations, thus making them the first nuclear powers to deposit their instruments of ratification. It represents a milestone in the global effort to reduce the nuclear threat and build a safer world. The President obviously expresses his gratitude to President Chirac, to Prime Minister Blair in his statement and again call on the United States Senate to give its advice and consent to the CTBT this year. The President argues that the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban is in the best interests of the United States because its provisions will significantly further our nuclear nonproliferation and arms control objectives and strengthen international security.

France, Britain OK Nuclear Treaty

By Nicole Winfield

Associated Press Writer

Monday, April 6, 1998; 6:36 p.m. EDT

UNITED NATIONS (AP) -- Britain and France on Monday became the first nuclear powers to ratify a treaty banning nuclear weapons tests and called on others to join them.

Representatives from the two countries turned over documents to the United Nations stating their government's acceptance of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Eleven other countries have done the same.

Britain's U.N. ambassador, John Weston, called the treaty "the cornerstone of international efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation" and said Britain and France were proud to be the first nuclear states to ratify it. The United States, China and Russia are the other three declared nuclear powers.

The treaty was signed in September 1996 by 149 countries. At least 44 countries that have nuclear power or nuclear research reactors on their soil must ratify the treaty before it can take effect.

President Clinton called on the Senate to ratify the treaty this year and thanked Britain and France for leading the way.

"I applaud this milestone in the global effort to reduce the nuclear threat and build a safer world," Clinton said in a statement.

British Foreign Secretary Robin Cook said he welcomed France's ratification

and urged ``all

countries which have not yet signed or ratified to do so -- whether or not they possess nuclear weapons."

France staged a widely criticized series of test blasts in the South Pacific in 1995-96.

In a Paris news conference Monday, Michel Duclos, the French Foreign Ministry's deputy director for disarmament, called on the leading nuclear powers ``to show an example."

France also specifically urged India, Pakistan and Israel to ratify the treaty. They are believed to have nuclear capability.

Other states with nuclear power or research reactors that have ratified the treaty are Austria, Japan, Peru and Slovakia. It also has been ratified by the Czech Republic, Fiji, Micronesia, Mongolia, Qatar, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.

The treaty provides for an international monitoring system to check violations. A network of 321 stations will be able to detect underground, atmospheric or underwater explosions more powerful than the equivalent of 1,000 tons of conventional

explosives.

The system, based in Vienna, is to begin by the end of the year, with or without ratification,

Duclos said.

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: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <mbox.unicc.org@mbox.unicc.org>

Received: from gk-blue.unicc.org (gk-red.unicc.org [192.91.247.2])

by igcb.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id GAA04572

for <mupj@igc.apc.org>; Tue, 7 Apr 1998 06:50:51 -0700 (PDT)

Received: by gk-blue.unicc.org; (5.65v3.2/1.3/10May95) id AA01933; Tue, 7 Apr 1998 15:50:50 +0200

Received: from gh-old.unicc.org (guardhouse [193.72.50.67])

by mira.unicc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id PAA17244

for <mupj@igc.apc.org>; Tue, 7 Apr 1998 15:52:21 +0200 (MET DST)

Received: by gh-old.unicc.org (5.65/jsb-190694);

id AA19316; Tue, 7 Apr 1998 15:25:47 +0200

Date: Tue, 7 Apr 1998 15:25:47 +0200

Message-Id: <9804071325.AA19316@gh-old.unicc.org>

Received: from guardhouse.unicc.org ([193.72.50.215]) by capella.unicc.org

(Netscape Messaging Server 3.01) with SMTP id AAA3CDA

for <mupj@igc.apc.org>; Tue, 7 Apr 1998 15:28:04 +0200

X-Sender: d.atwood@mbox.unicc.org

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.4

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="====_891987988=="

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

From: mbox.unicc.org@mbox.unicc.org (David Atwood)

Subject: Re: NPT PrepCom speaker

X-Attachments: C:\MYDOCU~1\LTRSMI~1\MPBOVY~1.DOC;

X-Mozilla-Status: 0011

====_891987988=="

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

Dear Howard,

I am attaching a letter which I am sending to Marie Pierre Bovy. I am also sending her a copy of your letter. You will see her address on my letter.

Her FAX/phone number is 33-4 03 85 50 82 16. As I am going to be away from today until next Thursday (the 16th), I have suggested she be directly in touch with you. You might already send her some of the material you have for her to look at. Her problem may well be that she has no money to get to the meeting, since she lives very simply, but perhaps she is planning to be around for some of the meeting. I just don't know.

One other suggestion that I have for you (and I should have sent this much earlier) is to contact Daniel Gomez-Ibanez. Daniel is with something called the Peace Council. There are a range of well-known people who are Peace Councillors, including Elise Boulding, Desmond Tutu, and Oscar Arias.

Daniel organized the multi-faith services in Geneva (April 96), Oslo (Sept. 97), and Ottawa (Dec. 97). He will know the people here in Geneva through his contacts two years ago. He may well have some ideas for you and would be a good man to talk to. I can only find his e-mail address at the moment.

This is: dgi@peacecouncil.org He lives in Wisconsin.

All good wishes,

David

>Dear David:

>

>We have received several suggestions for the NGO presenter on the
>spiritual and ethical perspective. I've conferred with David Robinson
>(Pax Christi USA) and Clayton Ramey (U.S. FOR), the other two
>co-conveners of the Religious Working Group. We've concluded that Marie
>Pierre Bovy is our first choice if she is willing to undertake this
>assignment.

>

>Would you be willing to ask her in our behalf? (You can just forward
>this letter to her if that's the easiest way.) If she is willing, we
>will need to touch base with Felicity Hill, who is coordinating NGO
>presentations, for the NGO committee is seeking a balance of gender,
>race, continents, etc. But I expect that Ms. Bovy would be well
>received.

>

>Her presentation will be one of thirteen by NGO representatives, probably
>the first one. Ten minutes are allotted for each presentation (that's
>four to five pages of double-space text). I'm gathering ideas for the
>content from several sources and will share these ideas with her as
>suggestions to incorporate into the presentation. The statement by
>Cardinal Danneels and Dr. Raiser is another source of themes. We would
>ask her to produce a first draft, which Dave Robinson, Clayton Ramey, and
>I would comment on. We would also want to show a near-final draft to
>Felicity Hill.

>

>I don't know whether the NPT PrepCom language will be English only,
>English and French, or the whole panoply of U.N. languages. Perhaps you
>know that or could find out. If French is one of the languages and Ms.
>Bovy would want to speak in her native tongue, we would like to have an
>English text available.

>
>Although the date for NGO presentations hasn't been determined,
>Wednesday, April 29 seems a probability. The NGO committee would like
>all presenters to be in Geneva by Sunday, April 26 if possible so that
>they can put together a well-orchestrated presentation. But that's not
>an absolute requirement.

>
>If Marie Pierre Povy is willing to undertake this assignment, please let
>me know and supply me with her address and phone number so that I can
>communicate with her directly.

>
>Thanks for your assistance.

>
>Howard

>
>
>

-----_891987988==_

Content-Type: application/octet-stream; name="MPBOVY~1.DOC"; x-mac-type="42494E41"; x-mac-creator="6D646F73"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64

Content-Disposition: attachment; filename="MPBOVY~1.DOC"

0M8R4KGxGuEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPgADAP7/CQAGAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAADgAAAA
AAAAAA

EAAADwAAAAEAAAD+////AAAAAA0AAAD////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////c

pWgAY+AJCAAAAABIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAwAAow0AAEcYAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAow
oAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABIAAGwAAAAAEgAAbAAAAAGwSAAAA
AAAAbBIA

AAAAAABsEgAAAAAAAGwSAAAAAAAAbBIAABQAAACmEgAAAAAAAKYSAAAAAAAAphIAAAAAAAC
mEgAA

AAAAAKYSAAAAAAAAphIAAAoAAACwEgAACgAAAKYSAAAAAAAaxcAADEAAAC6EgAAAAAAALoS
AAAA

AAAAuhIAAAAAAAC6EgAAAAAAALoSAAAAAAAAuhIAAAAAAAC6EgAAAAAAALoSAAAAAAAAuxMA
AAIA

AAC9EwAAAAAAAL0TAAAAAAAAAAvRMAADwAAAD5EwAAqgEAAKMVAACqAQAATRCaAB4AAACcFwA
AWAAA

APQXAABTAAAaxcAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAbBIAAAAAAAC6EgAAAAAAABw
AIAAEA

AQC6EgAAAAAAALoSAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAALoSAAAAAAAAuhIAAAAAAABrFwA
AAAAA

AIQTAAAAAAAAbBIAAAAAAABsEgAAAAAAALoSAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAALoSAA
AAAAA

hBMAAAAAAACEEwAAAAAAAIQTAAAAAAAAuhIAAMoAAABsEgAAAAAAALoSAAAAAAAbBIAAAA
AAAC6

EgAAAAAAALsTAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAVMZdJmK9AYASAAAoAAAAjhIAABgAAABsEgAAAAAA

MCBtaW51dGVzIGVhY2guICBGB3IgZWFjaCBwcmVzZW50YXRpb24sIHRoZXJlIGlzIGEgc21hbGwg
Z3JvdXAgd29ya2luZyB0byBzdWdnZXN0IGlucHV0LiAgSWYgeW91IHdlemUgd2lsbGluZyB0byBk
byB0aGlzIHByZXNlbnRhdGlvbWwW91IHdvdWxkIGhhdmUgdGhIIGNoYW5jZSB0byBwcmVwYXJl
IHRoZSBwcmVzZW50YXRpb24sIGJ1dCBkcmF3aW5nIG9uIHNvbWUgb2YgdGhIIHRob3VnaHRzIHdo
aWNoIHNvbWUgaGF2ZSBwcmVwYXJlZCBhbHJlYWR5LiAgSWYgeW91IGFncmVILCBib3dhcmQgd2ls
bCBiZSBhYmxIIHRvIHNlbnQgeW91IGNvcGllcyBvZiB0aGUgdGhpbnmdzIHRoYXQgaGF2ZSBhbHJl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Ry
ZXNzIGFyZTogSG93YXJkIFcuIEhbbGxtYW4sIENoYWlyLCBNZXRob2Rpc3RzIFVuaXRlZCBmb3Ig
UGVhY2Ugd2l0aCBkdXN0aWNlOyBQaG9uZS9mYXg6ICszMDEgODk2LTAwMTMgKFVtQSk7IGUtbWFp
bDogbXVwakBpZ2Mub3JnLiAgSSBhbSBhbHNvIHNlbnRpbmcgaGltIGegY29weSBvZiBteSBsZXRO
ZXIgdG8geW91LCBhbG9uZyB3aXRoIHlvdXIgcGhvbnUvRkFYIG51bWJlci4NDQ0NDQ0JSGVsZW5l
IGFuZCBJIGFyZSBnb2luZyB0byBDb3JzaWNhIHRvbW9ycm93IGZvciBhIHdlZWsuICBNeSBmaXJz
dCBob2xpZGF5IHNPbnNlIGegZmV3IGRheXMgb3ZlciBDBaHJpc3RtYXMuICBJIGFtLCB1bmZvcnRl
bmF0ZWx5LCBhcyBtdWNoIGegd29ya29ob2xpYyBhcyBjIHdhcyBhdCBJRk9SLg0NCUkgaG9wZSB5
b3WSbGwgYmUgYWJsZSB0byBjb21lIHRvIHRoZSBOUFQgYW5kIHRvIGRvIHRoZXJkaW5hbCBEZW5l
aW9uLiAgSWYgeW91IGFyZSBjb21pbmcsIGRvIGxldCBtZSBrbm93LCBzbyB0aGF0IHdlIIGNhbiBt
ZWV0IGVhY2ggb3RoZXIgaW5kIGNhdGNoIHVwIGegYml0Lg0NCQkKJCQkKJCUXvdmUgdG8geW91IGFu
ZCBQaWVycm90LA0NDR4AnMICnciCpIUupcJBpqAFp6AFqKAFqcUDqgAAqwkAAIEIQACcAwIFTERN
QU4AAAAAAIEJQAC0BAMFSUNJVFkAAQAAAIEIQACJAgaEAIBFAAAAAACBCUAAiAYDAQADAAEAw

AA

eQMAAKMNAADDDQAAAP0A+wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACdQEAA2MSAAAEAM
AAAEDAAAC

AwAAAwMAAAQDAAAcAwAAMgMAAEcDAABkAwAAegMAAHsDAACIAwAAiQMAAJsDAACuAwAAvgM
AAL8D

AADSawAA0wMAALoEAAC7BAAAJAcAACUHAACrCQAARkAADQMAAA1DAAANgwAADcMAAA4DAA
AOQwA

AOEMAADiDAAAga0AAIENAACHDQAAog0AAKMNAAD9AAFFIxSB/QABRSMbAf0AAUUjGwH9AAFFIxSB

/QABRSPYAP0AAUUj2AD9AAFFI9gA/QABRSPYAP0AAUUj2AD9AAFFIxSB+wABRSMbAfsAAUUjGwH7

AAFFIxSB+wABRSMbAfsAAUUjGwH7AAFFIxSB+wABRSMbAfsAAUUjGwH7AANFIxSB+wABRSMbAfsA

B0UjGwH7AAFFIxSB+wAIRSMbAfsAAUUjGwH7AAhFIxSB+wABRSMbAfsAAUUjGwH7AAFFIxSB+wAB

RSMbAfsAAUUjGwH7AAJFIxSB+wABRSMbAfsAAkUjGwH7AAFFIxSB+wABRSMbAfsAAUUjGwH7AAFF

IxBAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAAACAAAFASUOAA8
ACAABAEsA

DwAAAAAAHAAAQPH/AgAcAAZOb3JtYWwAAgAAAAAYAYQkIYxgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AIgBB

QPL/oQAiABZEWZhdWx0IFBhcmFncmFwaCBGb250AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAowoAAAMAow0AAAY
A

////wIABCD//wEAACD//wIAAAAAADkJAACjCgAAAACoAAAAAQAAAAAAAAAMAAMMNAAHAAADAACj

DQAACAAAAAAfQAAAIIAACWAAAAMgAAAJsAAACHAAAAPwAAAK0AAAC2AAAAvQAAACMBAAA
qAQAA

/gEAAAYCAACHAwAAjgMAAKIDAACsAwAAZgMAANYDAACQBgAAIwYAAJwGAACiBgAAAbwgAAHYIAA
DR

CAAA3QgAAMQJAADOCQAAMoAAJ8KAACICgAABwAcAAcAHAHABwABwAcAAcAHAHABwABwAc
AAcA

HAAHABwABwAcAAcAHAHABwABwAcAAcAHAHABwABwAcAAcANwADKioqMEM6XE15IERvY3VtZ
W50

c1xsdHJzIG1pc2NcTVAgQm92eSA3IEFwcmlsIDk4LmRvY/9ASFAGRGVza0pldCA0MDAgUHJpbnRl

cgBMUFQxOgBIUFcxRERJAEhQIERlc2tKZXQgNDAwIFByaW50ZXIASFAGRGVza0pldCA0MDAgUHJp

bnRlcgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABDUDIAAWAQN/gAcBAAkAAAAAAGQAAQAHACwBAgABACwBAQAAAAA
AAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAE
AAAADAAAA

AQAAAAEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEhQIERlc2tKZXQgNDAwIFByaW50ZXIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABMUFQxAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAAwAAAEAAAAAAOQ
M9gkAAQA

AgABAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQA
AAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAsASwBSFAGRGVza0pldCA0MDAgUHJpbnRlcgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABDUDIAAWAQN/gAcBAAkA

AAAAAGQAAQAHACwBAgABACwBAQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAAADAAAAAQAAAAEAAAAAAAAAAAAAEhQIERlc2tKZX
QgNDAw

IFByaW50ZXIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABMU
FQxAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////UgBvAG8AdAAgAEUAbgB0

AHIAeQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAABdAAAAAQAAAAAAAAACQIAAAQAAABYAB
QH////

////wEAAAAACQIAAAAAAMAAAAAAAAABGAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQFTGXSZivQEQAAGAMAAAA
AABX

AG8AcgBkAEQAbwBjAHUAbQBIAg4AdAAAAEcATJIIAEM6XE15IERvY3VtZW50c1xsdHJzIG1pc2MA

AAAAAAAAAGgACAQIAAADAAAA////wAAAAAAAAAAIhCAAAAAAAAAAAAAAgy7HQQEAAAJAAAAB
wAA

AAAAAABHGAAAAAAAAAAEAQwBvAG0AcABPAGIAagAAAAAAAAAAAAAgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
ACAAAA

AAAAAAEAAAHAAAAVPz/ACAAAAASAIB////////////////////////////////AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA////wwAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAGoAAAAAAAAABQBTAHUAbQBtAGEAcgB5AEkAbgBmAG8AcgBt
AGEA

dABpAG8AbgAAAAIAAACAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACgAAgH////BAAAAP////8AAAAAAAA
A

AABMAAD2ItWMAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACAAAyAEAAFPBSFIBAAAA/v//wMAAAAE
AAAA

BQAAAYAAAAHAAAACAAAAAkAAAD+////CwAAAawAAAANAAAA/v////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////wEA/v8DCgAA////wAJAgAA

AAAAwAAAAAAAAAEYYAAAATWljcm9zb2Z0IFdvcmQgRG9jdW1lbnQACgAAAE1TV29yZERVYwAQAAAA

V29yZC5Eb2N1bWVudC42APQ5snEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADQzxHgobEa4QAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA/v8
A

AAQAAGAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAAAOcFn/L5T2gQq5EIAcsns9kwAAAAMAEABIAAAABA
AAA

mAAAAIAAACgAAAAAwAAAMAAAAEAAAAzAAAAUAAADYAAAABgAAAOQAAAAHAAAA8AAA
AAgAAAAI

AQAACQAAABQBAAASAAAAIAEAAAOAAABIAQAACwAAAFQBAAAMAAAAYAEAAA0AAABsAQAADg
AAAHgB

AAAPAAAAGAEABAAAACIAQAAEwAAAJABAAACAAAA5AQAAB4AAAAYAAAATmV3IFBob25ILCBGQ
Vgg

JiBFLW1haWwAHgAAAAEAAAAAx0MAHgAAAAQAAAAqKioAHgAAAAEAAAAALCBGHgAAAAEAAAAAi
EgA

HgAAAA4AAABOZXcgUGhvbmuUuZG90AAAAHgAAAAQAAAAqKioAHgAAAAIAAAAxAEQAHgAAAB4AA
ABN

aWNyb3NvZnQgV29yZCBmb3Igv2luZG93cyA5NQAAoEAAAAAARsMjBQBEAG8AYwB1AG0AZQBuaHQA

UwB1AG0AbQBhAHIAeQBJAG4AZgBvAHIAbQBhAHQAaQBvAG4AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADgAAgD////////

//////8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAKAAAA5AAAAAAAAA
AAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAP//////////wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD//////////8AAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD+/wAABAACAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAABAAAAAtXN1ZwuGxCTlwgAKyz5rjAAAAC0AAAACAAAAEAAABIAAADwAAAFAAAAEA
AAA

XAAAAUAAABkAAAABgAAAGwAAAALAAAAdAAAABAAAAB8AAAADAAAAIQAAAACAAAA5AQAA
B4AAAAC

AAAAIABXbwMAAAAVAAAAwAAABIAAADAAAABAAAAAsAAAAAAAAACwAAAAAAAAAMEAAA
AgAAAB4A

AAAYAAAAATmV3IFBob25ILCBGQVggJiBFLW1haWwAAwAAAAAAAAACTkcAFAAAAIIEQAADChe8AQEP
CAMDD7IBSwgLJGwqIxMNAgcAAwAAAACBCUAAiwYHAVMAFgAAAIIIEQADTAQAGDgIZEwhVBAEDCVI
A
ER9HSyhMDQIEBExBU1QAAQAAAIEIQACwAZIDBQNPT1AAAAAAAAIEHQACwAQQETkVYVAAAAAAAAAgQ
IA
AMMEBAhQUkVWSU9VUwAAAAAagQIAAMMEBANSRUwAAAAAIEHQACwAQUCSFMAAAAAAIEHQAC
CwAQQB
UwALAAAAGgVAAAOTAJwKMQsCAvUBKyoIBQVZTUJPTAAAAAAAAAgQdAAJIBBAZXSU5ET1cAAQAAAIEI
QAB6yAMDAUUAHwAAAIIICQAAJABoASAAAAAAAAAAEAEgSLGwEIBESDHJcBEQABAFcKMAEEA0NITwA
A
AAAAgQdAALABBAJORAAAAAAGQdAALABBAVQUkIOVAAIAAAAAGgBAAG8AAAAAABAAQBUwA
AAAAA
gQhAAOYDBQJTRQAAAAAAGQRAABEFAVQAAgAAAIEIQADnAwOUAgMBRwAAAAAAGQhAAL4DBAJFU
gAB
AAAAgQIAALgFRwYBUwACAAAAGQhAAIoBswLhAgMFSU5GT1IAAAAAAIEIQAC7AwQCU0gAFgAAAIID
QAAIngEILBNsAAEAAAMFiwIEAREOIgULDAQcBgJFRAAXAAAAAGgFAAAMFB10AAAAAAAAAAAAAKmQ
Mh
AwEKJz5QIQEHAVMAAGAAAIEIQAAAN9APUAQYDTVNHAAAAAACBB0AAsAEGBVRBQkxFAAAAAACBB
0AA
sAEFBFRFUKUAAAAAAAAIEIQAC7AwMETEFORAApAAAAAGNAABIJpwEPJQ03ODEKDyIACQQTIG4XBgEA
AAAAAAAAAAoCEgEAACIHahUUQwEDB01FU1NBR0UAAAAAAAAIEHQACwAQMETkIEQQAAAAAAGQhAA
PkC
BQJTSABAAAAAGQIAANcE0wEDBE9QRU4AAAAAIEHQACwAQMGUkVTVUxUAAAAAACBB0AAsAEDA
VMA
CQAAAIIGQADNASwqGnULVVprRwIDT05BAEAAACBCEAAhQLsAwIGUkNST0ZUAAAAAACBCUAA7AQ
D
AUUADAAAIIIFQADtASBpcABYETYMAESHJAQDQVJNAAgAAACCBUAAIwIzAAAAvQGYAQNhBwFTABQ
A
AACCA0AAhQNOQRoFEGAZDwwGBgEBAgAAEwUDAQQHQk9NQklORwAAAAAAGQIAAKYFBQVSRUFLU
wAA
AAAAgQIAAN0EBAFEAAEAAACBCUAA3ASjAQQIRklHSFRFUIMAAAAAIEJQADcBAQFUE9XRVIAAAA
A
AIEJQACtBgQBUwADAAAAGQhAAIAD3AEQvgEEBFdPT0QAAQAAAIEJQAC/BBADA0IORwAAAAAAGQIA
AK0GAwFNAAcAAACCBkAARZ4CkgEISgEASwEAAMAAAAAGQdAAIEBBAAGAAAAAIEHQACBAQQCRU

QA

AAAAAIEJQACIBgUBUgAAAAAAgQIAANIFBAJMWQAFAAAAgQhAAN0B5AK5ASIADwQBUwACAAAAgQhA

ALEdbLYBBARXQVJFAAAAAACBA0AACQMCU1QA8AAAAIIBQAADAQABAAMDAAAEAAAABAAEHAQKGwQC

AgwBBgAFAR0JAQADBAMBAAEAAgABAWEBAQAAAEDAguAAwEFAAADAQQBAgABAAQBAAADCQwAFQAA

AAAAAgQCAAMBCQEEAAAAAgAAAAHAwABAgAAAgEABAAAAAABAEBAAKEAgADAAABAgEDCgAAAAAA

AgAAQAAAQAgEBAwABAQYHAQQAAAAAAgEAAwEAAAEBBAAABQECAAFAQIAAAACAQMAAwIBAgAAAgAC

AAICDgAAAAAAAw0ABAAIAAIAAgADAAAGAQEBCgAGAAUABQUCCQAGAAEGCgoCAAAABQADBAAAAIEH

QAD5AYsBENMBTQUHQUREUkVTUwATAAAAggJAAKUCGgYAAwsQBQAAQCUAQABYxgBAB0FA0NPTAAA

AAAAgQdAAKgBBQRGTEFHAAAAAACBB0AAqAEFBkhFSUdIVAAAAAAAgQdAAKgBBQJMWQAEAAAAgQhA

AOYDzAEAdQEFBE5BTUUAewAAAIICQACIAhoGAAMLEAUABUAgAEAAWMYAQAdCQADAgAAAIIEQADx

AhUABQNST1cAAAAAAIEHQACoAQUEVEINRQAAAAAAAgQdAAKYBCQVTRVRVUAAAAAAAgAdAAAAFBVdJ

RFRIAAAAAACBB0AAqAECBFNDQUwAAwAAAIEIQABykQNpvgEEA0hFUgABAAAAGhAAO8CRQMBSAAC

AAAAgQhAAL4DKgAEATIAAAAAAIEIQAC+AwQCRVIAAAAAAIEJQACbBAYDSUVTAEEAACBCEAA6QMA

BgFZAAEAAACBCEAA6QMABAVHVUFsRAAAAAAAAgQhAAOsDBANJTkcABAAAAIIEQAACygMAAmUDAVMA

AAAAAIEIQADQAwQDQkFOAAkAAACCBUAA1wERBhcMsAEJMzCCAQQDRUhBAAYAAACBB0AA+gFDAQAC

cbwBBwADAAAAAIEIQADEAgQDSUxFABAAAACCBEEA1gEVAxcXQI7BE8DFoUBAHEAAAUGT05BQkxFL

AAEAAACBCUAA3QTNAQMBVAAAAAAAgQIAAPIFAGFUABcAAACCBEEAAEk4FCCYBMD2TAVIEBAoKAWoj

DiwBSAxTAQMETkVTUwADAAAAAggVAABeRAz8AAwFTAAcAAACCBUAAAtQMAABxJggEFIQMDVEVEAAIA

AACBCEAA4wEuvQIEA0IORwAEAAAAgQhAAMoBvAJKuAERAwVaQUxBTgAAAAAAgQhAAOsDAGJWRQBL

AAAAggJAAGM3OgALBQIDFgAFFTUIHiUABAABDwQfAQIHAAQLDQEACgoEAwkWBQANDBEVABEAAgAK

AwUACAIAAAMNBwEHBAUFawEEAgIBAQMMAAMEAVIAAAAAAIEIQADmAwIBWAAFAAAAggNAAAMEAGaX

AeECAwRBQkxFAAAAACBCEAArQMDAkVEAA8AAACCBUAAAawUFAQZZpwEAjwEGNUkSgwE2LAQBUwAJ

AAAAggRAAAoEDwAAWBwZjAKEAQMDSU5HAAEAAACBCUAAA5wEAwNVUFMAAAAAAIEGQAB1AQNKMTEA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwMBMwAAAAAAGhAAOkDAwE0AAAAACBCEAA6QMDATUAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBOAAA

AAAAgQhAAOkDAwE5AAAAACBCEAA6QMDAVgAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBWQAAAAAAGhAAOkDAgIyMgAA

AAAAgQhAAOkDAwE0AAAAACBCEAA6QMCAjMzAAAAACBCEAA6QMDATQAAAAAIEIQADpAwICNjEA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwMBMwAAAAAAGhAAOkDAwE5AAAAACBCEAA6QMCAjg2AAAAACBCEAA6QMDATgA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwICOTEAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBNAAAAAAGhAAOkDAwE4AAAAACBCEAA6QMDATkA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwMBQwAAAAAAGhAAOkDAwFYAAAAACBCEAA6QMCCEFMTEdBVEFOAAAAAACBCEAA

iwICakM1AAAAACBCEAA6QMCAkg0AAAAACBCEAA6QMCAlg4AAAAACBCEAA6QMBAUsAAAAAIEJ

QADyBQICNjMAAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBOQAAAAAAGhAAOkDAgI4MwAAAAAAGhAAOkDAwE0AAAAACB

CEAA6QMDATkAAAAAIEIQADpAwICOTMAAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBNAAAAAAGhAAOkDAwE5AAAAACB

CEAA6QMDAUsAAAAAIEIQADpAwICVjQAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBOQAAAAAAGhAAOkDAgJZNAAAAAAA

gQhAAOkDAQFMAAMAAACBCEAAEQruAbMCAgIxMQAAAAAAGhAAOkDAwEzAAAAACBCEAA6QMDATcA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwMBOAAAAAAGhAAOkDAwFXAAAAACBCEAA6QMCAjIxAAAAACBCEAA6QMDATMA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwICMzEAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBMwAAAAAAGhAAOkDAwE1AAAAACBCEAA6QMDATcA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwMBOAAAAAAGhAAOkDAgI0MQAAAAAAGhAAOkDAwEzAAAAACBCEAA6QMDATYA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwMBOAAAAAAAgQhAAOkDAgI1MQAAAAAAAgQhAAOkDAwEzAAAAAACBCEAA6QMD
ATUA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwICNjEAAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBMwAAAAAAAgQhAAOkDAwE1AAAAAACBCEAA6QMD
ATcA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwMBOAAAAAAAgQhAAOkDAwFSAAAAAACBCEAA6QMCAjgxAAAAAACBCEAA6QM
DATMA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwMBNwAAAAAAAgQhAAOkDAwE4AAAAAAAABAAAAADibMCZivQFAAAAAAH5e
VCZi

vQFAAAAAAH5eVCZivQEDAAAAAgAAAAMAAACJAQAAAwAAAMUIAADAAAAAAAANDPEeChsRh
AAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD4AAwD+/wkABgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAAAA4AAAAAAAA/v8AAAQAAg
AAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAAAALVzdWcLhsQk5cIACss+a4wAAAAtAAAAAgAAAABAAAASAAAAA8AA
ABQ

AAAABAAAFwAAAFFAAAAZAAAAAYAAABsAAAACwAAAHQAAAAQAAAAfAAAAAwAAACEAAAA
AgAAAOQE

AAAEAAAAAgAAACAAV28DAAAAAFQAAAMAAAASAAAAAwAAAAQAAAALAAAAAAAAAAAsAAAAAA
AAADBAA

AAIAAAAEAAAAGAAAAE5ldyBQaG9uZSwgRkFYICYgRS1tYWlsAAMAAAAAAAAAA0M8R4KGxGuEAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPgADAP////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

-----_891987988==_

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

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: d.atwood@mbox.unicc.org

-----_891987988==_--

Return-Path: <mbox.unicc.org@mbox.unicc.org>

Received: from gk-blue.unicc.org (gk-red.unicc.org [192.91.247.2])

by igcb.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id IAA06553

for <mupj@igc.apc.org>; Tue, 7 Apr 1998 08:39:13 -0700 (PDT)

Received: by gk-blue.unicc.org; (5.65v3.2/1.3/10May95) id AA28841; Tue, 7 Apr 1998 17:39:10 +0200

Received: from gh-old.unicc.org (guardhouse [193.72.50.67])

by mira.unicc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id RAA01735

for <mupj@igc.apc.org>; Tue, 7 Apr 1998 17:40:43 +0200 (MET DST)

Received: by gh-old.unicc.org (5.65/jsb-190694);

id AA01551; Tue, 7 Apr 1998 17:36:42 +0200

Date: Tue, 7 Apr 1998 17:36:42 +0200

Message-Id: <9804071536.AA01551@gh-old.unicc.org>

Received: from guardhouse.unicc.org ([193.72.50.215]) by capella.unicc.org

(Netscape Messaging Server 3.01) with SMTP id AAA4127;

Tue, 7 Apr 1998 17:39:02 +0200

X-Sender: d.atwood@mbox.unicc.org

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Version 1.4.4

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="====_891995848=="

To: ipb@gn.apc.org

From: mbox.unicc.org@mbox.unicc.org (David Atwood)

Subject: Attention: Adam and Jo

Cc: mupj@igc.apc.org

X-Attachments: C:\MYDOCU~1\LTRSMI~1\MPBOVY~1.DOC;

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

====_891995848=="

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

Dear Adam and Jo,

I phoned Colin earlier today to get a address and phone number for Marie Pierre Bovy ("Stop Essais"). The phone/FAX number he gave me was 33-403-85508216. I have tried this, but it doesn't seem to work. Could you have a look and see if I wrote it down correctly. And then send it to Howard Hallman (mupj@igc.apc.org), as I have sent him this number. I have had to mail my letter to Marie Pierre. I am attaching the letter. If you do get the right number, would you mind trying to FAX it to her to speed things a bit. I am out of time here and not back until a week from Thursday, and Howard wants to get on with being in touch with Marie Pierre.

Many thanks,

David

-----_891995848==_

Content-Type: application/octet-stream; name="MPBOVY~1.DOC"; x-mac-type="42494E41"; x-mac-creator="6D646F73"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: base64

Content-Disposition: attachment; filename="MPBOVY~1.DOC"

0M8R4KGxGuEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPgADAP7/CQAGAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAAAADgAAAA
AAAAAA

EAAADwAAAAEAAAD+////AAAAAA0AAAD////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////c

pWgAY+AJCAAAAABIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAwAAow0AAEcYAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAow
oAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABIAAGwAAAAAEgAAbAAAAGwSAAAA
AAAAbBIA

AAAAAABsEgAAAAAAAGwSAAAAAAAAbBIAABQAAACmEgAAAAAAAKYSAAAAAAAaphIAAAAAAAC
mEgAA

AAAAAKYSAAAAAAAaphIAAAoAAACwEgAACgAAAKYSAAAAAAAaxcAADEAAAC6EgAAAAAALoS
AAAA

AAAAuhIAAAAAAAC6EgAAAAAALoSAAAAAAAuhIAAAAAAAC6EgAAAAAALoSAAAAAAAuxMA
AAIA

AAC9EwAAAAAAL0TAAAAAAAAAvRMAADwAAAD5EwAAqgEAAKMVAACqAQAATRCaAB4AAACcFwA
AWAAA

APQXAABTAAAAaxcAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAbBIAAAAAAC6EgAAAAAAAABw
AIAAEA

AQC6EgAAAAAALoSAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAALoSAAAAAAAuhIAAAAAAABrFwA
AAAAA

AIQTAAAAAAAAAbBIAAAAAAABsEgAAAAAALoSAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAALoSAA
AAAAA

hBMAAAAAAAAACEwAAAAAAIQTAAAAAAAAuhIAAMoAAABsEgAAAAAALoSAAAAAAAAbBIAAAA
AAAC6

EgAAAAAALsTAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABAVMzdJmK9AYASAAAOAAAjhIAABgAAABsEgAAAAA
AGwS

AAAAAAAAbBIAAAAAAABsEgAAAAAALoSAAAAAAAuxMAAAAAACEwAANwAAAIQTAAAAA
AAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAANDQ0NTmV3IFBob25lLCBGQVggJiBFLW1haWwNV
GVs

bCBiZSBhYmxIIHRvIHNlbnmQgeW91IGNvcGllcyBvZiB0aGUgdGhpbnmdzIHRoYXQgaGF2ZSBhbHJl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y
ZXNzIGFyZTogSG93YXJkIFcuIEhbbGxtYW4sIENoYWlyLCBNZXRob2Rpc3RzIFVuaXRIZCBmb3Iga
UGVhY2Ugd2l0aCBKdXN0aWNlOyBQaG9uZS9mYXg6lCszMDEgODk2LTAwMTMgKFVTQSk7IGUtbWFp
bDogbXVwakBpZ2Mub3JnLiAgSSBhbSBhbHNvIHNlbnmRpbmcgaGltIGegY29weSBvZiBteSBsZXRo
ZXIgdG8geW91LCBhbG9uZyB3aXRoIHlvdXIgcGhvbnUvRkFYIG51bWJlci4NDQ0NDQ0JSGVsZW5l
IGFuZCBJIGFyZSBnb2luZyB0byBDdb3JzaWNhIHRvbW9ycm93IGZvciBhIHdlZWsuICBNeSBmaXJz
dCBob2xpZGF5IHNPbnmNIIGegZmV3IGRheXMgb3ZlciB0aHJpc3RtYXMuICBjIGFtLCB1bmZvcnRl
bmF0ZWx5LCBhcyBtdWNoIGegd29ya29ob2xpYyBhcyBjIHdhdhcyBhdCBJRk9SLg0NCUkgaG9wZSB5
b3WSbGwgYmUgYWJsZSB0byBjb21lIHRvIHRoZSBOUFQgYW5kIHRvIGRvIHRoaXMgcHJlc2VudGF0
aW9uLiAgSWYgeW91IGFyZSBjb21pbmcsIGRvIGxldCBtZSBrbm93LCBzbyB0aGF0IHdlIHNhbiBt
ZWV0IGVhY2ggb3RoZXIgaW5kIGNhdGN0IHVwIGegYml0Lg0NCQkKJCQkKCUxvdmUgdG8geW91IGFu
ZCBQaWVycm90LA0NDR4AnMICnciCpIUupcJBpqAFp6AFqKAFqcUDqgAAqwkAAIEIQACcAwIFTERN
QU4AAAAAAIEJQAC0BAMFSUNJVFkAAQAAAIEIQACJAgaEAIBFAAAAAACBCUAAiAYDAQADAAEAw
AA
eQMAAKMNAADDDQAAAP0A+wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAACdQEAA2MSAAEAAM
AAEDAAAC

AwAAAwMAAAQDAAAcAwAAMgMAAEcDAABkAwAAegMAAHsDAACIAwAAiQMAAJsDAACuAwAAvgM
AAL8D

AADSAwAA0wMAALoEAAC7BAAAJAcAACUHAACrCQAARAKAADQMAAA1DAAANgwAADcMAAA4DAA
AOQwA

AOEMAADiDAAAga0AAIENAACHDQAAog0AAKMNAAD9AAFFIxsB/QABRSMbAf0AAUUjGwH9AAFFIxsB

/QABRSPYAP0AAUUj2AD9AAFFI9gA/QABRSPYAP0AAUUj2AD9AAFFIxsB+wABRSMbAfsAAUUjGwH7

AAFFIxsB+wABRSMbAfsAAUUjGwH7AAFFIxsB+wABRSMbAfsAAUUjGwH7AANFIxsB+wABRSMbAfsA

B0UjGwH7AAFFIxsB+wAIRSMbAfsAAUUjGwH7AAhFIxsB+wABRSMbAfsAAUUjGwH7AAFFIxsB+wAB

RSMbAfsAAUUjGwH7AAJFIxsB+wABRSMbAfsAAkUjGwH7AAFFIxsB+wABRSMbAfsAAUUjGwH7AAFF

IxsBAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAAACAAAFASUOAA8
ACAABAEsA

DwAAAAAAHAAAQPH/AgAcAAZOb3JtYWwAAgAAAAAYAYQkIYxgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AIgBB

QPL/oQAIABZEWZhdWx0IFBhcmFncmFwaCBGb250AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAowoAAAMAow0AAAY
A

////wIABCD//wEAACD//wIAAAAADkJAACjCgAAAACoAAAAAQAAAAAAAAAMAAMMNAAHAAADAACj

DQAACAAAAAAfQAAAIIAACWAAAAmgAAAJsAAACHAAAApWAAAK0AAAC2AAAAvQAAACMBAAA
qAQAA

/gEAAAYCAACHAwAAjgMAAKIDAACsAwAAZgMAANYDAACQBGAAlwYAAJwGAACiBgAAbwgAAHYIAA
DR

CAAA3QgAAMQJAADOCQAAMoAAJ8KAACICgAABwAcAAcAHAAHABwABwAcAAcAHAAHABwABwAcAAcA

HAAHABwABwAcAAcAHAAHABwABwAcAAcAHAAHABwABwAcAAcANwADKioqMEM6XE15IERvY3VtZW50

c1xsdHJzIG1pc2NcTVAgQm92eSA3IEFwcmlsIDk4LmRvY/9ASFAGRGVza0pldCA0MDAgUHJpbnRl

cgBMUFQxOgBIUFcxRERJAEhQIERlc2tKZXQgNDAwIFByaW50ZXIASFAGRGVza0pldCA0MDAgUHJp

bnRlcgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABDUDIAAWAQN/gAcBAAkAAAAAAGQAAQAHACwBAGABACwBAQAAAAA
AAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAE
AAAADAAAA

AQAAAAEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEhQIERlc2tKZXQgNDAwIFByaW50ZXIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABMUFQxAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAAwAAAEAAAAAAOQ
M9gkAAAQA

AgABAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQA
AAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAsASwBSFAGRGVza0pldCA0MDAgUHJpbnRlcgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABDUDIAAWAQN/gAcBAAkA

AAAAAGQAAQAHACwBAGABACwBAQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAAADAAAAAQAAAAEAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEhQIERlc2tKZX
QgNDAw

IFByaW50ZXIAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABMU
FQxAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAEAAAwAAAEAAAAAAOQM9gkAAAQAAGABAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAsASwBA4ABADgJAAA4CQAACQABA
AAAOAkA

AAAAAAAA0CQAAMQAVFpABAABUaW1lcyBOZXcgUm9tYW4ADBaQAQIAU3ltYm9sAAsmkAEAAEFyaWFs

ACIABABxCIwYAADQAgAAaAEAAAAAyTskRsk7JEbIOyRGAQABAAAAiQEAMUIAAACAAQAAAAEAIM
Q

EgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAgABAAAAQAAAAAAAAADpIgAAAABTAAAIQzpcTVNPZmZpY2VcVGVtcGxhdG
Vc

TmV3IFBob25lLmRvdBdOZXcgUGhvbmlUeIEZBWCAmIEUtbWFpbAAAAAMqKioDKioQAAAAAAAAAAAA

ADgxAAAAACBCEAA6QMDATQAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBNQAAAAAgQhAAOkDAwFDAAAAACBCEAA
A6QMD

AUQAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBTQAAAAAgQhAAOkDAgI5MQAAAAAgQhAAOkDAwE0AAAAACBCEAA
6QMD

ATUAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBNwAAAAAgQhAAOkDAwFDAAAAACBCEAA6QMDAU0AAAAAIEIQAD
pAwMB

TgAAAAAgQhAAOkDAgJDMQAAAAAgQhAAOkDAwE0AAAAACBCEAA6QMDATUAAAAAIEIQADp
AwIC

SDEAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBNQAAAAAgQhAAOkDAwFDAAAAACBCEAA6QMDAU0AAAAAIEIQADp
AwIC

TTEAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBNQAAAAAgQhAAOkDAgJWMQAAAAAgQhAAOkDAwFDAAAAACBCEAA
A6QMC

AlgxAAAAACBCEAA6QMDATUAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBTQAAAAAgQhAAOkDAQFIAAIAACBCEAA0
AMK

7QECajE2AAAAACBCEAA6QMDATgAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBUAAAAAgQhAAAEAAAACAAAAAwA
AAAQA

AAAFAAAABgAAAAcAAAAIAAACQAAAAoAAAALAAAADAAAAP7////9////EQAAAP7///8ZAAAA/v//

////////////////////////////////////+////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////UgBvAG8AdAAgAEUAbgB0

AHIAeQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAABdAAAAQAAAAAAAAACQIAAAQAAABYAB
QH////

////wEAAAACQIAAAAAMAAAAAABGAAAAAQAFTGXSZivQEQAAGAMAAAA
AABX

AG8AcgBkAEQAbwBjAHUAbQBIAg4AdAAAEcATJIIAEM6XE15IERvY3VtZW50c1xsdHJzIG1pc2MA

AAAAAAGgACAQIAAADAAAA////wAAAAAIAhCAAAAAAgy7HQQEAAAJAAB
wAA

AAAAABHGAAAAAAEAQwBvAG0AcABPAGIAagAAAAAAGAAAAA
ACAAA

AAAAAAEAAHAAAAPz/ACAAAASAAIB////////AAAAA////wwAAAA

AAAAAAGoAAAAAABQBTAHUAbQBtAGEAcgB5AEkAbgBmAG8AcgBt
AGEA

dABpAG8AbgAAAAIAAACAAAAAACgAAgH////BAAAAP////8AAAAAA
A

AABMAAD2ItWMAAAAAAACAAYAEAAFPBSFIBAAA/v//wMAAAE
AAAA

BQAAAYAAAHAAAACAkAAAD+////CwAAAwAAANAAA/v////////

////////

////////

////////

////////

////////

////////

////////

////////wEA/v8DCgAA////wAJAgAA

AAAwwAAAAAAEYYAAATWljcm9zb2Z0IFdvcmQgRG9jdW1lbnQACgAAAE1TV29yZERvYwAQAAA

V29yZC5Eb2N1bWVudC42APQ5snEAAAAAADQzxHgobEa4QAAAAA/v8
A

AAQAAGAAAAAQAQAOCFn/L5T2gQq5EIACsns9kwAAAAmAEAABIAAABA
AAA

mAAAAIAAACgAAAAwAAAMAAAAEAAAZAAAAUAAADYAAAABgAAAOQAAAAHAAA8AAA
AAgAAAAI

AQAACQAAABQBAAASAAAIAEAAoAAABIAQAACwAAAFQBAAAMAAA YAEEAA0AAABsAQAADg
AAAHgB

AAAPAAAAGAEABAAAACIAQAEEwAAAJABAAACAAAA5AQAB4AAAAAYAAAATmV3IFBob25ILCBGQ
Vgg

JiBFLW1haWwAHgAAAAEAAAAAx0MAHgAAAAQAAAAqKioAHgAAAAEAAAAALCBGHgAAAAEAAAAAi
EgA

HgAAAA4AAABOZXcgUGhvbmUuZG90AAAAHgAAAAQAAAAqKioAHgAAAAIAAAAxAEQAHgAAAB4AA
ABN

aWNyb3NvZnQgV29yZCBmb3IgdV2luZG93cyA5NQAAoEAAAAAARsMjBQBEAG8AYwB1AG0AZQBuAHQA

UwB1AG0AbQBhAHIAeQBJAG4AZgBvAHIAbQBhAHQAaQBvAG4AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAADgAAgD////////

//////8AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAP//////////wAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA//////////AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD//////////8AAAAAAAAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD+/wAABAACAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAA

AAAAAABAAAAAtXN1ZwGxCTlwgAKyz5rjAAAAC0AAAACAAAAEAAABIAAADwAAAFAAAAEA
AAA

XAAAAUAAABkAAAABgAAAGwAAAALAAAAdAAAABAAAAB8AAAADAAAAIQAAAACAAAA5AQAA
B4AAAAC

AAAAIABXbwMAAAAVAAAawAAABIAAADAAAABAAAAsAAAAAAAAACwAAAAAAAAAMEAAA
AgAAAB4A

AAAYAAAATmV3IFBob25ILCBGQVggJiBFLW1haWwAAwAAAAAAAAACTkcAFAAAAIIEQAADChe8AQEP

CAMDD7IBSwgIJGwqIxmNAGcAAwAAAACBCUAAiwYHAVMAFgAAAIIEQADTAQAGDgIZEwhVBAEDCVI
A

ER9HSyhMDQIEBExBU1QAAQAAAIEIQACwAZIDBQNPT1AAAAAAAAIEHQACwAQQETkVYVAAAAAAAgQ
IA

AMMEBAhQUkVWSU9VUwAAAAAgQIAAMMEBANSRUwAAAAAIEHQACwAQUCSFMAAAAAAIEHQAC
CwAQQB

UwALAAAaggVAAAOTAjwKMQsCAvUBKyolBQVZTUJPTAAAAAAAgQdAAJIBBAZXSU5ET1cAAQAAAIEI
QAB6yAMDAUUAHwAAAIIICQAAJABoASAAAAAAAEAEgSLGwEIBEsDHJcBEQABAFcKMAEEA0NITwA
A
AAAAgQdAALABBAJORAAAAAAAgQdAALABBAVQUkIOVAIAAAAaggBAAG8AAAAAAABAAQBUwA
AAAAA
gQhAAOYDBQJTRQAAAAAAAgQRAABEFVQAAgAAAIEIQADnAwOUAgMBRwAAAAAAgQhAAL4DBAJFU
gAB
AAAAgQIAALgFRwYBUwACAAAAGQhAAIoBswLhAgMFSU5GT1IAAAAAAIEIQAC7AwQCU0gAFgAAAIID
QAAIngEILBNsAAEAAAMFiwIEAREOIgULDAQcBgJFRAAXAAAAaggFAAAMFB10AAAAAAAKmQ
Mh
AwEKJz5QIQEHAVMAAgAAAIEIQAAAN9APUAQYDTVNHAAAAACBB0AAsAEGBVRBQkxFAAAAAACBB
0AA
sAEFBFRFUKUAAAAAAIEIQAC7AwMETEFORAAPAAAAaggNAABIJpwEPJQ03ODEKDyIACQQTIG4XBgEA
AAAAAAAOCEgEAACIHahUUQwEDB01FU1NBR0UAAAAAIEHQACwAQMETkIEQQAAAAAAgQhAA
PkC
BQJTSABAAAAGQIAANcE0wEDBE9QRU4AAAAAIEHQACwAQMGUkVTVUxUAAAAACBB0AAsAEDA
VMA
CQAAAIIGQADNASwqGnULVVprRwIDT05BAAEAAACBCEAAhQLsAwIGUkNST0ZUAAAAACBCUAA7AQ
D
AUUADAAAIIIFQADtASBpcABYETYMAEsHJAQDQVJNAAgAAACCBUAAIwIzAAAAvQGYAQNhBwFTABQ
A
AACCA0AAhQNOQRoFEGAZDwwGBgEBAgAAEwUDAQQHQk9NQklORwAAAAAAgQIAAKYFBQVSRUFLU
wAA
AAAAgQIAAN0EBAFEAAEAAACBCUAA3ASjAQQIRklHSFRFUIMAAAAAIEJQADcBAQFUE9XRVIAAA
A
AIEJQACtBgQBUwADAAAAGQhAAIAD3AEQvgEEBFdPT0QAAQAAAIEJQAC/BBADA0IORwAAAAAAgQIA
AK0GAwFNAAcAAACCBkAARZ4CkgEISgEASwEAAMAAAAAgQdAAIEBBAAGAAAAAIEHQACBAQQCRU
QA
AAAAAIEJQACIBgUBUgAAAAAAgQIAANIFBAJMWQAFAAAAgQhAAN0B5AK5ASIADwQBUwACAAAAGQ
hA
ALEDbLYBBARXQVJFAAAAAACBA0AACQMCU1QA8AAAAIIBQAADAQABAAMDAAAEAAAABAAEHA
KKGwQC
AgwBBgAFAR0JAQADBAMBAAEAAgABAWEBAQAAAAEDAguAAwEFAAADAQQBAGABAAQBAAADCQ
wAFQAA

AAAAAgQCAAMBCQEEAAAAAgAAAAHAwABAgAAAgEABAAAAAABAEBAAkEAgADAAABAgEDCg
AAAAAA

AgAAAQAAAQAgEBAwABAQYHAQQAAAAAAAgEAAwEAAAEBBAAABQECAAQIAAAACAQMAAwIBAg
AAAgAC

AAICDgAAAAAAAw0ABAIAAIAAgADAAAGAQEBCgAGAAUABQUCCQAGAAEGCgoCAAAABQADBAA
AAIEH

QAD5AYsBENMBTQUHQUREUkVTUwATAAAAggJAAKUCGgYAAwsQBQAAQCUAQABYxgBAB0FA0NP
TAAA

AAAAgQdAAKgBBQRGTEFHAAAAACBB0AAqAEFBkhFSUdIVAAAAAAAgQdAAKgBBQJMWQAEAAAAg
QhA

AOYDzAEAdQEFBE5BTUUAewAAAIICQACIAhoGAAMLEAUABUAgAEAAWMYAQAdCQADAgAAAIIEQ
ADx

AhUABQNST1cAAAAAAIEHQACoAQUEVEINRQAAAAAAAgQdAAKYBCQVTRVRVUAAAAAAAgAdAAAAF
BVdJ

RFRIAAAAACBB0AAqAECBFNDQUwAAwAAAIEIQABykQNpvgEEA0hFUgABAAAAGhAAO8CRQMBSA
AC

AAAAgQhAAL4DKgAEATIAAAAAAIEIQAC+AwQCRVIAAAAAAIEJQACHBAYDSUVTAEEAACBCEAA6Q
MA

BgFZAAEAAACBCEAA6QMABAVHVUFSRAAAAAAAAgQhAAOsDBANJTKcABAAAAIIEQAACygMAAmUDA
VMA

AAAAAIEIQADQAwQDQkFOAAkAAACCBUAA1wERBhcMsAEJMzCCAQQDRUhBAAYAAACBB0AA+gFDA
QAC

cbwBBwADAAAAAIEIQADEAgQDSUx FABAAAACCBEEA1gEVAXcbXQI7BE8DFoUBAHEAAAUGT05BQkxF

AAEAAACBCUAA3QTNAQMBVAAAAAAAgQIAAPIFAGFUABcAAACCBEEAAEk4FCCYBMD2TAVIEBAoKA
woj

DiwBSAxTAQMETkVTUwADAAAAGgVAABeRAz8AAwFTAAcAAACCBUAAAtQMAABxJggEFIQMDVEVEAAI
A

AACBCEAA4wEuvQIEA0IORwAEAAAAGhAAMoBvAJKuAERAwVaQUxBTgAAAAAGhAAOsDAGJWRQB
L

AAAAggJAAGM3OgALBQIDFgAFFTUIHiUABAABDwQfAQIHAAQLDQEACgoEAwkWBQANDBEVABEAAg
AK

AwUACAIAAAMNBwEHBAUFAwEEAgIBAQMMAAMEAVIAAAAAAIEIQADmAwIBWAAFAAAAggNAAAM
EAGaX

AeECAwRBQkxFAAAAACBCEAArQMDakVEAA8AAACCBUAAAwUFAQZZpWEAjwEGNUkSgwE2LAQBU
wAJ

AAAAggRAAAoEDwAAWBwZjAKEAQMDSU5HAAEAAACBCUAAA5wEAwNVUFMAAAAAAIEGQAB1AQ

NKMTEA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwMBMwAAAAAagQhAAOkDAwE0AAAAAACBCEAA6QMDATUAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBOAAA

AAAAgQhAAOkDAwE5AAAAAACBCEAA6QMDAVgAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBWQAAAAAagQhAAOkDAgIyMgAA

AAAAgQhAAOkDAwE0AAAAAACBCEAA6QMCAjMzAAAAAACBCEAA6QMDATQAAAAAIEIQADpAwICNjEA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwMBMwAAAAAagQhAAOkDAwE5AAAAAACBCEAA6QMCAjg2AAAAAACBCEAA6QMDATgA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwICOTEAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBNAAAAAagQhAAOkDAwE4AAAAAACBCEAA6QMDATkA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwMBQwAAAAAagQhAAOkDAwFYAAAAAACBCEAA6QMCCEFMTEdBVEFOAAAAAACBCEAA

iwICakM1AAAAAACBCEAA6QMCAkg0AAAAAACBCEAA6QMCAlg4AAAAAACBCEAA6QMBAUsAAAAAIEI

QADyBQICNjMAAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBOQAAAAAagQhAAOkDAgI4MwAAAAAagQhAAOkDAwE0AAAAAACB

CEAA6QMDATkAAAAAIEIQADpAwICOTMAAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBNAAAAAagQhAAOkDAwE5AAAAAACB

CEAA6QMDAUsAAAAAIEIQADpAwICVjQAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBOQAAAAAagQhAAOkDAgJZNAAAAAAA

gQhAAOkDAQFMAAMAAACBCEAAEQruAbMCAgIxMQAAAAAagQhAAOkDAwEzAAAAAACBCEAA6QMDATcA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwMBOAAAAAagQhAAOkDAwFXAAAAAACBCEAA6QMCAjIxAAAAAACBCEAA6QMDATMA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwICMzEAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBMwAAAAAagQhAAOkDAwE1AAAAAACBCEAA6QMDATcA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwMBOAAAAAagQhAAOkDAgI0MQAAAAAagQhAAOkDAwEzAAAAAACBCEAA6QMDATYA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwMBOAAAAAagQhAAOkDAgI1MQAAAAAagQhAAOkDAwEzAAAAAACBCEAA6QMDATUA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwICNjEAAAAAIEIQADpAwMBMwAAAAAagQhAAOkDAwE1AAAAAACBCEAA6QMDATcA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwMBOAAAAAagQhAAOkDAwFSAAAAAACBCEAA6QMCAjgxAAAAAACBCEAA6QMDATMA

AAAAAIEIQADpAwMBNwAAAAAagQhAAOkDAwE4AAAAAABAAAAAADibMCZivQFAAAAAAH5e

VCZi

vQFAAAAAAH5eVCZivQEDAAAAAgAAAAMAAACJAQAAAwAAAMUIAADAAAAAANDPEeChsRrh
AAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD4AAwD+/wkABgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAAAA4AAAAAAAA/v8AAAQAAG
AAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAQAAAALVzdWcLhsQk5cIACss+a4wAAAAtAAAAgAAAABAAAASAAAAA8AA
ABQ

AAAABAAAFwAAAFAAAAZAAAAAYAAABsAAAACwAAAHQAAAAQAAAAfAAAAwAAACEAAAA
AgAAAOQE

AAAEAAAAAgAAACAAV28DAAAAAFQAAAMAAAASAAAAAwAAAAQAAAALAAAAAAAAAAAsAAAAAA
AAADBAA

AAIAAAAEAAAAGAAAEE5ldyBQaG9uZSwgRkFYICYgRS1tYWlsAAMAAAAAAAAA0M8R4KGxGuEAAAAA

AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAPgADAP////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

////////////////////////////////////

--===== _891995848==_

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

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: d.atwood@mbox.unicc.org

-----_891995848=--

Dealing with Netscape General Protection Faults

Enclosed below is documentation provided by Netscape for troubleshooting GPF related problems. In addition, you can do the following:

- o For a quick fix, edit the file `c:\interact\netscape\netscape.ini` and change the line that says "Display Inline Images=yes" to "Display Inline Images=no". This will force Netscape into text mode.
- o You can see a list of programs that are running by holding down the Ctrl key and pressing Esc. Close any other InterACT applications such as Mail or Telnet before launching Netscape.

The most common problem seems to be the video driver Windows is configured to use. Some don't work well with Netscape and switching to a different video driver can fix a lot of these problems.

Netscape's GPF Troubleshooting Suggestion's

URL: <http://help.netscape.com/kb/client/960513-61.html>

Troubleshooting General Protection Fault (GPF) problems

Microsoft Windows can sometimes be prone to a wide variety of crashes, glitches, GPF's, and other assorted weirdness. Here's a list of things to try if you're seeing those sorts of problems when you run Netscape:

Preliminaries:

- 1) Make sure your Windows Swap file is set to Permanent not Temporary.
- 2) Run a scan disk on your hard drive to check for any errors.

Things to try:

First, edit your NETSCAPE.INI file and change the "Use Asynch DNS" line to "No". This sometimes works magic in getting things to work, since some configurations of Windows networking software will fall over at the first sight of asynchronous DNS. Also, if you do this, make sure you set "Max Connections" to "1". (Both of these settings are in the "[Network]" section of the INI file.)

You should edit your CONFIG.SYS file to have:

```
FILES=40      (or better)
BUFFERS=40   (or 10 if you are using SMARTDRV disk caching)
STACKS=9,256
SHELL=C:\DOS\COMMAND.COM C:\DOS\ /P /E:2048
```

You might need to update the Windows video driver for your video card.

To test whether this is the case, change back to the Windows standard VGA display mode (by running SETUP from the Windows directory and changing the display option to VGA), then running Netscape for a while to see if you still run into problems. If the problem now goes away, then contact your video card company for updates to your video driver software. Problems have definitely been seen with older Cirrus Logic and ATI Mach 32 / Mach 64 video drivers.

Sometimes, conflicts can occur with programs that Windows loads when it starts up. Check the "LOAD=" and "RUN=" lines of your WIN.INI file, and remove (or comment out) any of these lines which automatically start up programs you don't really need to have running.

Do you have an antivirus program loaded in memory? Sometimes these programs will interfere with Netscape's operation, and cause crashes.

Sometimes, something you're loading in your CONFIG.SYS or AUTOEXEC.BAT might interfere with the way that the Navigator works. You might want to try temporarily removing some of the things loaded in those files to see if they might have caused the problems you were seeing.

Copyright 1996 Netscape Communications Corporation

Draft statement on the health and environmental effects of nuclear weapons production/ Arjun Makhijani/ 8 April 1998

Note to convenors and other reviewers. In drafting this, I have omitted the term "nuclear fuel cycle" since this applies to nuclear power and not strictly to nuclear weapons production and testing, which is by its nature a one-time use. Of course, there is now the problem of what to do with surplus fissile materials, which is potentially a fuel cycle type of issue. I do not know whether I was to cover this topic, or whether Martin Kalinowski's section on the FMCT is sufficient. I am leaving them out for now, but could add some paragraphs, if it were deemed desirable by the other convenors.

Please also note that I will provide references in the next draft. I wanted to get this draft to you as soon as possible.

Draft Text:

Nuclear weapons production and testing has involved extensive health and environmental damage not only in the weapons states, but throughout the world. One of the most remarkable features of this damage has been the readiness of governments to harm the very people that they claimed they were protecting by building these weapons for national security reasons. In general, this harm was inflicted on people in disregard of democratic norms, even in those countries where such norms are codified in constitutions and laws. Secrecy, fabrication of data, cover-ups in the face of attempted public inquiry, and even human experiments without informed consent have all been features of nuclear weapons production and testing programs.

The most extensive damage, in terms of the populations affected has been from the atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons, which began in 1945, with a US test, and ended in 1980 with a Chinese test. For instance, children who drank milk were specially exposed to high radiation doses in the immediate aftermath of such testing due to the deposition of iodine-131, a highly radioactive short-lived fission product that concentrates in milk and then in the thyroid gland. The US National Cancer Institute estimates that between 10,000 and 75,000 additional cases of thyroid cancer will occur due to US atmospheric testing at the Nevada Test Site alone.

The damage from atmospheric tests also extended to other parts of the world. This was clearly understood at the time, as the following excerpt from a 1960 editorial in the alumni magazine of the University of California (which was and continues to be the main US contractor for nuclear weapons physics and design) Engineering school shows:

"The increase in radiation one receives from fallout is about equal to the increase one receives from cosmic rays when moving from sea level to the top of a hill several hundred feet high. . . . It means, though, your babies' chances of having a major birth defect are increased by one part in 5,000 approximately. Percentage wise, this is insignificant. When applied to the population of the world, it means that nuclear testing so far has produced about an additional 6,000 babies born with major birth defects. [emphasis added]

"Whether you choose to look at "one part in 5,000" or "6,000 babies," you must weigh this acknowledged risk with the demonstrated need of the United States for a nuclear arsenal. "

In addition there was damage from US testing in the Pacific area, as well as from Soviet, British, French and Chinese testing.

Iodine-131 was only one of the radionuclides involved. Among the long-lived radionuclides that have produced and will continue to produce increased cancers risk for decades and centuries to come are: carbon-14, cesium-137, zirconium-95, strontium-90, ruthenium-106, tritium, and plutonium-239. Some of these substances, notably carbon-14 and tritium, cross the placenta, become organically bound in developing cells and hence endanger fetuses.

It is estimated that between 100,000 and almost half a million premature cancer deaths will have resulted from all atmospheric weapons testing by the end of the next century worldwide. About four times as many premature deaths are estimated to occur if all radiation doses from carbon-14, which has a half-life of 5,730 years, and other very long-lived radionuclides are taken into account.

Nuclear weapons states have also inflicted harm on non-nuclear states through uranium mining and milling. Both worker and population exposures are involved. The environmental damage was in the form of air pollution and water pollution with uranium, radium-226, thorium-230, and radon gas (via its radioactive decay products). There is also contamination by non-radioactive toxic materials such as arsenic and molybdenum. Uranium mill wastes, known as tailings, will continue to pose health and environmental risks for thousands of years. Throughout the world, the lands and lives of indigenous people have been the most severely affected by both nuclear weapons testing and by uranium mining and milling.

Nuclear weapons states obtained uranium from many countries, including Canada, Congo, East Germany, Namibia (in violation of UN resolutions), Niger, and Australia. The most severe effects on workers from nuclear weapons production were due to uranium mining. In reviewing data from the United States and the former Soviet Union, some researchers have concluded that radiation dose and/or health data were poorly kept. As a result many epidemiological investigations have yielded questionable results, at best. For instance, until 1989, radiation dose records of nuclear weapons workers in the United States did not include information due to internally deposited radioactive materials. These data were kept separately and not provided to workers even when they asked for their radiation records. One investigation, revealed that despite official denial, a majority of workers at a uranium processing plant were overexposed during the 1950s and early 1960s. At least two million workers, and probably far more, were involved in nuclear weapons and related production. Besides radioactive materials, many other toxic materials such as carbon tetrachloride and other organic solvents, chromium and other heavy metals, hydrofluoric acid and fluorine gas, were involved. At least two million workers were affected throughout the world, probably many more.

Armed forces personnel were also subjected to severe risks. They assisted

in nuclear weapons testing and in exercises simulating nuclear war conditions. When they became ill, their governments all too often turned their backs on them. And human experiments were conducted without informed consent.

Most is known about the damage inflicted by US nuclear weapons production and testing, because the United States has been the most open of the nuclear weapons states. The most dramatic single breakthrough for democratic practice came on December 6, 1993, due to a great act of statesmanship and courage by then-US Secretary of Energy, Hazel O'Leary. In a press conference she announced that the United States government had done radiation experiments on its own citizens, some without informed consent. A presidential commission subsequently made more details known to the public. Documents on the health and environmental effects of nuclear weapons production, many of them amounting to a sort of electronic truth commission, have been posted on the Internet. For instance, researchers have been able to establish that the United States coordinated its atmospheric testing program with Kodak and other makers of photographic film, so as to protect the film from the effects of fallout. But they did not inform the producers or consumers of milk that it would be contaminated with iodine-131, increasing the risk of cancer and possibly other diseases of the thyroid and those caused by thyroid hormonal deficiency.

The environmental damage has also been severe and will continue for centuries. Highly radioactive wastes are stored in tanks at many sites. Many are at some risk of fires and explosions. One such explosion actually occurred in the Soviet Union on September 29, 1957. Over 10,000 people were evacuated from their homes over a period of two years, but they were not told why. The Soviet government only acknowledged the problem in 1989. Even the CIA, which knew of the accident as early as 1959, did not make it public, presumably out of fear of arousing public questions about US waste management practices.

The British government provided false reassurances to the public from an October 1957 reactor fire at Sellafield (then called Windscale). The French and Chinese governments are the most secretive of the declared nuclear weapons states. The undeclared and threshold states, such as Israel, India, and Pakistan are the most secretive of all.

Recommendations

While no amount of democratic practice can compensate for the harm already inflicted on people, the NPT Review conference should recommend that a Global Truth Commission on the Health and Environmental Effects of Nuclear Weapons Production and Testing be created. Such a commission could be established in various ways. For instance, it could be an ad hoc commission of the UN General Assembly, or it could be under the joint auspices of the World Health Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme. Some work has already been done on these issues by UN agencies. Indeed, the NPT review conference mechanism might itself be a vehicle for establishing such a commission.

It is a lamentable commentary on the state of the world that more than half a century after the start of the nuclear arms race, nuclear weapons states

have still not systematically acknowledged to the world's people the harm they have inflicted on them. The appointment of a Truth Commission will not only be salutary for global democracy and accountability on the part of the world's most powerful countries, it could also be a powerful force for nuclear disarmament. It is not widely realized that most nuclear weapons plants in the United States were shut in the late 1980s and early 1990s as a result of health and environmental concerns, and not due to any treaty. The key was increasing knowledge and action by the people of the United States, most notably the people living in the shadows of these plants, of the immense harm inflicted on them without their informed consent under cover of national security.

Ideally, the work of the Global Truth Commission of the Health and Environmental Effects of Nuclear Weapons Production and Testing should be funded by the declared nuclear weapons states, which also happen to be the permanent members of the Security Council. But they may not do it. It will be fitting if it were funded from voluntary contributions of member states and of philanthropists.

The NPT Review Conference should urge the nuclear weapons states to turn over to the Commission copies of documents relating to health and environment. But much of the work of the commission, such as taking testimony from affected populations, can begin even without such documentation.

At least one publicly accessible repository for documents should be established in a non-nuclear weapons state on every continent for all official public documents relevant to the matter, except Antarctica. There should also be one repository in every nuclear weapons state. The documents should also be made available on the Internet, so far as possible. The undeclared nuclear weapons states should be encouraged to join the process. Israel, India and Pakistan are not signatories to the NPT, but cooperation in the work of the Commission should not require accession to the NPT.

As the work of the commission reveals health needs, mechanisms to assist the affected populations should be created. The public in both the nuclear weapons states and non-nuclear weapons states should be invited to participate in the work of the commission by providing materials, documents, testimony, and expertise. The mothers of the world are, after all, often its first epidemiologists. Finally, it is imperative that the greatly disproportionate harm done by nuclear weapons testing and by uranium mining and milling to indigenous peoples be addressed by the work of the Truth Commission.

We also recommend that this PrepComm put on the agenda a call for environmental damage caused by nuclear weapons states in non-nuclear weapons countries to be repaired, to the extent possible. There is some precedent for this. For instance, Britain has undertaken to compensate Australia for the costs of some of the damage caused by its nuclear weapons tests. Likewise, the United States has provided some compensation to many of the victims of nuclear weapons testing in the Marshall Islands, as well as some environmental restoration.

The worldwide public awareness of the profound damage to future generations that has already been done due to past nuclear weapons production and

testing could increase the political and moral pressure towards disarmament from large numbers of people. Today, nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation seem like esoteric subjects fit for technocrats and diplomats. But that view of the matter disregards the silent damage that is daily being inflicted upon the Earth and its children. It is time to change that. It would be fitting if this conference, charged with setting the agenda for non-proliferation and disarmament, seizes the moment to do it.

Arjun Makhijani

President, Institute for Energy and Environmental Research

6935 Laurel Ave.,

Takoma Park, Maryland 20912, U.S.A.

Phone 301-270-5500

Fax: 301-270-3029

e-mail: arjun@ieer.org

web page: <http://www.ieer.org>

FW: BOUNCE abolition-caucus@igc.org: Non-member submission from
[National Peace Council <npc@gn.apc.org>]
Date: Tue, 07 Apr 1998 15:00:31
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
From: National Peace Council <npc@gn.apc.org>
Subject: NPT PREP COM SUBMISSSION: INVITE TO SIGN ON

If your organisation would like to sign on to the submission below please let me know by Fri 10 April via email or by tel 44 (0)171 354 9911 or fax 44 (0) 171 354 0033. Thank you. Frances Connelly (Abolition 2000 UK Co-ordinator)

SUBMISSION TO THE NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY PREPCOM MEETING IN GENEVA, 28 APRIL - 8 MAY 1998 FROM:
ABOLITION 2000 UK
CAMPAIGN FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT
MEDICAL ACTION FOR GLOBAL SECURITY
NUCLEAR FREE LOCAL AUTHORITIES
PAX CHRISTI

OTHER ORGANISATIONS ARE INVITED TO ADD THEIR NAMES

1. Introduction

1.1. This memorandum first sets out some of the facts which strongly suggest that the nuclear weapon states consider the NPT to be a licence for them to retain nuclear weapons in perpetuity. Second, it points out that there are at present no on-going negotiations about nuclear disarmament at all. Third, it suggests a set of objectives for the non-nuclear-weapon states. Fourth, there is a short note on tactics.

1.2. The central problem is clear. It is not with the non-nuclear-weapon states parties to the Treaty. Apart from the five declared nuclear weapon states and the three near-nuclear states not parties to the Treaty (India, Pakistan and Israel), virtually the whole of the rest of the world has declared its non-nuclear-weapon status. Many of these non-nuclear states also belong to nuclear-weapon-free zones. That is not where the problem lies.

1.3. The problem lies with the failure of the five nuclear weapon states to fulfil their obligations under the Treaty - a failure which has persisted now for nearly thirty years.

2. Nuclear weapons in perpetuity?

2.1. Current nuclear weapon programmes suggest that the nuclear weapon states propose to retain their nuclear weapon capability into the indefinite future. These are some examples:

2.1.a. In the US, there is a \$5.2 billion programme underway to extend the operational life of Minutemen III missiles and improve their capability up to the year 2020.

2.1.b. The US Stockpile and Stewardship Management Programme is a fifteen-year programme, priced at \$4 billion a year. This is bigger than the average expenditure for comparable warhead development and production

during the Cold War (\$3.7 billion in 1997 dollars). This programme includes a great deal of 'modernisation', in infringement of the spirit, if not the letter, of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

2.1.c. France is developing a new air-to-surface missile with a nuclear warhead which will only come into operation, at the earliest, in 2008.

2.1.d. Russia is developing a new variant of the SS-25 missile, called the Topol M, and also probably a new submarine-launched ballistic missile, a follow-on to the SS-N-20 called the SS-NX-26.

3. Nuclear Disarmament negotiations.

3.1 The START II Treaty was signed in January 1993. Since then, there have been no nuclear disarmament negotiations. START II is not yet in force: the Russian Duma, for various reasons, some good, some bad, has not ratified it. The impression is sometimes given that the Treaty would reduce the number of nuclear warheads on each side to 3,000 each. That is not correct. With 'hedges', reserves and tactical warheads the figure is more likely still to be at least 11,000 on each side, by the year 2007.

That is 500,000 Hiroshimas.

3.2. The impression is also sometimes given that there is some 'technological imperative' for this snail's progress to nuclear disarmament. That, too, is not correct. With relatively little expansion of existing facilities all the nuclear warheads on this planet could be dismantled in seven years.

3.3. No progress has been made on information exchange between the US and Russia, nor on any international supervision of the process of dismantlement.

3.4. The US and Russian position appears to be that for at least a further decade nuclear disarmament is entirely a bilateral affair. Together with France and Britain (but not China) they think non-nuclear-weapon-states should not be allowed any say in the matter.

3.5. The nuclear weapon states (except China) have doctrines of sub-strategic use which clearly imply possible use against non-nuclear-weapon states parties to the NPT. This means that the security assurances which they have given are not worth the paper they are written on.

4. Objectives for non-nuclear states at the PrepCom

4.1. To get the nuclear weapon powers to make an unambiguous 'statement of intent' to get rid of all their nuclear weapons, with no link to General and Complete Disarmament (GCD).

4.2. To get them to agree explicitly that they will not develop any new warheads or new missiles.

4.3. To get the USA and Russia to leapfrog START II and begin START III negotiations, with a 1,000 total warhead limit for all warheads, including hedges, reserves and tacticals, and with a target date of June 1999 for completing negotiations. (START II was underway before START I was ratified.)

4.4. To get the nuclear weapon states to agree that the first steps should now be taken towards multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. A large majority of states voted for this in the General Assembly.

4.5. To get the nuclear weapon states to agree a No First Use Treaty, which would therefore genuinely guarantee that any non-nuclear-weapon state was safe from a nuclear attack by a nuclear weapon state.

4.6. To get the nuclear weapon states to take some substantial measures of de-alerting.

5. Tactics

5.1. At the 1997 PrepCom, the non-nuclear-weapon states were described, perhaps not unfairly, as being "docile and disorganised". One main objective should be to find as much common ground as possible between all the non-nuclear-weapon states, including those normally described as "Western". For example, all those states, except Turkey, voted in favour of the International Court of Justice's advisory opinion on nuclear disarmament negotiations - an opinion which omits any reference to GCD, and which says "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament..."

5.2. At some point the non-nuclear-weapon states should possibly be prepared to indicate that they cannot continue indefinitely as parties to such an unequal Treaty.

Dear friends,

Please find attached the final version of the NGO statement on fissile materials prepared for the NPT PrepCom in Geneva.

I hope it is of interest for you and I hope it will serve the delegates in Geneva and raise their interest to talk to the NGOs.

With best regards,

Martin

NGO statement on fissile materials, controls, inventory and IAEA safeguards to the delegates of the second Preparatory Committee meeting for the NPT Review Conference in the year 2000 from April 27 to May 8, 1998 in Geneva

Towards universal, comprehensive and transparent accountancy, safeguarding and disposition of military and civilian fissile materials.

Thank you Mr. Chairman and distinguished delegates for giving non-governmental organisations the opportunity to present their views and recommendations. We hope that these considerations are of value for your work and we wish you all success in your efforts, especially during this Preparatory Committee meeting for the Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty in the year 2000.

A. Importance of stepwise progress towards a comprehensive cut-off agreement for the NPT

1. At the first NPT PrepCom in New York in 1997 it was suggested (and read in a personal statement by the Chairman) that special time should be reserved in the NPT review process to discuss the cut-off issue. In this short statement we would like to recommend what delegates might consider during this specially reserved time. It should be kept in mind that the particular quality of this forum is that the nuclear threshold states are not Parties to the Treaty.

2. Since the end of 1996 any progress towards a cut-off agreement at the Conference on Disarmament (CD) is completely deadlocked. Therefore, the most effective way to progress toward such a treaty will be through incremental advances at various other fora before the commencement of negotiations at the CD. Other fora can continue to create progress in parallel with negotiations at the CD. A special possibility would be to start negotiations on a cut-off agreement outside the CD in order that it can be concluded among those who agree, and then political pressure could move others to join. The NPT review process is one of the most important and

most influential fora at which small steps towards a cut-off agreement can be achieved.

The main purpose of any intermediate steps would be to reinforce the commitments of countries that have ceased production, to increase transparency, to build confidence in these commitments, and to increase pressure on countries that continue production for nuclear weapons. Last and not least, the nuclear weapon states need to demonstrate in this stepwise process their commitment to take real steps towards nuclear disarmament.

3. Within an agenda towards a nuclear-weapon-free world a cut-off agreement should be one of the very next steps and negotiations should commence as soon as possible. A comprehensive cut-off agreement that meets all reasonable demands will not easily be achievable. To begin with, the negotiating mandate at the CD should remain narrowly defined, in order not to block a possible conclusion of a treaty. The minimum goal should be a non-discriminatory, multilateral, internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other explosive devices. There is still broad consensus that it is necessary in the negotiations to allow for addressing other topics like existing stocks from past production. However, it seems to be clear that the nuclear-weapon states are not prepared to have their military stocks cut back by such a treaty. They might possibly be prepared to discuss a declaration of stockpiles or a commitment to minimise non-military stockpiles outside of safeguards. The goal should be that all civilian fissile materials and military material declared excess to weapons use should be placed under international safeguards.

4. Some NGOs take the view that nuclear disarmament should be included or linked to a cut-off agreement. However, the delicate question is how such an integration or linkage can be achieved. As long as the nuclear-weapon states are not prepared to include decisive disarmament measures into a cut-off agreement or to establish some kind of linkage between both, some nuclear threshold states will hardly be prepared to negotiate such a treaty. The demand for a formal linkage will block any progress because it is unacceptable to the nuclear-weapon states. Therefore, the solution may be found by integrating a particular measure into the cut-off agreement that has implications on disarmament. Few analysts suggest to include specific restrictions on further production of tritium into the cut-off agreement. This would have a reversible impact on qualitative disarmament in the nuclear-weapon states. The fraction of nuclear weapons which lack tritium will be qualitatively disarmed by reducing their yield by two orders of magnitude. This is reversible, because they will regain their full yield as soon as tritium is refilled. Even among NGOs many experts have the feeling that such a step is completely unacceptable to nuclear-weapon states, especially if it is implemented with the intention to use the decay of tritium as a

forcing function for disarmament.

5. A formal linkage between the cut-off and disarmament appears not to be acceptable to the nuclear-weapon states and it may not be possible to integrate sufficient disarmament measures into a cut-off agreement. However, the asymmetrical situation regarding fissile materials needs to be addressed. Especially, for a cut-off to be acceptable for states with smaller nuclear capabilities, the agreement has to be combined with arrangements to maintain the pressure for disarmament. At a minimum, early commitments to further reductions beyond START II are required to create the climate in which nuclear threshold states could accept to join a cut-off. Some analysts suggest another kind of linkage. Nuclear threshold countries could link their production moratoria to the weapons states continuing to reduce their stockpiles of warheads and fissile materials not under safeguards "at a sufficient rate", perhaps 50% every five years.

The solution to accommodate the differing needs of nuclear-weapon states and non-parties to the NPT may be some kind of a package approach. Each part of the package could have narrowly defined mandates in order to ensure agreement to start the negotiations and success in concluding them. While it is quite unclear at the moment what type of package would work, one or more of the following should be considered in addition to a fissile materials cut-off agreement:

- Establishment of an ad hoc committee on disarmament at the CD
- Establishment of a disarmament discussion process at the CD including a question format like the parliamentary question process
- Establishment of an ad hoc scientific group to consider technical aspects of nuclear disarmament (similar to the group of experts that considered verification aspects of a CTBT prior to the CD being given a negotiating mandate on the CTBT)
- some kind of tritium control outside of the fissile materials cut-off agreement
- A practical demonstration by the nuclear-weapon states of their disarmament commitments such as de-alerting of nuclear forces
- A practical demonstration by non-parties to the NPT of their non-nuclear weapons intentions such as voluntary declarations on non-production of fissile material
- Announcement by the nuclear-weapon states of what the next step will be after the cut-off agreement, and a commitment to enter into negotiations at an early date.

6. A conflict similar to that which currently deadlocks the cut-off issue is causing frictions at the NPT Preparatory Committee meetings. As long as the nuclear-weapon states are not prepared to discuss future disarmament measures within the NPT review process while in other areas - like the cut-off - future plans are discussed, a discriminatory situation in this important international forum can hardly be avoided.

B. Fissile material in the military arsenal and outside of safeguards - each step at its time.

7. Most nuclear-weapon and nuclear threshold states have already ended the production of fissile materials for weapon purposes. The very first step that can be immediately taken is that all these states commit themselves publicly to turn their de-facto production stop into a declared moratorium. Those states that have not done so already should join this formal moratorium. This would be valuable even without verification arrangements. For the time being, countries could be expected to live up to their commitments, motivated by the expectation that all past production will eventually be reconstructed and it will be verified that they in fact halted production for weapons, once a formal cut-off enters into force.

8. Transparency on inventories should be complete and universal. The first step in achieving international control of all fissile materials is to have a full and accurate accounting of the location, amount, and form of fissile materials in each country. Even the material still in weapons should be included in this complete inventory in order to reduce the danger of withdrawal of materials at a later stage of disarmament. The total amount in weapons would be sufficient and does not need to be more detailed. This accounting must be universal. There should be no exclusions for any reason. Specific measures to ensure universal adherence to transparency as a first step appears to be advisable. For example, it has been suggested that accountability could be established in the form of imposing criminal penalties upon national leaders for failure to account fully for fissile materials within their countries. A few analysts take the view that quality and justice of enforcement measures would improve, if the UN security council becomes more democratic. Again, verification can start at a later date.

9. For the time being, it is possible to postpone the commencement of verification. Nuclear safeguards can gradually be introduced until only a restricted portion of fissile materials remains outside full-scope safeguards. Adequate non-intrusive monitoring methods should be established to put even those materials under some kind of verification that are not subject to regular safeguards. These monitoring methods would serve as confidence building measures until full-scope safeguards are established. As soon as an inventory becomes subject to international safeguards, all declarations can be checked for consistency with past book entries by undertaking a full physical inventory measurement and by applying methods of nuclear archaeology.

10. The military production facilities that remain open should be shut down and dismantled and those that have been shut down already should also be dismantled. Dismantling of facilities

probably should not occur until agreement is reached on transparency and verification measures, because these facilities contain physical evidence on total production. Exemptions will be made for some enrichment facilities and only those portions where LEU is turned into HEU should be dismantled. Special arrangements need to be negotiated in case some countries want to keep a stand-by production facility for tritium or to develop or even construct a new production technology for tritium. Verification procedures would be required to ensure that such stand-by facilities are not used for plutonium production.

11. In the long run, controls on fissile material should be comprehensive. However, everything does not have to fall under the rubric of a cut-off convention. In order to serve the purpose of a nuclear-weapon-free world, a cut-off of fissile materials should go beyond the mere ending of the production of these materials for military purposes. Otherwise, those countries that already have large stockpiles would primarily benefit. Thus, such a cut-off would reinforce the status quo of nuclear "haves" and "have nots". Therefore, the cut-off agreement has to offer the flexibility to become as comprehensive as possible in that all fissile materials will eventually be placed under international controls. Such an agreement needs to be universal in that it applies to all countries. The only way to eliminate completely the discriminatory nature of the NPT will be the elimination of all national stocks of nuclear warheads and unsafeguarded fissile material. The crucial question is whether full-scope safeguards over all fissile materials in nuclear threshold states could be acceptable to them before the nuclear-weapon states take their final step of nuclear disarmament.

12. Eventually, the control of fissile materials plays an important role in the transformation of the non-proliferation regime into a nuclear-weapon-free world regime. The crucial question is how a reduction of unsafeguarded stockpiles of fissile material can be managed in a way that a nuclear-weapon state or a nuclear threshold state can become a non-nuclear-weapon state. For nuclear-weapon states this transformation will be linked to the destruction of the last remaining nuclear weapons. This needs to be different for nuclear threshold states which have a policy of nuclear ambiguity. They are known to possess sufficient amounts of nuclear-weapon-usable material to produce a number of nuclear weapons. When these states join the nuclear disarmament progress they should reduce the upper limit of their stocks of nuclear-weapon-usable materials while the recognised nuclear-weapon-states further reduce the limits of their nuclear arsenals. The last step would involve placing all remaining stocks of fissile material in all countries under international safeguards. This suggestion does not mean that some countries will not go non-nuclear before others. Any country can drop out early of the disarmament process and become a non-nuclear state.

C. Reductions on the availability of weapons-usable fissile materials

13. International transparency in the inventories of highly enriched uranium (HEU) and plutonium as well in the national strategies to manage these materials is of high value for non-proliferation and may set a precedent that could well be followed with regard to military material and such outside of safeguards. The guidelines on plutonium management that were agreed by nine countries in late 1997 constitutes a modest step in that direction though several issues have not been resolved satisfactorily. Especially the agreed format of annual plutonium balances does not create the desired transparency. For example, the figures are rounded to 100 kg only.

14. The logical consequence of the previous points is that at some point in time all civilian installations in nuclear threshold states and in nuclear-weapon states will be put under IAEA safeguards. However, the inherent problems of safeguarding fissile materials lead to the requirement that their availability should be reduced as far as possible.

15. Stocks of HEU - both military and civilian - should be reduced to the lowest levels practical, and civilian use of HEU should be eliminated. Nuclear-weapon states should put excess HEU under safeguards. The blending down to low enriched uranium should pose little problems as long as it is carried out under verified inspections. This process needs to be accelerated. Perhaps it is possible to put a moratorium on any uranium enrichment to whatever isotope ratio until the present global stocks of HEU, including that from the nuclear weapons to be dismantled, is consumed in diluted form in light water power reactors. However, this appears to be even less realistic than a ban on plutonium separation from spent fuel.

16. Stocks of unirradiated plutonium should be minimised. Safeguarding of plutonium at bulk-handling facilities can never be perfect. Besides proliferation risks posed by state actors there is always a terrorist threat. This applies even to plutonium in unirradiated MOX fuel. Reactor-grade plutonium can be used for nuclear weapons and may even be of advantage for designing a crude nuclear weapon because no external neutron source is required to start the chain reaction due to the enhanced neutron background of plutonium-240 and higher isotopes.

One immediate step is to put a moratorium on the reprocessing of spent fuel at least as long as separated plutonium is still available for commercial purposes. From the non-proliferation point of view it is desirable to ban civilian reprocessing. Anyway, economic and ecological arguments already speak against the use of plutonium for fresh fuel. Perhaps an

economic incentive could be established to reduce the amount of unirradiated plutonium by introducing an inspection fee that is proportional to the amount of material and facilities which have to be put under IAEA safeguards.

17. How can plutonium be disposed of? How to handle the plutonium coming out of dismantled nuclear weapons? It must be made non-weapons-usable rather than be allowed to sit in storage ready for re-use. As a first step, the metal pits can be made unusable, e.g. by squeezing them out of shape and transforming them into oxide. The plutonium can then be treated according to the stored weapons standard. Further, it can be irradiated or mixed with radioactive waste and immobilised with glass or in a ceramic.

The technical feasibility, the risks and the merits of burning or transmuting plutonium should be evaluated in a way which is optimised for the elimination of plutonium and downgrading its isotopic composition and without aiming at simultaneous power generation. However, the largest challenge is to develop an efficient technology that works without reprocessing and without new reprocessing technologies. It should be noted that downblending of the isotopic composition of plutonium is not able to render this material unusable for nuclear weapons. Also, it should be taken into account that the reuse of plutonium in MOX fuel for power generation will encourage commercial plutonium use and reprocessing. Therefore, only very few NGO representatives accept a MOX strategy, especially when combined with immobilisation in a dual-track approach. In view of these advantages and disadvantages one might think of an appropriate balanced mix of various techniques and technologies to minimise the risk of proliferation.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates,
I would like to thank you very much for listening to this statement prepared by non-governmental organisations on fissile materials. We hope that it motivates you to discuss these issues with NGOs and to profit from their advice and expertise.

This statement was edited by Martin Kalinowski in an open process to which 40 experts were invited individually. Input was provided and reflections were given by a number of experts, especially by Owen Greene, F.H. Hammad, Wolfgang Liebert and Arjun Makhijani. These experts do not necessarily subscribe to all points made in the statement. The responsibility for mistakes and inappropriate wording lies only with the editor of this statement. Credit should be given to the contributors.

=====
Martin B. Kalinowski, IANUS

Hochschulstr. 10, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany
Tel.: +49-6151-163016 FAX: +49-6151-166039
Internet, private: KALINOWSKI@HRZPUB.TU-DARMSTADT.DE
Internet, group: IANUS@HRZPUB.TU-DARMSTADT.DE
<http://www.tu-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/welcome.htm> and [.../inesap.htm](http://www.tu-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/inesap.htm)

Please mind the change in our postal address!

Please mind the slight change in the internet address: tu instead of th !

Please circulate far and wide! (file also included as attachment)

**SIGN ON TO A STATEMENT BY RELIGIOUS LEADERS:
RATIFY THE CTBT**

Dear Colleague,

Last fall, President Clinton submitted the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) to the Senate for U.S. ratification. Unfortunately, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, chaired by Sen. Jesse Helms (NC), has not identified the treaty as a high priority. If the CTBT continues to languish in the Senate, the U.S. will miss an important opportunity to help curb the proliferation of nuclear weapons worldwide.

Today, we call on your assistance in moving this treaty through the Senate. The religious community has a long tradition of struggling to eliminate the threat of nuclear weapons. This year, many of us will be working with coalitions and with Congress to ensure ratification of this historic treaty. Please lend us your support by signing on to the following open statement urging Senate ratification of the treaty. If you have questions or comments, please let us know. We will do all we can to answer your queries and address your concerns.

In late April, when the Congress returns to Washington after the Spring recess, we plan to present to the Senate majority and minority leaders this statement in support of the CTBT signed by a large number of supporters from a broad representation of religious groups. We encourage leaders from national, regional, and local levels to lend their names to this statement

Yours in peace,

Joe Volk

Please send us your response as soon as possible--deadline is May 1.

YES! PLEASE SIGN ME ON TO THE RELIGIOUS LEADERS STATEMENT.

Name and Title: _____

Denomination/Name of congregation: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____ Fax: _____ Email: _____

To sign on to the Statement by American Religious Leaders: Ratify the CTBT, please complete this form and mail or fax it to Bridget Moix at FCNL, 245 Second St., NE, Washington, DC 20002; fax 202-547- 6019. You can also call (202-547-6000) or email (bridget@fctl.org) your response.

A Statement by

American Religious Leaders:
Ratify the CTBT

May 1998

As persons entrusted by our diverse religious communities with special responsibilities to address the issues of justice and peace, we have joined in this appeal for Senate action to approve the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) before the August recess.

For more than forty years, the nuclear arms race dominated the Cold War policies of the United States. Within our faith communities, those policies raised the profoundest questions about the sacredness of God's creation, our moral responsibilities, and human destiny. With the end of the Cold War, the issues of the nuclear threat have changed, but the threat remains and the profound moral questions persist. The retention of thousands of nuclear weapons, combined with the threats of proliferation and terrorism, requires renewed attention to these issues. At the moral core of nuclear issues is the credibility of nuclear-weapon states in seeking to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons by or to other states or political groups.

We believe that ratification of the CTBT during 1998 is the most urgent and timely action that could contribute significantly toward reducing the nuclear danger. We are reminded that ratification of the CTBT would help fulfill U.S. commitments under the Limited Test Ban Treaty and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and is consistent with current U.S. law. In fact, the CTBT would make permanent internationally the current moratorium on nuclear testing which the U.S. already observes. The international verification regime of this treaty provides a means to effectively monitor such a permanent ban on testing and to restrict further proliferation of nuclear weapons technology. U.S. leadership on ratification of this treaty is critical.

The United States Senate has within its powers the capacity to take decisive action on some of the most fateful issues affecting the security of our nation and the peace of our planet. We urge the Senate to proceed swiftly this session to devote the most serious consideration to the honoring of our previous treaty commitments and to the merits of the CTBT. We earnestly hope our senators will then decide it is time to consent to the treaty's ratification.

We assure our senators of our determination to interpret this issue as a vital matter of religious conscience for our communities -- and we pray for their own good health and wisdom.

Yours faithfully,

National:

Rabbi Eric Yoffie
President
Union of American Hebrew Congregations

Clifton Kirkpatrick
Stated Clerk of the General Assembly
Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

Rabbi Arthur Waskow
Director
The Shalom Center

Johan Maurer
General Secretary
Friends United Meeting

Kathy Thornton, RSM,
National Coordinator
NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby

Ronald J. Sider
President
Evangelicals for Social Action

Paul H. Sherry
President
United Church of Christ

Rev. Tyrone S. Pitts
General Secretary
Progressive National Baptist Convention, Inc.

Kara Newell
Executive Director
American Friends Service Committee

Bishop McKinley Young
African Methodist Episcopal Church

The Rev. Dr. Daniel E. Weiss
General Secretary
American Baptist Churches, USA

Dr. Richard L. Hamm
General Minister and President
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) in the United States and Canada

The Rev. Dr. Joseph M. Mason
Interim Executive Director
Church of the Brethren, General Board

Heather Nolen
Coordinator

Church of the Brethren, Washington Office

Susan Shank Mix
President
Church Women United

Bruce Birchard
General Secretary
Friends General Conference (for ID purposes only)

John K. Stoner
Coordinator
New Call to Peacemaking

Metropolitan Theodosius (Lazor)
Primate
Orthodox Church in America

John A. Buehrens
President
Unitarian Universalist Association

Lynette Meck
Executive Director
Mennonite Central Committee, U.S.

Ronald J.R. Mathies
Executive Director
Mennonite Central Committee

Dr. Bert Beach
General Conference of the Seventh Day Adventist Church

Jim Wallis
Executive Director
Sojourners

Dr. Willie T. Snead
Sr. President
National Missionary Baptist Convention of America

Howard Hallman
Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Joe Volk
Executive Secretary
Friends Committee on National Legislation

Rev. Ted Keating, SM
Director for Justice and Peace
Catholic Conference of Major Superiors of Men's Institutes

Rev. Bill Moroney
Missionaries of Africa

Bishop William Boyd Grove
Ecumenical Officer
United Methodist Council of Bishops

Local and Regional:

Bishop Donald Parsons
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Anchorage, Alaska

Frank Chingliak
President of the Provincial Board
Moravian Church in Alaska

The Rt. Rev. Mark MacDonald
Episcopal Diocese of Alaska

Bishop Michael J. Kaniecki, SJ
Roman Catholic Diocese of Fairbanks, Alaska

Rev. Richard A. Heacock, Jr.
President
Alaska Christian Conference

Rabbi Eugene Levy
Congregation Bnai Israel
Little Rock, Arkansas

Dr. F Gladwin Connell
Conference Council Director
Little Rock Annual Conference

Rev. Dr. Carolyn Tyler
Interfaith Disaster Recovery (for ID purposes only)
Little Rock, Arkansas

Sister Maria Liebeck
Daughters of Charity
Little Rock, Arkansas

Archbishop Mor Cyril Aphrem Karim
Eastern Archdiocese
Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch

Bishop M.L. Meadors, Jr.
United Methodist Church
Jackson, Mississippi

Gordon L. Sommers, President
Moravian Church, Northern Province

Rev. Galen Wray
Centenary United Methodist Church
Beatrice, Nebraska

Collins Kilburn
Executive Director
North Carolina Council of Churches

The Rev. Bill Dalke
Conference Minister
Rocky Mountain Conference
United Church of Christ

Peace and Justice Task Force
Rev. Robert A. Kinsey, Chair
Rocky Mountain Conference
United Church of Christ

Bishop K. Woodrow Hearn
United Methodist Church
Texas Annual Conference

Bishop Walter F. Sullivan
Catholic Diocese of Richmond, Virginia

Robert E. Hughes
Board of Church and Society, Chair
United Methodist Church
Mercer Island, Washington

Attachment Converted: C:\INTERACT\data\download\Rellead2.wpd

ACTION ALERT! ACTION ALERT! ACTION ALERT! ACTION ALERT! ACTION ALERT!

We need YOU to urge the Religious leaders in your community to sign on to this statement. - It is especially important to have local community religious leaders from the key CTBT states signed on to this statement.

THIS STATEMENT IS A GREAT ORGANIZING TOOL FOR YOU! - Find more people to help on your Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW! Campaign

The DEADLINE has been EXTENDED to MAY 1.

Please do this now. The plans to distribute this on the hill with press confernces etc. has been delayed until early May. WE NEED AS MANY RELIGIOUS LEADERS AS POSSIBLE from YOUR COMMUNITIES!

**SIGN ON TO A STATEMENT BY RELIGIOUS LEADERS:
RATIFY THE CTBT**

Dear Colleague,

Last fall, President Clinton submitted the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) to the Senate for U.S. ratification. Unfortunately, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, chaired by Sen. Jesse Helms (NC), has not identified the treaty as a high priority. If the CTBT continues to languish in the Senate, the U.S. will miss an important opportunity to help curb the proliferation of nuclear weapons worldwide.

Today, we call on your assistance in moving this treaty through the Senate.

The religious community has a long tradition of struggling to eliminate the threat of nuclear weapons. This year, many of us will be working with coalitions and with Congress to ensure ratification of this historic treaty. Please lend us your support by signing on to the following open statement urging Senate ratification of the treaty. If you have questions or comments, please let us know. We will do all we can to answer your queries and address your concerns.

In late April, when the Congress returns to Washington after the Spring recess, we plan to present to the Senate majority and minority leaders this statement in support of the CTBT signed by a large number of supporters from a broad representation of religious groups. We encourage leaders from national, regional, and local levels to lend their names to this statement

Yours in peace,

Joe Volk

Please send us your response as soon as possible--deadline is May 1.

YES! PLEASE SIGN ME ON TO THE RELIGIOUS LEADERS STATEMENT.

Name and Title:

Denomination/Name of
congregation: _____

Address:

Phone: _____ Fax: _____ Email: _____

To sign on to the Statement by American Religious Leaders: Ratify the CTBT, please complete this form and mail or fax it to Bridget Moix at FCNL, 245 Second St., NE, Washington, DC 20002; fax 202-547- 6019. You can also call (202-547-6000) or email (bridget@fcnl.org) your response.

A Statement by
American Religious Leaders:
Ratify the CTBT

May 1998

As persons entrusted by our diverse religious communities with special responsibilities to address the issues of justice and peace, we have joined in this appeal for Senate action to approve the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) before the August recess.

For more than forty years, the nuclear arms race dominated the Cold War policies of the United States. Within our faith communities, those policies raised the profoundest questions about the sacredness of God's creation, our moral responsibilities, and human destiny. With the end of the Cold War, the issues of the nuclear threat have changed, but the threat remains and the profound moral questions persist. The retention of thousands of nuclear weapons, combined with the threats of proliferation and terrorism, requires renewed attention to these issues. At the moral core of nuclear issues is the credibility of nuclear-weapons states in seeking to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons by or to other states or political groups.

We believe that ratification of the CTBT during 1998 is the most urgent and timely action that could contribute significantly toward reducing the nuclear danger. We are reminded that ratification of the CTBT would help fulfill U.S. commitments under the Limited Test Ban Treaty and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and is consistent with current U.S. law. In fact, the CTBT would make permanent internationally the current moratorium on nuclear testing which the U.S. already observes. The international verification regime of this treaty provides a means to effectively monitor such a permanent ban on testing and to restrict further proliferation of nuclear weapons technology. U.S. leadership on ratification of this treaty is critical.

The United States Senate has within its powers the capacity to take decisive action on some of the most fateful issues affecting the security of our nation and the peace of our planet. We urge the Senate to proceed swiftly this session to devote the most serious consideration to the honoring of our previous treaty commitments and to the merits of the CTBT. We earnestly hope our senators will then decide it is time to consent to the treaty's ratification.

We assure our senators of our determination to interpret this issue as a vital matter of religious conscience for our communities -- and we pray for their own good health and wisdom.

Yours faithfully,

National:

Rabbi Eric Yoffie
President
Union of American Hebrew Congregations

Clifton Kirkpatrick
Stated Clerk of the General Assembly
Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

Rabbi Arthur Waskow
Director
The Shalom Center

Johan Maurer
General Secretary
Friends United Meeting

Kathy Thornton, RSM,
National Coordinator
NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby

Ronald J. Sider
President
Evangelicals for Social Action

Paul H. Sherry
President
United Church of Christ

Rev. Tyrone S. Pitts
General Secretary
Progressive National Baptist Convention, Inc.

Kara Newell
Executive Director
American Friends Service Committee

Bishop McKinley Young
African Methodist Episcopal Church

The Rev. Dr. Daniel E. Weiss
General Secretary
American Baptist Churches, USA

Dr. Richard L. Hamm
General Minister and President
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) in the United States and Canada

The Rev. Dr. Joseph M. Mason
Interim Executive Director
Church of the Brethren, General Board

Heather Nolen
Coordinator
Church of the Brethren, Washington Office

Susan Shank Mix
President
Church Women United

Bruce Birchard
General Secretary
Friends General Conference (for ID purposes only)

John K. Stoner
Coordinator
New Call to Peacemaking

Metropolitan Theodosius (Lazor)
Primate
Orthodox Church in America

John A. Buehrens
President
Unitarian Universalist Association

Lynette Meck
Executive Director
Mennonite Central Committee, U.S.

Ronald J.R. Mathies
Executive Director
Mennonite Central Committee

Dr. Bert Beach
General Conference of the Seventh Day Adventist Church

Jim Wallis
Executive Director

Sojourners

Dr. Willie T. Snead
Sr. President
National Missionary Baptist Convention of America

Howard Hallman
Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Joe Volk
Executive Secretary
Friends Committee on National Legislation

Rev. Ted Keating, SM
Director for Justice and Peace
Catholic Conference of Major Superiors of Men's Institutes

Rev. Bill Moroney
Missionaries of Africa

Bishop William Boyd Grove
Ecumenical Officer
United Methodist Council of Bishops

Local and Regional:

Bishop Donald Parsons
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Anchorage, Alaska

Frank Chingliak
President of the Provincial Board
Moravian Church in Alaska

The Rt. Rev. Mark MacDonald
Episcopal Diocese of Alaska

Bishop Michael J. Kaniecki, SJ
Roman Catholic Diocese of Fairbanks, Alaska

Rev. Richard A. Heacock, Jr.
President
Alaska Christian Conference

Rabbi Eugene Levy
Congregation Bnai Israel
Little Rock, Arkansas

Dr. F Gladwin Connell
Conference Council Director

Little Rock Annual Conference

Rev. Dr. Carolyn Tyler
Interfaith Disaster Recovery (for ID purposes only)
Little Rock, Arkansas

Sister Maria Liebeck
Daughters of Charity
Little Rock, Arkansas

Archbishop Mor Cyril Aphrem Karim
Eastern Archdiocese
Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch

Bishop M.L. Meadors, Jr.
United Methodist Church
Jackson, Mississippi

Gordon L. Sommers, President
Moravian Church, Northern Province

Rev. Galen Wray
Centenary United Methodist Church
Beatrice, Nebraska

Collins Kilburn
Executive Director
North Carolina Council of Churches

The Rev. Bill Dalke
Conference Minister
Rocky Mountain Conference
United Church of Christ

Peace and Justice Task Force
Rev. Robert A. Kinsey, Chair
Rocky Mountain Conference
United Church of Christ

Bishop K. Woodrow Hearn
United Methodist Church
Texas Annual Conference

Bishop Walter F. Sullivan
Catholic Diocese of Richmond, Virginia

Robert E. Hughes
Board of Church and Society, Chair
United Methodist Church
Mercer Island, Washington

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Kathy Crandall, Coordinator
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

Dear Mr. Hallman:

thank you for your message. I will be e-mailing (or faxing if e-mail does not succeed) you the letter and the appendices shortly.

Janet Somerville will consult with the Executive Committee of the CCC and will inform you whether or not she'll be signing the letter. The church leaders' signatures, however, will not appear.

Thank you. If you need any further information or clarification, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Iman Nashed (Ms.)

>
>Dear Mr. Nashed:
>
>Thank you for your reply. I have previously received the letter from
>Canadian churches to your government. I didn't received the appendices and
>would like to have them. My fax number is 301 896-0013 (phone is the same).
>Mailing address is Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th
>Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
>
> Will General Secretary Janet Somerville sign the statement on nuclear
>abolition? Will it be possible in the short timeframe to get signatures
>from heads of Canadian churches?
>
>Thanks for your assistance,
>Howard W. Hallman

>
Information & Communications
Coordinator
YWG Liaison
The Canadian Council of Churches
Tel: 416-232-6070 ext. 2021
Fax: 416-236-4532
E-mail: ccchurch@web.net
Web-page: <http://www.web.net/~ccchurch>

****WE HAVE MOVED****

Our new address as of Feb. 1 is
3250 Bloor St.W.
Etobicoke ON M8X 2Y4

Dear Disarmament Advocates:

At the request of Sen. Daschle (D-SD Minority Leader), the CBO recently produced this report, available at <http://www.cbo.gov/otherdoc.cfm>
Sen. Daschle also made a floor speech in conjunction with the letter. I posted the speech a few weeks ago - If you don't remember or can't find it - let me know, I'm happy to send it to you.

-Kathy Crandall
Disarmament Clearinghouse

Congressional Budget Office
March 18, 1998

Estimated Budgetary Impacts of Alternative Levels of Strategic Forces

For most of the last fifty years, the Department of Defense (DoD) has maintained a triad of forces to respond to the threat of nuclear warfare. Beginning in the 1970s, the size and shape of those strategic forces have been influenced by arms control agreements between the United States and the former Soviet Union. The first such agreement under the Strategic Arms Reductions Talks (START) calls for the United States to deploy no more than 6,000 warheads according to counting rules established in that treaty. START II calls for the United States to reduce its forces to 3,500 warheads by January 1, 2003, as written into the treaty, or December 31, 2007, as recently agreed upon by President Clinton and President Yeltsin. START I has been signed and ratified by both nations, but START II awaits ratification by the Russian Duma.

In response to a Congressional request, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has estimated the budgetary impacts of four alternative levels of strategic forces. The alternatives include remaining at START I levels, reducing to START II levels of 3,500 warheads by 2003 instead of 2007, and making further reductions to 2,500 warheads and 1,000 warheads.

U.S. forces are currently at START I levels, and the Administration's plan calls for reducing forces to START II levels by the end of 2007. CBO estimates that reducing forces to START II levels by the end of 2007 would save an average of \$700 million a year through 2008 and about \$800 million a year in the long run, compared to maintaining today's forces. (All estimates are expressed in constant 1998 dollars.) Making the START II reductions by 2003 would yield additional savings of \$700 million through 2008.

Reducing strategic warheads to 2,500 could save about \$1.5 billion dollars a year in the long run compared with funding for today's force levels or it might not yield any additional savings if few or no platforms are retired. For a limit of 1,000 warheads, CBO estimates that savings could increase to about \$2 billion a year in the long run.

Cost of Current Nuclear Forces (6,000-Warhead Limit)

The national defense budget includes funding for nuclear offensive forces operated by the military services, Department of Energy weapons programs that build and maintain nuclear warheads, and strategic command, control, and communications (C3), and surveillance systems. Nuclear offensive forces consist primarily of about 200 bombers, 550 land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), and 18 Trident submarines. These forces are all armed with multiple nuclear warheads under the START I limit of 6,000 warheads.

In the fiscal year 1998 budget, the costs for current nuclear forces and supporting activities total about \$20 billion. That includes about \$8 billion for strategic offensive forces, about \$4 billion for DOE programs, \$6 billion for C3 and surveillance, and another \$2 billion for treaty verification and other related programs. The 1998 total, however, includes just \$2 billion for force modernization compared with the \$4 billion CBO estimates would be necessary to replace and modernize today's offensive forces in the long run. For that reason, CBO would estimate the total costs of maintaining and supporting current nuclear force levels at \$22 billion.

Defense spending contains still other sums that might reasonably be attributed to nuclear forces--including efforts to reduce the threat from other nation's nuclear forces. The Department of Energy will spend about \$6 billion in 1998 to clean and restore the environment from decades of nuclear weapons production. Including the costs of missile defenses and strategic air defenses would add another \$5 billion, bringing the total to \$33 billion a year.

Budgetary Impact of START II (3,500-Warhead Limit)

The START II treaty was signed by President George Bush and President Boris Yeltsin on January 3, 1993. It was ratified by the United States Senate in January 1996, but it awaits ratification by the Russian Duma. The treaty would allow Russia and the United States to have 3,500 strategic nuclear warheads, including no more than 1,750 warheads to be deployed on submarines. ICBMs could have only one warhead and must be no more powerful ("heavy") than the Russian SS-19 missile. The treaty also places limits on bombers and the use of missile silos. On March 21, 1997, Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin agreed to extend the deadline for START II implementation from January 1, 2003, to December 31, 2007.

Implementation by the end of 2007. DoD's current plans call for implementing START II according to the Clinton/Yeltsin agreement. The Navy would retire four of its oldest Trident submarines by 2003, and the Air Force would retire 50 Peacekeeper missiles by 2008. Relative to START I this plan would save an annual average of about \$700 million through 2008--largely because of costs that the Navy would not have to bear. Under START I, the Navy would probably need funding for additional D5 missiles, modifications to four submarines that carry C4 missiles, and overhauls (including refueling the nuclear core) of those four submarines. Acquiring the D5 missiles would cost an average of about \$400 million a year through 2008, assuming the Navy would buy about 100 more missiles at about \$40 million a missile--the approximate

price of the most recent purchase. CBO estimates, based on data from the Navy, that costs to modify hardware and software would total about \$250 million a boat and average about \$100 million a year through 2008. Also, costs to overhaul the submarines would amount to about \$175 million a boat and average about \$70 million a year over the 1999-2008 period.

In addition, DoD's plan would save the costs of operating the four submarines and 50 Peacekeepers. Although those forces cost about \$300 million a year to operate, DoD's plan would save only \$1.3 billion through 2008--or an average of about \$130 million a year--because the changes to Peacekeepers would not occur until after 2003.

Over the very long term, the difference between a START I force and a START II force would be about \$800 million a year. In addition to about \$300 million a year in operating costs, DoD would have to spend \$500 million a year to replace aging systems. Those replacement costs would include about \$400 million a year for the sea-based leg of the triad and about \$100 million a year for Peacekeeper missiles.

Implementation by January 1, 2003. Early implementation of the START II treaty would result in additional savings of about \$700 million due to earlier retirement of the Peacekeeper missiles. There would be no additional savings from retiring Trident submarines because the Administration plans to retire the submarines by 2003.

Savings From a 2,500-Warhead Limit

At the Helsinki Summit, Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin agreed to negotiate a treaty--often referred to as START III--that would call for a limit of 2,000 to 2,500 strategic warheads. The United States could implement such an agreement in many ways. Reducing the number of warheads carried by existing platforms would yield little or no additional savings. On the other hand, savings would be significant to the extent that submarines, land-based missiles, and bombers were eliminated. For example, if 200 Minuteman missiles and 10 bombers were taken from the force while Trident missiles were modified to carry 4 instead of 5 warheads, the 2,500-warhead limit would save about \$1.5 billion a year compared to today's force levels or about \$0.7 billion when compared to funding under START II. Those savings would stem not only from reduced costs for day-to-day operations but also from avoiding future costs to replace the aging systems. A 2,500-warhead limit could be realized in many other ways that would affect budgetary savings. For example, greater reductions in the number of platforms, including eliminating one leg of the triad entirely, would increase the savings.

Savings from a 1,000-Warhead Limit

An agreement to maintain no more than 1,000 warheads could save roughly \$2 billion in the long run compared to funding for today's forces under START I. Savings would vary depending on how many Trident submarines,

Minuteman missiles, and B-52 bombers were retained. As with a 2,500-warhead limit, reducing the number of warheads per sea-based missile and keeping 14 Trident submarines could contribute to meeting the objective, but it would not offer as much savings as reducing the number of submarines and arming each missile with more warheads. Similarly, whether B-52 bombers are retired, held in a reserve role, or devoted entirely to nonnuclear warfare would affect the budgetary impact. For example, paring the force by 200 Minuteman missiles and arming each missile in 14 Trident submarines with one warhead would save about \$1.3 billion in the long run. Alternatively, if 300 Minuteman missiles, 20 bombers, and 8 Trident submarines were taken from the force, savings would total about \$2.5 billion in the long run compared with START I forces.

Disarmament Clearinghouse
1101 14th Street NW #700
Washington DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

Enclosed is the email list for NWWG. IF you copy it and then paste it in your nicknames, address book, or whatever you use on line, you can have one list and hit us all. If you see any errors here, please let me know. Most names are self explanatory, the ones that aren't

73774.3675@compuserve.com = ISIS
paexec = Gordon Clark
panukes = Bruce Hall
paprog = Fran Teplitz
wandwill = Kim Robson
vision = all the folks at 20/20
ctbt@2020vision = Marie RIETMANN
mupj = Howard Hallman
disarmament = Kathy Crandall

kathy@fcl.org
wandwill@clark.net
ledwidge@psr.org
vision@igc.org
disarmament@igc.org
jsmith@clw.org
mupj@igc.org
paprog@igc.org
bmorse@igc.org
dculp@nrdc.org
dkimball@clw.org
btiller@psr.org
bridget@fcl.org
cdavis@clw.org
73744.3675@compuserve.com
tperry@ucsusa.org
tcollina@ucsusa.org
paexec@igc.org
tom.clements@wdc.greenpeace.org
ieer@ieer.org
anitas@ieer.org
panukes@igc.apc.org
cpaine@nrdc.org
syoun@basicint.org
billeisen@rocketmail.com
armsintern@ucsusa.org
ctbt@2020vision.org
panukes@igc.org

Maureen Eldredge
Program Director
Alliance for Nuclear Accountability
1801 18th St. NW, Suite 9-2
Washington, DC 20009
202-833-4668/fax: 202-234-9536
(formerly the Military Production Network)

A national network of watchdog organizations

working on DOE's nuclear weapons complex.

FW: BOUNCE abolition-caucus@igc.org: Non-member submission from
[National Peace Council <npc@gn.apc.org>]
Date: Tue, 07 Apr 1998 15:00:31
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
From: National Peace Council <npc@gn.apc.org>
Subject: NPT PREP COM SUBMISSSION: INVITE TO SIGN ON

If your organisation would like to sign on to the submission below please let me know by Fri 10 April via email or by tel 44 (0)171 354 9911 or fax 44 (0) 171 354 0033. Thank you. Frances Connelly (Abolition 2000 UK Co-ordinator)

SUBMISSION TO THE NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY PREPCOM MEETING IN GENEVA, 28 APRIL - 8 MAY 1998 FROM:
ABOLITION 2000 UK
CAMPAIGN FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT
MEDICAL ACTION FOR GLOBAL SECURITY
NUCLEAR FREE LOCAL AUTHORITIES
PAX CHRISTI

OTHER ORGANISATIONS ARE INVITED TO ADD THEIR NAMES

1. Introduction

1.1. This memorandum first sets out some of the facts which strongly suggest that the nuclear weapon states consider the NPT to be a licence for them to retain nuclear weapons in perpetuity. Second, it points out that there are at present no on-going negotiations about nuclear disarmament at all. Third, it suggests a set of objectives for the non-nuclear-weapon states. Fourth, there is a short note on tactics.

1.2. The central problem is clear. It is not with the non-nuclear-weapon states parties to the Treaty. Apart from the five declared nuclear weapon states and the three near-nuclear states not parties to the Treaty (India, Pakistan and Israel), virtually the whole of the rest of the world has declared its non-nuclear-weapon status. Many of these non-nuclear states also belong to nuclear-weapon-free zones. That is not where the problem lies.

1.3. The problem lies with the failure of the five nuclear weapon states to fulfil their obligations under the Treaty - a failure which has persisted now for nearly thirty years.

2. Nuclear weapons in perpetuity?

2.1. Current nuclear weapon programmes suggest that the nuclear weapon states propose to retain their nuclear weapon capability into the indefinite future. These are some examples:

2.1.a. In the US, there is a \$5.2 billion programme underway to extend the operational life of Minutemen III missiles and improve their capability up to the year 2020.

2.1.b. The US Stockpile and Stewardship Management Programme is a fifteen-year programme, priced at \$4 billion a year. This is bigger than the average expenditure for comparable warhead development and production

during the Cold War (\$3.7 billion in 1997 dollars). This programme includes a great deal of 'modernisation', in infringement of the spirit, if not the letter, of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

2.1.c. France is developing a new air-to-surface missile with a nuclear warhead which will only come into operation, at the earliest, in 2008.

2.1.d. Russia is developing a new variant of the SS-25 missile, called the Topol M, and also probably a new submarine-launched ballistic missile, a follow-on to the SS-N-20 called the SS-NX-26.

3. Nuclear Disarmament negotiations.

3.1 The START II Treaty was signed in January 1993. Since then, there have been no nuclear disarmament negotiations. START II is not yet in force: the Russian Duma, for various reasons, some good, some bad, has not ratified it. The impression is sometimes given that the Treaty would reduce the number of nuclear warheads on each side to 3,000 each. That is not correct. With 'hedges', reserves and tactical warheads the figure is more likely still to be at least 11,000 on each side, by the year 2007.

That is 500,000 Hiroshimas.

3.2. The impression is also sometimes given that there is some 'technological imperative' for this snail's progress to nuclear disarmament. That, too, is not correct. With relatively little expansion of existing facilities all the nuclear warheads on this planet could be dismantled in seven years.

3.3. No progress has been made on information exchange between the US and Russia, nor on any international supervision of the process of dismantlement.

3.4. The US and Russian position appears to be that for at least a further decade nuclear disarmament is entirely a bilateral affair. Together with France and Britain (but not China) they think non-nuclear-weapon-states should not be allowed any say in the matter.

3.5. The nuclear weapon states (except China) have doctrines of sub-strategic use which clearly imply possible use against non-nuclear-weapon states parties to the NPT. This means that the security assurances which they have given are not worth the paper they are written on.

4. Objectives for non-nuclear states at the PrepCom

4.1. To get the nuclear weapon powers to make an unambiguous 'statement of intent' to get rid of all their nuclear weapons, with no link to General and Complete Disarmament (GCD).

4.2. To get them to agree explicitly that they will not develop any new warheads or new missiles.

4.3. To get the USA and Russia to leapfrog START II and begin START III negotiations, with a 1,000 total warhead limit for all warheads, including hedges, reserves and tacticals, and with a target date of June 1999 for completing negotiations. (START II was underway before START I was ratified.)

4.4. To get the nuclear weapon states to agree that the first steps should now be taken towards multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. A large majority of states voted for this in the General Assembly.

4.5. To get the nuclear weapon states to agree a No First Use Treaty, which would therefore genuinely guarantee that any non-nuclear-weapon state was safe from a nuclear attack by a nuclear weapon state.

4.6. To get the nuclear weapon states to take some substantial measures of de-alerting.

5. Tactics

5.1. At the 1997 PrepCom, the non-nuclear-weapon states were described, perhaps not unfairly, as being "docile and disorganised". One main objective should be to find as much common ground as possible between all the non-nuclear-weapon states, including those normally described as "Western". For example, all those states, except Turkey, voted in favour of the International Court of Justice's advisory opinion on nuclear disarmament negotiations - an opinion which omits any reference to GCD, and which says "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament..."

5.2. At some point the non-nuclear-weapon states should possibly be prepared to indicate that they cannot continue indefinitely as parties to such an unequal Treaty.

April 9, 1998

Dear Abolitionists:

I would like to share with you a statement "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition", signed by Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, and Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches. It is addressed to the delegates of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee and urges them to take decisive action at their forthcoming meeting in Geneva. We have sent this statement to the foreign ministries of the NPT signatory states and have asked them to consider Cardinal Danneels' and Dr. Raiser's ideas when they instruct their delegation to the NPT Preparatory Committee. Perhaps you likewise could contact your foreign minister and give your endorsement to the proposals contained in the statement. You could emphasize, as the statement does, that loyalty to humankind is greater than loyalty to political blocs. Therefore, delegates should take responsibility as stewards of God's Earth and not be wholly subservient to the nuclear weapons states and their reluctance to give up their nuclear weapons.

On the first evening of the Preparatory Committee session the Religious Working Group on Nuclear Abolition is sponsoring a reception for the delegates. Cardinal Danneels and Dr. Raiser will make welcoming remarks and encourage the delegates to make notable achievements during the two-week session. Ambassador Eugeniusz Wyzner, chair of the Preparatory Committee, has agreed to respond to their welcome. In this manner we hope to lift the moral issue before the delegates on the opening day and to challenge them take advantage of their gathering to make significant progress in the quest for nuclear abolition.

Shalom,
Howard W. Hallman, Co-Convener
Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition

###

ACT NOW FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION

A Statement Addressed to the
Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee

The time has come to rid planet Earth of nuclear weapons -- all of them, everywhere. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee has a remarkable opportunity at its upcoming meeting to set the course resolutely for the achievement of this goal.

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. This was quite apparent in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The same result would probably occur in any further use, and indeed would be worse because of the increased destructive power of modern nuclear weapons.

When used as an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt. It loses sight of the inviolable connection between means and end by failing to recognize that just ends cannot be achieved through wrongful means.

During the past 50 years the production and testing of nuclear weapons has proven grievously harmful to individuals and the environment in the vicinity of mining operations, processing plants, production facilities, and test sites. Numerous locales are burdened with lingering radioactivity and deadly waste products that will take decades to clean up. Some sites may never be restored to safe occupancy.

Psalm 24 teaches, "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and those who dwell therein." The First Book of Moses, also known as Genesis, indicates that God made Earth available to humankind to till and keep, that is, to use for mutual benefit and to preserve. Because production and use of nuclear weapons causes grave harm to

Earth and its inhabitants, we as good stewards of God's Earth have an obligation to rid the world of this perilous threat.

Numerous religious bodies have condemned nuclear weapons and have called for their abolition. Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemn as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See before the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 15, 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino stated: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....This is a moral challenge, a legal challenge and a political challenge. That multiple-based challenge must be met by the application of our humanity."

In principle the nations of Earth agree on the need to eliminate nuclear weapons. Indeed, they have made a strong commitment in Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) "to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." After reviewing this article at the request of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice unanimously agreed 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."

Now is the time to take this obligation seriously. We call upon the members of the NPT Preparatory Committee to make the 1998 session a notable landmark in the journey toward the abolition of all nuclear weapons.

First, we ask the delegates to call resolutely upon the nuclear weapon states to embark upon a series of steps along the road leading to nuclear abolition. There is broad consensus among study commissions, retired generals and admirals, scientists, and other civilian experts on what these steps should be. They include:

- Declare a policy of no first use amongst themselves and non-use in relation to non-nuclear weapon states.
- Cease all research, development, production, and deployment of new nuclear weapons.
- Refrain from modernizing the existing nuclear arsenal and increasing the number of deployed nuclear weapons.
- Take all nuclear forces off alert and remove warheads from delivery vehicles.
- Achieve faster and deeper bilateral reduction of nuclear weapons by the United States and Russia.

It would be appropriate for the NPT Preparatory Committee to require the nuclear weapon states to provide annual progress reports on how they are carrying out such measures.

Second, we ask the delegates to take the lead in commencing the process of developing a nuclear weapons convention to outlaw and abolish all nuclear weapons. One appropriate method would be to establish a working group of the NPT Preparatory Committee for this purpose. Although the nuclear weapons states should be part of this process, other nations need not wait until they are willing to become engaged. Rather as stewards of God's Earth, non-nuclear weapon states can begin the task of developing a nuclear weapons convention that specifies a fair and effective program to abolish all nuclear weapons.

We appeal to delegates to the NPT Preparatory Committee to consider what is best for the whole Earth and its inhabitants when they vote on issues of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. Loyalty to all humankind exceeds that of loyalty within political blocs of nations. We urge delegates to act now decisively and courageously for the benefit of all the peoples of Earth.

Godfried Cardinal Danneels, President Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, General Secretary
Pax Christi International World Council of Churches

March 1998

Dear Arjun,

Thank you so much for posting your draft. I love your idea for a Global Truth Commission. As I recall, at the Geneva NGO planning meeting after much discussion about what issues should be covered, we deliberately included the nuclear fuel cycle for this particular presentation in order to include nuclear power which is promoted in Article IV of the NPT, so I hope you can write about the health and environmental effects from those activities as well, without stressing only weapons production. Also, I think it might be good to include that they are still opening up new uranium mines in Australia, and I believe in the US as well, even though we have no satisfactory solution to the waste problem. Many thanks. Alice Slater

At 05:48 PM 4/8/98 -0700, Arjun Makhijani wrote:

>Draft statement on the health and environmental effects of nuclear weapons
>production/ Arjun Makhijani/ 8 April 1998

>
>Note to convenors and other reviewers. In drafting this, I have omitted the
>term "nuclear fuel cycle" since this applies to nuclear power and not
>strictly to nuclear weapons production and testing, which is by its nature a
>one-time use. Of course, there is now the problem of what to do with
>surplus fissile materials, which is potentially a fuel cycle type of issue.
>I do not know whether I was to cover this topic, or whether Martin
>Kalinowski's section on the FMCT is sufficient. I am leaving them out for
>now, but could add some paragraphs, if it were deemed desirable by the other
>convenors.

>
>Please also note that I will provide references in the next draft. I wanted
>to get this draft to you as soon as possible.

>
>Draft Text:

>
>Nuclear weapons production and testing has involved extensive health and
>environmental damage not only in the weapons states, but throughout the
>world. One of the most remarkable features of this damage has been the
>readiness of governments to harm the very people that they claimed they were
>protecting by building these weapons for national security reasons. In
>general, this harm was inflicted on people in disregard of democratic norms,
>even in those countries where such norms are codified in constitutions and
>laws. Secrecy, fabrication of data, cover-ups in the face of attempted
>public inquiry, and even human experiments without informed consent have all
>been features of nuclear weapons production and testing programs.

>
>The most extensive damage, in terms of the populations affected has been
>from the atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons, which began in 1945, with a
>US test, and ended in 1980 with a Chinese test. For instance, children who
>drank milk were specially exposed to high radiation doses in the immediate
>aftermath of such testing due to the deposition of iodine-131, a highly
>radioactive short-lived fission product that concentrates in milk and then
>in the thyroid gland. The US National Cancer Institute estimates that
>between 10,000 and 75,000 additional cases of thyroid cancer will occur due
>to US atmospheric testing at the Nevada Test Site alone.

>
>The damage from atmospheric tests also extended to other parts of the world.

>This was clearly understood at the time, as the following excerpt from a
>1960 editorial in the alumni magazine of the University of California (which
>was and continues to be the main US contractor for nuclear weapons physics
>and design) Engineering school shows:

>
>"The increase in radiation one receives from fallout is about equal to the
>increase one receives from cosmic rays when moving from sea level to the top
>of a hill several hundred feet high. . . . It means, though, your babies'
>chances of having a major birth defect are increased by one part in 5,000
>approximately. Percentage wise, this is insignificant. When applied to the
>population of the world, it means that nuclear testing so far has produced
>about an additional 6,000 babies born with major birth defects. [emphasis
>added]

>
>"Whether you choose to look at "one part in 5,000" or "6,000 babies," you
>must weigh this acknowledged risk with the demonstrated need of the United
>States for a nuclear arsenal. "

>
>In addition there was damage from US testing in the Pacific area, as well as
>from Soviet, British, French an Chinese testing.

>
>Iodine-131 was only one of the radionuclides involved. Among the
>long-lived radionuclides that have produced and will continue to produce
>increased cancers risk for decades and centuries to come are: carbon-14,
>cesium-137, zirconium-95, strontium-90, ruthenium-106, tritium, and
>plutonium-239. Some of these substances, notably carbon-14 and tritium,
>cross the placenta, become organically bound in developing cells and hence
>endanger fetuses.

>
>It is estimated that between 100,000 and almost half a million premature
>cancer deaths will have resulted from all atmospheric weapons testing by the
>end of the next century worldwide. About four times as many premature
>deaths are estimated to occur if all radiation doses from carbon-14, which
>has a half-life of 5,730 years, and other very long-lived radionuclides are
>taken into account.

>
>Nuclear weapons states have also inflicted harm on non-nuclear states though
>uranium mining and milling. Both worker and population exposures are
>involved. The environmental damage was in the form of air pollution and
>water pollution with uranium, radium-226, thorium-230, and radon gas (via
>its radioactive decay products). There is also contamination by
>non-radioactive toxic materials such as arsenic and molybdenum. Uranium
>mill wastes, known as tailings, will continue to pose health and
>environmental risks for thousands of years. Throughout the world, the lands
>and lives of indigenous people have been the most severely affected by both
>nuclear weapons testing and by uranium mining and milling.

>
>Nuclear weapons states obtained uranium from many countries, including
>Canada, Congo, East Germany, Namibia (in violation of UN resolutions),
>Niger, and Australia. The most severe effects on workers from nuclear
>weapons production were due to uranium mining. In reviewing data from the
>United States and the former Soviet Union, some researchers have concluded
>that radiation dose and/or health data were poorly kept. As a result many
>epidemiological investigations have yielded questionable results, at best.

>For instance, until 1989, radiation doses records of nuclear weapons workers
>in the United States did not include information due to internally deposited
>radioactive materials. These data were kept separately and not provided to
>workers even when they asked for their radiation records. One
>investigation, revealed that despite official denial, a majority of workers
>at a uranium processing plant were overexposed during the 1950s and early
>1960s. At least two million workers, and probably far more, were involved
>in nuclear weapons and related production., Besides radioactive materials,
>many other toxic materials such as carbon tetrachloride and other organic
>solvents, chromium and other heavy metals, hydrofluoric acid and fluorine
>gas, were involved. At least two million workers were affected throughout
>the world, probably many more.

>
>Armed forces personnel were also subjected to severe risks. They assisted
>in nuclear weapons testing and in exercises simulating nuclear war
>conditions. When they became ill, their governments all too often turned
>their backs on them. And human experiments were conducted without informed
>consent.

>
>Most is known about the damage inflicted by US nuclear weapons production and
>testing, because the United States has been the most open of the nuclear
>weapons states. The most dramatic single breakthrough for democratic
>practice came on December 6, 1993, due to a great act of statesmanship and
>courtesy by then-US Secretary of Energy, Hazel O'Leary. In a press
>conference she announced that the United States government had done
>radiation experiments on its own citizens, some without informed consent. A
>presidential commission subsequently made more details known to the public.
>Documents on the health and environmental effects of nuclear weapons
>production, many of them amounting to a sort of electronic truth commission,
>have been posted on the Internet. For instance, researchers have been able
>to establish that the United States coordinated its atmospheric testing
>program with Kodak and other makers of photographic film, so as to protect
>the film from the effects of fallout. But they did not inform the producers
>or consumers of milk that it would be contaminated with iodine-131,
>increasing the risk of cancer and possibly other diseases of the thyroid and
>those caused by thyroid hormonal deficiency.

>
>The environmental damage has also been severe and will continue for
>centuries. Highly radioactive wastes are stored in tanks at many sites.
>Many are at some risk of fires and explosions. One such explosion actually
>occurred in the Soviet Union on September 29, 1957. Over 10,000 people were
>evacuated from their homes over a period of two years, but they were not
>told why. The Soviet government only acknowledged the problem in 1989.
>Even the CIA, which knew of the accident as early as 1959, did not make it
>public, presumably out of fear of arousing public questions about US waste
>management practices.

>
>The British government provided false reassurances to the public from an
>October 1957 reactor fire at Sellafield (then called Windscale). The French
>and Chinese governments are the most secretive of the declared nuclear
>weapons states. The undeclared and threshold states, such as Israel, India,
>and Pakistan are the most secretive of all.

>
>Recommendations

>
>While no amount of democratic practice can compensate for the harm already
>inflicted on people, the NPT Review conference should recommend that a
>Global Truth Commission on the Health and Environmental Effects of Nuclear
>Weapons Production and Testing be created. Such a commission could be
>established in various ways. For instance, it could be an ad hoc commission
>of the UN General Assembly, or it could be under the joint auspices of the
>World Health Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme.
>Some work has already been done on these issues by UN agencies. Indeed, the
>NPT review conference mechanism might itself be a vehicle for establishing
>such a commission.

>
>It is a lamentable commentary on the state of the world that more than half
>a century after the start of the nuclear arms race, nuclear weapons states
>have still not systematically acknowledged to the world's people the harm
>they have inflicted on them. The appointment of a Truth Commission will not
>only be salutary for global democracy and accountability on the part of the
>world's most powerful countries, it could also be a powerful force for
>nuclear disarmament. It is not widely realized that most nuclear weapons
>plants in the United States were shut in the late 1980s and early 1990s as a
>result of health and environmental concerns, and not due to any treaty. The
>key was increasing knowledge and action by the people of the United States,
>most notably the people living in the shadows of these plants, of the
>immense harm inflicted on them without their informed consent under cover of
>national security.

>
>Ideally, the work of the Global Truth Commission on the Health and
>Environmental Effects of Nuclear Weapons Production and Testing should be
>funded by the declared nuclear weapons states, which also happen to be the
>permanent members of the Security Council. But they may not do it. It will
>be fitting if it were funded from voluntary contributions of member states
>and of philanthropists.

>
>The NPT Review Conference should urge the nuclear weapons states to turn
>over to the Commission copies of documents relating to health and
>environment. But much of the work of the commission, such as taking
>testimony from affected populations, can begin even without such documentation.

>
>At least one publicly accessible repository for documents should be
>established in a non-nuclear weapons state on every continent for all
>official public documents relevant to the matter, except Antarctica. There
>should also be one repository in every nuclear weapons state. The documents
>should also be made available on the Internet, so far as possible. The
>undeclared nuclear weapons states should be encouraged to join the process.
>Israel, India and Pakistan are not signatories to the NPT, but cooperation
>in the work of the Commission should not require accession to the NPT.

>
>As the work of the commission reveals health needs, mechanisms to assist the
>affected populations should be created. The public in both the nuclear
>weapons states and non-nuclear weapons states should be invited to
>participate in the work of the commission by providing materials, documents,
>testimony, and expertise. The mothers of the world are, after all, often
>its first epidemiologists. Finally, it is imperative that the greatly
>disproportionate harm done by nuclear weapons testing and by uranium mining

>and milling to indigenous peoples be addressed by the work of the Truth
>Commission.
>
>We also recommend that this PrepComm put on the agenda a call for
>environmental damage caused by nuclear weapons states in non-nuclear weapons
>countries to be repaired, to the extent possible. There is some precedent
>for this. For instance, Britain has undertaken to compensate Australia for
>the costs of some of the damage caused by its nuclear weapons tests.
>Likewise, the United States has provided some compensation to many of the
>victims of nuclear weapons testing in the Marshall Islands, as well as some
>environmental restoration.
>
>The worldwide public awareness of the profound damage to future generations
>that has already been done due to past nuclear weapons production and
>testing could increase the political and moral pressure towards disarmament
>from large numbers of people. Today, nuclear disarmament and
>non-proliferation seem like esoteric subjects fit for technocrats and
>diplomats. But that view of the matter disregards the silent damage that is
>daily being inflicted upon the Earth and its children. It is time to
>change that. It would be fitting if this conference, charged with setting
>the agenda for non-proliferation and disarmament, seizes the moment to do it.
>Arjun Makhijani
>President, Institute for Energy and Environmental Research
>6935 Laurel Ave.,
>Takoma Park, Maryland 20912, U.S.A.
>Phone 301-270-5500
>Fax: 301-270-3029
>e-mail: arjun@ieer.org
>web page: <http://www.ieer.org>

>
>
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

Dear Friends,

The Transition Team of the Abolition 2000 Network asked that I post the invitation below which was mailed to many of you as well as our updated schedule of events at the PrepCom. We hope you will be able to join us in Geneva. If not, we urge you to lobby your governments at home using the suggestions in the NPT Action Alert which were posted to you on March 27th. Thank you to those who responded to the Action Alert and for any help you can give to our Network in contacting your governments before the PrepCom to help move our abolition agenda forward. Peace, Alice Slater

ABOLITION 2000

A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons
Working Group for the NPT Prep Comm

SCHEDULE OF 1998 NPT PREP COMM EVENTS

DAILY throughout the Prep Comm:
8-9am Abolition 2000 Daily Caucus.

9-10am NGO Disarmament Committee daily briefings.

Sunday, April 26

Time TBA: NGO Disarmament Committee Orientation for all NGO's present.

Monday, April 27

Morning: 1998 NPT Prep Comm opens.

Morning/Afternoon: Abolition 2000 Public action/demonstration on the Place de Nations.

11:00 am: NGO Orientation for groups not present on Sunday

1-3pm Vijali Hamilton - artist presents her work for World Peace.

6:00 PM (Following NPT Session) Presentation to Ambassador Eugeniusz Wyzner of over 13 million signatures calling for nuclear abolition by the Abolition 2000 Network(E Bldg., Outside conference room XX, 3rd floor)

6:30-8:30pm: Reception and Meeting, Religious Working Group of Abolition 2000, including leaders of various faith communities. Ecumenical Centre.

Tuesday, April 28

3-6pm: NGO presentations at the NPT Prep Comm.

6:30pm: Abolition 2000 with INES/INESAP/IALANA/IPB/LCNP: Towards a Nuclear Weapons Free World: Joseph Rotblat, David Krieger, Doug Roche, Mioko Matsubara

Wednesday, April 29

2-3pm: Briefing: Cut-off for nuclear weapons-usable Materials. Martin Kalinowski, Wolfgang Liebert.

5-7pm: Abolition 2000 Working Group: Beyond the CTB with Western States Legal Foundation: Laboratory Testing and Article VI Obligation for Disarmament: Jacqueline Cabasso, Vladamir Iakmets, Lysianne Alezard, Ted Taylor, Andrew Lichterman, Andre Gsponer, Greg Mello.

Thursday, April 30

1-2pm: Briefing: Multilateralizing the Nuclear Disarmament Process with Owen Green.

2-4pm INESAP/IALANA -The Nuclear Weapons Convention: Political Strategies and Verification: Alyn Ware, Marav Datan, Martin Kalinowski, Wolfgang Liebert, Juergen Scheffran.

Friday, May 1

1-2pm: INESAP - Weapons of Mass Destruction Free Zone in the Middle East: Ayman Kalil, Praful Bidwai

2-10: Abolition 2000 annual meeting (part 1).

Saturday, May 2

9-12pm Abolition 2000 annual meeting (part 2).

2-6pm Middle Power Initiative for Nuclear Abolition - Consultation Session, MPI Steering Committee

Monday, May 4

1-3pm Abolition 2000 Working Group on Health Effects of Radiation with The Atomic Mirror, Hiti Tau and WEDO. The Toxic Legacy of the Nuclear Age: Pamela Meidell, Pamela Ransom, Janine Allis-Smith and Gabriel Tetiarahi, Jacques Mongnet, Alla Yaroshinskaya (invited)

5-7pm: IPB with Abolition 2000: NATO Expansion. Cora Weiss, Moderator, Ben Cramer, Rae Street, Bahig Nasser

Tuesday, May 5

8:45am Ambassador Jayantha Dhanapala, Undersecretary General of the Dept. of Disarmament Affairs to address NGOs

1-3pm Abolition 2000 with: International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms. Nuclear Strategies and the ICJ Opinion: John Burroughs, Alyn Ware, Hans Christensen, George Abi Saab, Merav Datan and Peter Weiss

5-7pm: Abolition 2000 Working Group on Sustainable Energy with: Plutonium Free Future and GRACE: Nuclear Energy and Environmentally Sustainable Alternatives. Claire Greensfelder, Alice Slater, Ted Taylor.

Wednesday, May 6th:

5-7pm: Abolition 2000 with: Women for a Free and Independent Pacific:
Nuclear Waste, Colonialism and Environmental Racism. Myrla Baldonado,
Gabriel Tetiarahi, Rachel Julian, Michael Simmons.

May 6 or 7th: IPB to host meeting of landmines and nuclear disarmament
activists on sharing of strategies and lessons to be learned from Ottawa process

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

FW: BOUNCE abolition-caucus@igc.org: Non-member submission from [Ian Prior <prior@netlink.co.nz>]

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

Date: Fri, 10 Apr 1998 10:53:17 +1200
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
From: Ian Prior <prior@netlink.co.nz>
Subject: Abolition 2000 NZ letter sent to all Embassies and High Commissions
in Wellington and those based in Canberra re NPT PrepCom 1998 and desirable outcomes.

To all those linked on the Abolition Caucus.

Alice Slater suggested that we mail this letter re the NPT PrepCom to those on the caucus link up.

We are in the process of finding out where the NZ Government will stand on some of the issues. Certainly they support the move to set up an intersessional committee at the 1997 Prep Com and we certainly hope they will do the same at this meeting. I hope we will be able to report that New Zealand takes a strong position on the important issues coming up. Our New Zealand Abolition 2000, our IPPNW affiliate and our IPPNW Education and research Trust believe it would be an excellent move if a copy of the February 2/9 Special Issue of THE NATION The Gift of Time The Case for Abolishing Nuclear Weapons by Jonathan Schell

Which includes conversations with a number of the key Abolitionists could be delivered to the leaders of all the delegations participating at the NPT PrepCom April 26-May 9th. Our New Zealand Groups set out above will be very glad to meet the costs involved. I hope some one in the Abolition 2000 organising team will take this up and implement the idea.

Best wishes to all those involved in the coming NPT PrepCom. It will be important to make sure that some national delegates who believe in the importance of the NPT ask how the recent Presidential Decision Directive which indicates that they will continue to rely for the indefinite future on nuclear weapons for national security of the US fits in with their acceptance of the NPT and Article VI.

Perhaps the public release of the document and debate about its direction both in the United States and in the wider world will encourage some rethinking about whether it will not set back the whole process of nuclear disarmament and encourage proliferation.

There is a New Zealand Maori expression that is rather apt as to where we are KIA KAHA KANUI TE MAHI BE STRONG THERE HARD WORK TO BE DONE

. Ian Prior

Date: Tue, 7 Apr 1998 13:15:50 -0700 (PDT)
X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org (Unverified)
Mime-Version: 1.0
To: Ian Prior <prior@netlink.co.nz>
From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Progress in NZ re NPT
Cc: lcnp@aol.com

Dear Ian,

Wonderful to hear from you. Hope you are on healing swiftly. Thanks for following through on our action suggestions. That's great about suggesting Alyn for the New Zealand delegation at the NPT, but I'm afraid Alyn may not be able to go because of visa difficulties. Perhaps this changes the picture. Would you be willing to post your letter to the embassies to the Abolition Caucus? It may inspire others to take similar actions. Warmest regards, Alice

At 03:47 PM 4/6/98 +1200, Ian Prior wrote:

>Dear Alice

> A long overdue response from me after getting your well thought out

>reminders for some action from this part of the world

>On Feb 22nd and 23rd our IPPNW and Abolition 2000 group had an excellent review

>meeting where we had contributions from Alyn Ware, Kate Dewes and Rob

>Green and Harold Evans and others.

>I rather sadly had to miss it as on 21 Feb I was having a chasing game with

>our granddaughter, Mereana and accelerated and then slipped and came an

>awful thump on my left side and hip and fractured the neck of my left

>femur..

>So to Hospital and it was pinned and plated by an expert team and it is now

>slowly healing, I'm doing well with elbow crutches but still largely house

>bound.

>

>Our trip to Geneva has had to be put off. We are putting Alyn Ware's name

>to

>our Minister of Foreign Affairs to see if they will accept an NGO person

>on

>the NZ delegation.

>

>Taking up your suggestions we have worked up a letter regarding the NPT

>and the important areas to struggle for progress that has been sent to

>the

>Ambassadors and High Commissioners of all the countries with their

>Embassies and High Commissions based here in Wellington and sent it also

>to those resident in Canberra but responsible for New Zealand. We hope they

>will send it to their Ministries.

>We will recruit Rob Green to send us back comments from the NPT and hope

>that Rebecca Johnson will again provide the magnificent progress reports

>in

>the way she did in 1977.

>With best wishes for some real progress at the NPT. I have had a few

>problems recently but hope that they are behind me.

>We are having a visit from two Hiti Tau representatives from April 18 to 2nd

>May organised by GreenPeace which should be productive.

>

> Yours sincerely

> Ian Prior

>

>

>Letter sent to all Embassies and High Commissions in Wellington and also

>to those who are resident at Canberra but represent their countries from

>there.

>
> 30-3-98 Non Proliferation Treaty Prep Com Meeting
> Geneva
> April 26 -May 9 1998

>His Excellency
>Ambassador
>Insert name etc

>
>Your Excellency
> You will be aware that the Non Proliferation Treaty Prep
>Com meeting is to be held in Geneva from April 25th to May 9th 1998. This
>is clearly going to be an important meeting .
>It should provide an opportunity to make further progress towards nuclear
>disarmament if some important areas can be put forward and debated at
>this
>meeting in preparation for the five yearly NPT Review and extension
>Conference in 2000.
>We have no doubt that your Government will be represented at the meeting
>and ask if you would consider forwarding this letter to your Ministry of
>ForeignAffairs setting out some of the areas in which Abolition 2000 is
>seeking to help encourage progress.

>
>We are writing on behalf of a number of different organisations in New
>Zealand that have now come together as part of the International Global
>Network,Abolition 2000 .
>There are now more than 1000 NGO's working together towards the goal of
>the
>Elimination of Nuclear Weapons and a number will be in Geneva at the 1998
>Annual Meeting at the time of the 1998 NPT Prep Com meeting.
>
>AmbassadorEugeniuszWyzner,Polish Ambassador to the UN and Chair of the
>1998
>NPT PrepCom has confirmed that a decision has been made to reserve
>three hours early in the session for eleven NGO presentations to be made
>to the country representatives.
>NGO,s are also being given the opportunity to lodge short papers of 2
>pages that the secretariat would undertake to circulate them to country
>representatives.

>
>The development of the Non Proliferation Treaty must be recognised as one
>of the most important treaties concerned with disarmament and in 1970 many
>countries entered into a compact.
>The Non nuclear weapon states agreed not to develop nuclear weapons while
>Nuclear Weapon States for their part agreed to negotiate in good faith on
>bringing the arms race to an end at an early date and on nuclear
>disarmament. The NPT provided that the parties would review their promises
>in 1995 at an NPT Review and Extension Conference.

>
>You will be aware that at this 1995 conference tremendous pressure was
>applied by the nuclear weapon states to extend the NPT indefinitely and
>unconditionally.A move many felt was planned to legitimise their
>possession
>of nuclear weapons.

>The Final Document called for "strengthening the review process "by
>continuing to hold Review Conferences every five years beginning in 2000,
>with Prep Coms every year beginning in 1997,with a possible PrepCom in
>2000 before the Review at the millenium. The document also called for the
>completion of the Comprehensive Test Ban no later than 1996. This goal was
>achieved.

>The Final document listed two other requirements of the nuclear weapon
>states to demonstrate their compliance with the NPT Article VI
>requirement"to pursue in good faith negotiations on effective measures
>relating to nuclear disarmament ."

>The document called for "the immediate commencement and early conclusion
>of negotiations on a convention banning the production of fissile
material
>for nuclear weapons "and the "determined pursuit by the Nuclear Weapons
>States of systemic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons
>...with the ultimate goals of eliminating those weapons.

>

>The 1997 NPT Prep Com covered and debated a large number of areas
including
>,Security, Nuclear Free zones and Nuclear Disarmament including the
>suggestion of setting up a Committee of the Conference on Disarmament to
>work at nuclear disarmament and also a proposal for an intersessional NPT
>working group to prepare for negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention.
>No consensus was reached on these and other key issues and they will be
>coming up at the 1998 NPT Prepcom meeting.

>

>The meeting concluded that the Nuclear Weapon States had made little or no
>progress to meet the goals they had agreed to under Article VI. They also
>choose to ignore the findings of the International Court of Justice.

>

>The 1998 NPT Prep Com meeting in Geneva must be used by governments of the
>nonnuclear states who have some committment to the goal of elimination of
>nuclear weapons as part of the determined pursuit towards that goal .

>

>Have the Nuclear weapon states any real committment to Article VI?
>It is clear that the nuclear weapon states will again resist any major
>steps that could lead towards nuclear disarmament unless there is a build
>up of political will and determination in their own countries
>This could be helped if the Non Nuclear States can make real progress at
>the PrepCom on the issues set out below in preparation for the 1999NPTPrep
>Com and the NPT 2000 Review Conference when more substantive changes
should
>have to be accepted by the NWS . But will they accept any challenge to
>their possession of nuclear weapons?

>

>Priority Areas for Non Nuclear Weapon States representatives to work for
>at the 1998 NPT along with other like minded countries.

>

>1.0 the establishment of an intersessional NPT working group to assist in
>the commencement of negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention using
the
>model convention for talking points (now an official UN
document,A/C.1.52/7

>

>2.0 implementing the Canberra Commission recommendations for immediate action:

>2.1 taking nuclear forces off alert

>2.2 removal of warheads from delivery vehicles

>2.3 ending deployment of non-strategic nuclear weapons

>2.4 ending nuclear testing (subcritical testing)

>2.5 initiating negotiations to further reduce US and Russian nuclear arsenals

>2.6 agreement amongst the nuclear weapon states of reciprocal no first use

> undertakings by them in relation to the non-nuclear weapon states

>

>3.0 establishing a register of weapons usable radioactive materials

>

>4.0 commitments not to modernise or design nuclear weapons (in labs or sub-critically)

>

>5.0 Require the Nuclear Weapon States to make public and transparent their policies relating to the deployment, threat or use of nuclear weapons.

>

>6.0 Require reporting requirements by the nuclear weapons states on progress on the above

>

>7.0 supporting an Abolition 2000 delegation with observer status at the 1999 Prep Com. similar to the status given the International Campaign to Ban

>Landmines.

>

>Priorities for 1998 we put forward

>

>1.0 Establishing an NPT intersessional committee to prepare for negotiations on a Nuclear Weapons Convention for the elimination of nuclear

>weapons using the Model Convention (now an official UN document >,A/C.1..52/7)

> The proposal for the intersessional committee was supported by the New Zealand delegation at the 1997 NPT Prep Com.

>2.0 Taking all nuclear weapons off alert status. This could be done quite quickly according to General Lee Butler (2nd Erich Geiringer Oration >Wellington Nov 1997)

>

> We recognise that there have been some important developments over recent years that can give some encouragement to those working to get rid of nuclear weapons. These include the decision of the International Court of Justice, the passing of the Comprehensive Test Ban and the very strong statements calling for abolition of nuclear weapons from many people including General Lee Butler, the Generals and Admirals and the National Leaders.

>The less encouraging developments include the Strategic Stratified maintenance programme, not only for testing existing weapons but also for producing new weapons.

>The New Presidential Decision Directive is frightening in its extension of the proposed use of nuclear weapons as "a cornerstone of US national security for the indefinite future". This sets out how how Nuclear weapons

>can be used against non nuclear states with chemical or biological weapons.
>These and other developments reinforce the need for the NPT to be fully developed as an effective part of the nuclear disarmament world programme,
>
>We would be happy to deal with any queries you may have about Abolition2000
>and the on going programmes being developed.
>
>Yours Sincerely
>
>Ian Prior ONZM.MD.FRACP.FRCP.FRS.NZ.DSc(Hon)
>IPPNW NZ . Abolition 2000. CoConvener.
>
>The Very Rev. John Murray MA(NZand Cambridge) Former Moderator Presbyterian
>Church of New Zealand , National CoConvener World CourtProject and
>Abolition 2000
>
>Dame Laurie Salas. DBE.QSO.B.A.
>United Nations Association of NZ. World Federation of UN. WILPF.
>NZInstitute of International Affairs. NZ Federation of University Women.
>Nat. Committee Council Security Asian Pacific

>
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

An interesting statement has been made by Canadian Church leaders consulting with Government. It is readable in this website - see New | Alleluia or A2000.

Ross Wilcock
rwilcock@web.net
<http://www.pgs.ca/>

At 05:19 PM 4/

9/98 -0700, you wrote:

>Dear Friends,

>The Transition Team of the Abolition 2000 Network asked that I post the
>invitation below which was mailed to many of you as well as our updated
>schedule of events at the PrepCom.....

Dear Alice:

The reception sponsored by religious leaders on Monday, April 27 from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. will take place at the Palais de Nations, 8th Floor Restaurant, not the Ecumenical Center. Thanks for keeping us informed on the schedule.

Shalom,
Howard

So encouraging to hear from Betsy and Sue. Enjoyed reading Lisa's poem. She is not on my E-mail list of class members. Am I missing something? Carlee.

SENSIVIERIA
(Snakeplant)

My grandma had a plant
a sword-shaped thing of leaves,
stripey, and yellow edged,
set in the shadowed hall.

She held my hand to see,
"It's called, snakeplant," she said.
I half-thought it might strike,
and ran if I went past.

Through the years she watered,
And often would exclaim,
"Just look at this fine plant,
How thick and green it grows."

I didn't like it then.
I do not like them now.
But when Grandpa died, with
a week to divide the

treasures, to live with Aunt,
she cast about for one
to take her precious plant,
I wish I'd volunteered.

Dear Felicity:

Thanks for sharing the correspondence with Daryl. I think that leaving names off statements to be made to the delegates is a good idea. We should include some kind of standard disclaimer in every statement, or in the introductory one only but applying clearly to all statements. Something along the following lines: NGOs have varying viewpoints; the preparation of the statements has been a collaborative process involving many but not all NGOs. Any particular point in a statement may or may not reflect the views of a particular NGO that participated in the process.

This would make things easier all the way around.

Arjun
Arjun Makhijani
President, Institute for Energy and Environmental Research
6935 Laurel Ave.,
Takoma Park, Maryland 20912, U.S.A.
Phone 301-270-5500
Fax: 301-270-3029
e-mail: arjun@ieer.org
web page: <http://www.ieer.org>

Dear Friends,

This is a rather long article from the US publication, The Nation, but I found it very inspiring for the work we are now engaged in with our Abolition Network and it may have ideas to think about on a strategy to get our treaty by the year 2000. Regards, Alice Slater

NEW MINEFIELDS FOR N.G.O.'S
The Nation Magazine, 4-13-98, p. 22-23

It was a delicious moment of triumph. Pictured on the front page of The New York Times was Jody Williams, emerging barefoot from her rural Vermont house after having been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for coordinating the International Campaign to Ban Landmines. A five-year effort had achieved far more than anyone would have believed possible. The image of Jody perched before her computer, e-mailing activists around the world, was held up as a new paradigm of global advocacy, a "people's power" that could outflank even the implacable Pentagon.

But as Jody would be the first to say, it was not that simple. The influence of e-mail depended on the expertise, credibility, media savvy and political alliances carefully built by a handful of non-governmental organizations in the United States, Europe and the developing world. The true new paradigm places N.G.O.s at center stage as a significant force in global politics, enabling ordinary people to pool resources, acquire specialized knowledge and make themselves heard. With the landmines victory behind them, NGOs are set to move on to other projects such as banning the use of child soldiers and establishing a new global court to prosecute genocidal killers and the most culpable war criminals.

The landmines campaign, which shared the Nobel Prize with Williams, can be seen as a model of what is to come. It originated in the work of six N.G.O.s. Human Rights Watch in New York and Physicians for Human Rights in Boston, as part of their monitoring of war-torn countries, encountered the devastation caused by these indiscriminate weapons and reported on the 26,000 innocent civilians killed or maimed each year in places like Angola, Bosnia, Cambodia and Mozambique. The Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation in Washington, Handicap International of France, the Mines Advisory Group of Britain and Medico International of Germany witnessed the plague of landmines in their humanitarian work. In 1992 these six groups launched a campaign to rid the world of this "weapon of mass destruction in slow motion." Over the next few years, they documented the appalling scope of the problem, encouraged the press to write about it, generated a surge of popular outrage and expanded the coalition to embrace more than 1,000 N.G.O.s in some sixty countries.

They also helped form an unprecedented coalition of small and medium-sized governments from the developed and developing world that were dedicated to an unconditional ban on antipersonnel landmines. Some, like Canada, Norway, and Austria, had a traditionally strong moral component to their foreign policy. Others, like Mozambique and South Africa, had seen their land blighted by landmines. What was notable was how few major powers were willing to end their use of these weapons.

The Clinton Administration, for example, sought various exceptions to a ban. Because traditionally the United States and a handful of other major powers call the shots when it comes to crafting international human rights law, Washington's objections would ordinarily have prevailed. But this time, with key backing from N.G.O.s the governments in the coalition developed the confidence to override the United States and put forward a treaty that 123 states have signed.

The United States and a few other major powers tend to dominate international negotiations partly through the sheer size and depth of the diplomatic force they can afford to deploy. N.G.O.s help to level the playing field by providing some of the expertise that smaller governments lack. They also offer assistance in enlisting the press and conducting certain informal diplomacy that is difficult for governments to undertake. In recognition of these important roles, governmental proponents of a landmines ban insisted that the N.G.O. campaign be granted access and the right to comment during final treaty negotiations, a first for any arms control or humanitarian law negotiation. N.G.O.s went on to change the terms of the debate:

' When the Pentagon claimed that landmines are necessary to save the lives of American soldiers, N.G.O.s issued a report showing that one third of U.S. casualties in the Vietnam War were caused by landmines.

' When the Pentagon sought to exempt antipersonnel landmines used in combination with antitank mines as "submunitions", N.G.O.s revealed that internally the Pentagon had already classified these weapons as antipersonnel mines.

' When the Pentagon claimed that landmines were necessary to defend South Korea, N.G.O.s lined up fourteen retired U.S. generals and an admiral to affirm the opposite.

' When the Clinton Administration sought to change the subject by pledging \$80 million in 1998 to remove mines already in place, N.G.O.s highlighted the inadequacy of the plan because, without a ban, landmines would continue to be produced for as little as \$3 each while landmine removal cost as much as \$1,000 each.

These arguments have yet to convince the U.S. government to support a landmines ban, but they provided ample reason for most of the rest of the world to leave Washington behind. N.G.O.s must still insure that pro-ban governments move from signing to ratifying the treaty, that recalcitrants like the United States are brought along and that all governments comply with the treaty's requirements. But already the focus has shifted forward, with N.G.O.s looking to build similar partnerships with small and medium-sized governments on other causes.

One promising candidate is the effort to establish an International Criminal Court for the world's most ruthless human rights criminals. The I.C.C. would be a genuinely international court, with its own judges, prosecutors and investigators, available to try those responsible for genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity whenever national judicial

systems fail. In 1993, when N.G.O.s put the issue on the agenda of the World Conference on Human Rights, the I.C.C. was only a dream. Now a treaty establishing the court is expected to be adopted in July. The issue today is no longer whether there will be an I.C.C. but whether it will have the strength and independence it needs to be effective.

As in the case of landmines, the U.S. government and several other major powers have sought to weaken the proposed I.C.C. Washington, in particular, is so preoccupied with precluding any possibility that a U.S. soldier will be brought before the court that it is willing to sacrifice an effective court in the process. For example, it wants to require that the U.N. Security Council approve most prosecutions. The effect would be to grant each permanent member of the Security Council veto power over prosecutions, making a mockery of the I.C.C.'s promise of universal justice. Washington also wants to condition prosecution on consent of the accused's government -- as if a future Saddam Hussein would ever agree to his own prosecution.

Again, N.G.O.s from the United States, Europe and the developing world -- including women's and human rights organizations and bar associations -- are working to block these shortsighted proposals. Through educational seminars, targeted reports, global diplomacy and articles in the press, they have helped build a coalition of more than forty governments known as the "like-minded states" from the developed and developing world. Joining the governments of northern Europe, Canada, Australia and New Zealand are such governments as Argentina, Ghana, Malawi, Senegal, South Africa and South Korea. Because many of the latter have recently completed transitions from authoritarian to democratic rule, they speak with special authority about the importance of an international institution of justice that would remain above local pressure for impunity.

Because they are less intent on maintaining good relations with the U.S. government than are many smaller government, N.G.O.s have taken the lead in rebutting Washington's arguments for weakening the court. For example, the Clinton Administration professes fear that an independent court might interrupt the word of the Security Council by prosecuting abusive leaders with whom the Council trying to make peace. N.G.O. s counter that allowing each permanent member of the Council to control the I.C.C.'s docket would make justice a bargaining chip, actually emboldening those committing atrocities by suggesting they could secure amnesty for their crimes as the price for a peace accord. Similarly, against the U.S. complaint that an I.C.C. prosecutor would be unaccountable to anyone, N.G.O.s note that there would be various checks in place, from possible judicial review of indictments to the power of impeachment. Such arguments helped to convince Britain last year to become the first Security Council permanent member to break with the United States on the issue.

N.G.O.s are building a similar coalition in an effort to ban the use of children under age 18 as soldiers. Child soldiers are a large but often neglected humanitarian problem. In such countries as Afghanistan, Burma, Liberia, Sri Lanka, Sudan and Uganda, government or rebel forces have placed an estimated quarter of a million children under arms, at times those as young as 8. The practice leaves the children physically at risk, emotionally traumatized and a danger to anyone they encounter.

While three treaties already prohibit the use of children under 15 as soldiers, the N.G.O.s' goal is to ban the recruitment or participation in armed conflict of children under 18. Again, N.G.O.s are working to build a coalition, joining a group of European governments with a broad array of others, particularly from Africa and Latin America. Apart from Russia, there is little immediate prospect that a major power will join.

The Clinton Administration opposes an 18 year old minimum because the Pentagon can meet its enlistment goals more easily without it. But as N.G.O.s point out, less than 0.5 percent of the U.S. military is composed of underage recruits. Indeed, almost all recruits reach 18 before completing their training. Even so, the United States is the only government worldwide that rejects even a combat ban on children under that age.

Particularly galling is the fact that, quite apart from its refusal to join the proposed ban, the Clinton Administration is taking advantage of so-called consensus rules to block other countries from adopting a ban for themselves. It fears that even a treaty among others would lead to criticism of the Pentagon. N.G.O.s are now working to execute an end run around the United States by encouraging sympathetic governments to abandon consensus rules -- which give an effective veto to Washington -- and insist on a vote. Even if negotiations were restricted to states that have ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child -- to which the enhance ban on child soldiers would be attached -- Washington, as one of only two governments worldwide not to have ratified that treaty, would be precluded from blocking progress.

International politics is often frustratingly remote. Popular participation is difficult, and even many smaller governments have a hard time breaking into the club of major powers that dominates decisions. The explosion of N.G.O.s at the end of the twentieth century and the global partnerships they have built promise greater accountability and, perhaps finally, a system in which humanitarian concerns stand a fair chance of competing with the narrow sense of human security that until recently has prevailed.

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

Dear friends,

I made a mistake and I ask you to delete the previous final version of the NGO statement on fissile disarmament and replace it by the corrected one that you find below. Alternatively you can exchange the name Arjun Makhijani and replace it by Abdul Nayyar, because this is the mistake I made.

I included the name of Arjun, although I had not received his consent. In fact he told me now that he is in strong disagreement with important substance of the statement. I have to assume that, though I stated that the experts who participated do not necessarily subscribe to all points made in the statement, people will still assume that they subscribe to most and at least to the most important ones.

I am sorry for this.

Martin

NGO statement on fissile materials
to be presented at the NPT PrepCom in Geneva

NGO statement on fissile materials, controls, inventory and IAEA safeguards to the delegates of the second Preparatory Committee meeting for the NPT Review Conference in the year 2000 from April 27 to May 8, 1998 in Geneva

Towards universal, comprehensive and transparent
accountancy, safeguarding and disposition
of military and civilian fissile materials.

Thank you Mr. Chairman and distinguished delegates for giving non-governmental organisations the opportunity to present their views and recommendations. We hope that these considerations are of value for your work and we wish you all success in your efforts, especially during this Preparatory Committee meeting for the Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty in the year 2000.

A. Importance of stepwise progress towards a
comprehensive cut-off agreement for the NPT

1. At the first NPT PrepCom in New York in 1997 it was suggested (and read in a personal statement by the Chairman) that special time should be reserved in the NPT review process to discuss the cut-off issue. In this short statement we would like to recommend what delegates might consider during this specially reserved time. It should be kept in mind that the particular quality of this forum is that the nuclear threshold states are not Parties to the Treaty.

2. Since the end of 1996 any progress towards a cut-off agreement at the Conference on Disarmament (CD) is completely deadlocked. Therefore, the most effective way to progress toward such a treaty will be through incremental advances at various other fora before the commencement of negotiations at the CD. Other fora can continue to create progress in parallel with negotiations at the CD. A special possibility would be to start negotiations on a cut-off agreement outside the CD in order that it can be concluded among those who agree, and then political pressure could move others to join. The NPT review process is one of the most important and most influential fora at which small steps towards a cut-off agreement can be achieved.

The main purpose of any intermediate steps would be to reinforce the commitments of countries that have ceased production, to increase transparency, to build confidence in these commitments, and to increase pressure on countries that continue production for nuclear weapons. Last and not least, the nuclear weapon states need to demonstrate in this stepwise process their commitment to take real steps towards nuclear disarmament.

3. Within an agenda towards a nuclear-weapon-free world a cut-off agreement should be one of the very next steps and negotiations should commence as soon as possible. A comprehensive cut-off agreement that meets all reasonable demands will not easily be achievable. To begin with, the negotiating mandate at the CD should remain narrowly defined, in order not to block a possible conclusion of a treaty. The minimum goal should be a non-discriminatory, multilateral, internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other explosive devices. There is still broad consensus that it is necessary in the negotiations to allow for addressing other topics like existing stocks from past production. However, it seems to be clear that the nuclear-weapon states are not prepared to have their military stocks cut back by such a treaty. They might possibly be prepared to discuss a declaration of stockpiles or a commitment to minimise non-military stockpiles outside of safeguards. The goal should be that all civilian fissile materials and military material declared excess to weapons use should be placed under international safeguards.

4. Some NGOs take the view that nuclear disarmament should be included or linked to a cut-off agreement. However, the delicate question is how such an integration or linkage can be achieved. As long as the nuclear-weapon states are not prepared to include decisive disarmament measures into a cut-off agreement or to establish some kind of linkage between both, some nuclear threshold states will hardly be prepared to negotiate such a treaty. The demand for a formal linkage will block any progress because it is unacceptable to the nuclear-weapon states. Therefore, the solution may be found by

integrating a particular measure into the cut-off agreement that has implications on disarmament. Few analysts suggest to include specific restrictions on further production of tritium into the cut-off agreement. This would have a reversible impact on qualitative disarmament in the nuclear-weapon states. The fraction of nuclear weapons which lack tritium will be qualitatively disarmed by reducing their yield by two orders of magnitude. This is reversible, because they will regain their full yield as soon as tritium is refilled. Even among NGOs many experts have the feeling that such a step is completely unacceptable to nuclear-weapon states, especially if it is implemented with the intention to use the decay of tritium as a forcing function for disarmament.

5. A formal linkage between the cut-off and disarmament appears not to be acceptable to the nuclear-weapon states and it may not be possible to integrate sufficient disarmament measures into a cut-off agreement. However, the asymmetrical situation regarding fissile materials needs to be addressed. Especially, for a cut-off to be acceptable for states with smaller nuclear capabilities, the agreement has to be combined with arrangements to maintain the pressure for disarmament. At a minimum, early commitments to further reductions beyond START II are required to create the climate in which nuclear threshold states could accept to join a cut-off. Some analysts suggest another kind of linkage. Nuclear threshold countries could link their production moratoria to the weapons states continuing to reduce their stockpiles of warheads and fissile materials not under safeguards ,at a sufficient rate", perhaps 50% every five years.

The solution to accommodate the differing needs of nuclear-weapon states and non-parties to the NPT may be some kind of a package approach. Each part of the package could have narrowly defined mandates in order to ensure agreement to start the negotiations and success in concluding them. While it is quite unclear at the moment what type of package would work, one or more of the following should be considered in addition to a fissile materials cut-off agreement:

- Establishment of an ad hoc committee on disarmament at the CD
- Establishment of a disarmament discussion process at the CD including a question format like the parliamentary question process
- Establishment of an ad hoc scientific group to consider technical aspects of nuclear disarmament (similar to the group of experts that considered verification aspects of a CTBT prior to the CD being given a negotiating mandate on the CTBT)
- some kind of tritium control outside of the fissile materials cut-off agreement
- A practical demonstration by the nuclear-weapon states of their disarmament commitments such as de-alerting of nuclear forces
- A practical demonstration by non-parties to the NPT of their non-nuclear weapons intentions such as voluntary declarations

on non-production of fissile material

- Announcement by the nuclear-weapon states of what the next step will be after the cut-off agreement, and a commitment to enter into negotiations at an early date.

6. A conflict similar to that which currently deadlocks the cut-off issue is causing frictions at the NPT Preparatory Committee meetings. As long as the nuclear-weapon states are not prepared to discuss future disarmament measures within the NPT review process while in other areas - like the cut-off - future plans are discussed, a discriminatory situation in this important international forum can hardly be avoided.

B. Fissile material in the military arsenal and outside of safeguards - each step at its time.

7. Most nuclear-weapon and nuclear threshold states have already ended the production of fissile materials for weapon purposes. The very first step that can be immediately taken is that all these states commit themselves publicly to turn their de-facto production stop into a declared moratorium. Those states that have not done so already should join this formal moratorium. This would be valuable even without verification arrangements. For the time being, countries could be expected to live up to their commitments, motivated by the expectation that all past production will eventually be reconstructed and it will be verified that they in fact halted production for weapons, once a formal cut-off enters into force.

8. Transparency on inventories should be complete and universal. The first step in achieving international control of all fissile materials is to have a full and accurate accounting of the location, amount, and form of fissile materials in each country. Even the material still in weapons should be included in this complete inventory in order to reduce the danger of withdrawal of materials at a later stage of disarmament. The total amount in weapons would be sufficient and does not need to be more detailed. This accounting must be universal. There should be no exclusions for any reason. Specific measures to ensure universal adherence to transparency as a first step appears to be advisable. For example, it has been suggested that accountability could be established in the form of imposing criminal penalties upon national leaders for failure to account fully for fissile materials within their countries. A few analysts take the view that quality and justice of enforcement measures would improve, if the UN security council becomes more democratic. Again, verification can start at a later date.

9. For the time being, it is possible to postpone the commencement of verification. Nuclear safeguards can gradually be introduced until only a restricted portion of fissile materials remains outside full-scope safeguards. Adequate non-intrusive monitoring methods should be established to put

even those materials under some kind of verification that are not subject to regular safeguards. These monitoring methods would serve as confidence building measures until full-scope safeguards are established. As soon as an inventory becomes subject to international safeguards, all declarations can be checked for consistency with past book entries by undertaking a full physical inventory measurement and by applying methods of nuclear archaeology.

10. The military production facilities that remain open should be shut down and dismantled and those that have been shut down already should also be dismantled. Dismantling of facilities probably should not occur until agreement is reached on transparency and verification measures, because these facilities contain physical evidence on total production. Exemptions will be made for some enrichment facilities and only those portions where LEU is turned into HEU should be dismantled. Special arrangements need to be negotiated in case some countries want to keep a stand-by production facility for tritium or to develop or even construct a new production technology for tritium. Verification procedures would be required to ensure that such stand-by facilities are not used for plutonium production.

11. In the long run, controls on fissile material should be comprehensive. However, everything does not have to fall under the rubric of a cut-off convention. In order to serve the purpose of a nuclear-weapon-free world, a cut-off of fissile materials should go beyond the mere ending of the production of these materials for military purposes. Otherwise, those countries that already have large stockpiles would primarily benefit. Thus, such a cut-off would reinforce the status quo of nuclear "haves" and "have nots". Therefore, the cut-off agreement has to offer the flexibility to become as comprehensive as possible in that all fissile materials will eventually be placed under international controls. Such an agreement needs to be universal in that it applies to all countries. The only way to eliminate completely the discriminatory nature of the NPT will be the elimination of all national stocks of nuclear warheads and unsafeguarded fissile material. The crucial question is whether full-scope safeguards over all fissile materials in nuclear threshold states could be acceptable to them before the nuclear-weapon states take their final step of nuclear disarmament.

12. Eventually, the control of fissile materials plays an important role in the transformation of the non-proliferation regime into a nuclear-weapon-free world regime. The crucial question is how a reduction of unsafeguarded stockpiles of fissile material can be managed in a way that a nuclear-weapon state or a nuclear threshold state can become a non-nuclear-weapon state. For nuclear-weapon states this transformation will be linked to the destruction of the last remaining nuclear weapons. This needs to be different for nuclear threshold states

which have a policy of nuclear ambiguity. They are known to possess sufficient amounts of nuclear-weapon-usable material to produce a number of nuclear weapons. When these states join the nuclear disarmament progress they should reduce the upper limit of their stocks of nuclear-weapon-usable materials while the recognised nuclear-weapon-states further reduce the limits of their nuclear arsenals. The last step would involve placing all remaining stocks of fissile material in all countries under international safeguards. This suggestion does not mean that some countries will not go non-nuclear before others. Any country can drop out early of the disarmament process and become a non-nuclear state.

C. Reductions on the availability of weapons-usable fissile materials

13. International transparency in the inventories of highly enriched uranium (HEU) and plutonium as well in the national strategies to manage these materials is of high value for non-proliferation and may set a precedent that could well be followed with regard to military material and such outside of safeguards. The guidelines on plutonium management that were agreed by nine countries in late 1997 constitutes a modest step in that direction though several issues have not been resolved satisfactorily. Especially the agreed format of annual plutonium balances does not create the desired transparency. For example, the figures are rounded to 100 kg only.

14. The logical consequence of the previous points is that at some point in time all civilian installations in nuclear threshold states and in nuclear-weapon states will be put under IAEA safeguards. However, the inherent problems of safeguarding fissile materials lead to the requirement that their availability should be reduced as far as possible.

15. Stocks of HEU - both military and civilian - should be reduced to the lowest levels practical, and civilian use of HEU should be eliminated. Nuclear-weapon states should put excess HEU under safeguards. The blending down to low enriched uranium should pose little problems as long as it is carried out under verified inspections. This process needs to be accelerated. Perhaps it is possible to put a moratorium on any uranium enrichment to whatever isotope ratio until the present global stocks of HEU, including that from the nuclear weapons to be dismantled, is consumed in diluted form in light water power reactors. However, this appears to be even less realistic than a ban on plutonium separation from spent fuel.

16. Stocks of unirradiated plutonium should be minimised. Safeguarding of plutonium at bulk-handling facilities can never be perfect. Besides proliferation risks posed by state actors there is always a terrorist threat. This applies even to plutonium

in unirradiated MOX fuel. Reactor-grade plutonium can be used for nuclear weapons and may even be of advantage for designing a crude nuclear weapon because no external neutron source is required to start the chain reaction due to the enhanced neutron background of plutonium-240 and higher isotopes.

One immediate step is to put a moratorium on the reprocessing of spent fuel at least as long as separated plutonium is still available for commercial purposes. From the non-proliferation point of view it is desirable to ban civilian reprocessing.

Anyway, economic and ecological arguments already speak against the use of plutonium for fresh fuel. Perhaps an economic incentive could be established to reduce the amount of unirradiated plutonium by introducing an inspection fee that is proportional to the amount of material and facilities which have to be put under IAEA safeguards.

17. How can plutonium be disposed of? How to handle the plutonium coming out of dismantled nuclear weapons? It must be made non-weapons-usable rather than be allowed to sit in storage ready for re-use. As a first step, the metal pits can be made unusable, e.g. by squeezing them out of shape and transforming them into oxide. The plutonium can then be treated according to the stored weapons standard. Further, it can be irradiated or mixed with radioactive waste and immobilised with glass or in a ceramic.

The technical feasibility, the risks and the merits of burning or transmuting plutonium should be evaluated in a way which is optimised for the elimination of plutonium and downgrading its isotopic composition and without aiming at simultaneous power generation. However, the largest challenge is to develop an efficient technology that works without reprocessing and without new reprocessing technologies. It should be noted that downblending of the isotopic composition of plutonium is not able to render this material unusable for nuclear weapons.

Also, it should be taken into account that the reuse of plutonium in MOX fuel for power generation will encourage commercial plutonium use and reprocessing. Therefore, only very few NGO representatives accept a MOX strategy, especially when combined with immobilisation in a dual-track approach. In view of these advantages and disadvantages one might think of an appropriate balanced mix of various techniques and technologies to minimise the risk of proliferation.

Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates,

I would like to thank you very much for listening to this statement prepared by non-governmental organisations on fissile materials. We hope that it motivates to you to discuss these issues with NGOs and to profit from their advice and expertise.

This statement was edited by Martin Kalinowski in an open process to which 40 experts were invited individually. Input was provided and reflections were given by a number of experts, especially by Owen Greene, F.H. Hammad, Wolfgang Liebert and Abdul Nayyar. These experts do not necessarily subscribe to all points made in the statement. The responsibility for mistakes and inappropriate wording lies only with the editor of this statement. Credit should be given to the contributors.

Martin B. Kalinowski, IANUS

Hochschulstr. 10, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany

Tel.: +49-6151-163016 FAX: +49-6151-166039

Internet, private: KALINOWSKI@HRZPUB.TU-DARMSTADT.DE

Internet, group: IANUS@HRZPUB.TU-DARMSTADT.DE

<http://www.tu-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/welcome.htm> and [../inesap.htm](http://www.tu-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/inesap.htm)

Please mind the change in our postal address!

Please mind the slight change in the internet address: tu instead of th !

Vince,

I too have been unsuccessful in getting e-mails to Rev. Hallman, but on the phone the other day he says he is getting other e-mail. A mystery. Here is his phone number: (301) 896-0013.

He gave me a good lead for an organization known as "20/20" but they are no longer accepting applications for 1998. I will however be able to use the information for next year's interns. He has other contact within the Christian lobbying community, so see what happens!

At 10:12 AM 4/10/98 -0700, you wrote:

>

>Dr. Thomas,

>

>I tried e-mailing Rev. Howard Hallman about the internship, but it seems
>as though his server is still down. Is there any way that you can get a
>hold of him and tell him that I am interested in the internship. If you
>do get a hold of him, please give him my number or e-mail address. Thank
>you! I have not heard or been given any confirmation as of yet to any of
>my other internship application. I will be sending my application to
>Case Corporation tomorrow. Thank you once again!

>

>Vincent

>

>

>

>*****

>

>"I believe in God just as I believe in the sun. I don't believe in the
>sun because I can see it, but because of what it allows me to see."

>

>

>

>*****

>

Ted N. Thomas

I am replying to "Angeltoad" (wonderful name) because he actually has a point.

It was dealt with at some length a couple of years ago in a thoughtful article in the New Yorker which recognized that deterrence would always be with us. We cannot "unlearn the secret". However, if we did in fact manage to get rid of the nuclear weapons (and, Angeltoad, grant me this for a moment), the deterrent would be that if any nation tried to build one, it is not an invisible operation. In a modern and well-monitored world, it would be clear quite soon that the U.S. or France or Israel or China was starting to rebuild and other nations could then also "return on the path to insanity". In the same way that even if we all agree to put our guns down, we still know where we left them.

Pete, the problem with your thinking is that it is absolutely sound and reasonable - if only nuclear weapons were in the same category as TNT. The point we should not lose sight of is that with Hiroshima/Nagasaki we entered a quite different place in history. A race of children suddenly possessed of a loaded revolver.

The proliferation of these weapons increases the chance of an accident (increases it in my view to the point of certainty). No one (except the U.S. ruling class) would accept the idea of only one country - the U.S. - possessing the bomb. Right now we have more than a half dozen nations that possess it (U.S., France, Russia, Britain, China, India, Israel). Others are certain to continue in this direction.

Our position, simply stated, is not that "no new country get the bomb" but that no country at all have the bomb. Which means reversing the drift of history.

If we are unable to do this - and the evidence is quite strong we won't be able to do it - our time is as limited as it would be if a large asteroid was aimed right at us. In this case the race is very much "the human race against the human race" - or, "our best instincts against our worst". Those of us who argue we really must move in this radical new direction (which involves much more than nuclear weapons - it involves, quite clearly, moves against any weapons of mass destruction and, ultimately, against even large concentrations of conventional weapons), are not unaware of your logic, but we see a different logic - or a different twist in the logic.

Namely, a race brilliant enough to invent a computer, but stupid enough not to see much sooner than five years ago (when it was first contemplated) that the year 2000 would pose serious problems, is a race which absolutely must understand its own limits in coping with certain technologies. Specifically, with any weapons - and there are others aside from nuclear ones - which put life on this planet at risk.

Our problem is our failure thus far to get the human race to see its own limits - and its ability to cope with them. (A paradox, but all movements involve paradox). We have on our side some very good brains and very good hearts. We also have some dreamers, and God bless them, they are needed. But I am in this campaign not because I am a dreamer but because I think of myself as a realist who wants this race to survive. It won't - in my view - if we continue our

present drift.

That is why it doesn't make sense to accept the status quo.

Peace,

David McReynolds

Dear Friends,

About six weeks ago I posted the following statement on the arms race, asking for non-governmental organizations to sign on. To date more than 70 have signed on. Thank you!

The statement was originally developed by Bob Tiller (Physicians for Social Responsibility) and Gordon Clark (Peace Action), working in collaboration with Daryl Kimball, Susan Gordon, and Maureen Eldredge. Christopher Paine also provided helpful ideas.

I am re-posting it now in order to request additional sign-ons from non-governmental organizations. If your organization has not endorsed this statement, please consider doing so. The statement is definitely still open for additional organizational names. (The first target date was March 6th, prior to distribution of the document with sign-on names to the U.S. Congress in mid-March. Although that distribution was done, we would like to have more signers now.)

Some people have asked if we want international signers, since most of the statement is about U.S. policy. Yes, we definitely want international organizations! It was an oversight not to mention that in the first posting. Although we are especially interested in gathering a good list of U.S. signers, international organizations are welcome. The organizational signers will be listed in three groups: (a) U.S. local and regional, (b) U.S. national, and (c) international.

Some people have pointed out that this statement does not refer to NPT treaty obligations or to nuclear weapons abolition. That is true. The statement was developed in order to focus on the issue of new weapons development, and it is not intended as a complete statement about all things anti-nuclear. It is designed to demonstrate both support for CTBT ratification and deep concern about the U.S. Stockpile Stewardship program. It is designed to attract support from a broad spectrum of organizations, including some that are not presently pursuing the goal of nuclear weapons abolition.

Let me add that Physicians for Social Responsibility and Peace Action, the two lead organizations on this statement, are strongly committed to abolition. Our hope is that many abolition-oriented organizations will endorse this statement, because ending the qualitative arms race and reshaping the U.S. Stockpile Stewardship program are key steps on the path to abolition. We believe that this statement is completely consistent with the goal of abolition, and many of you have agreed with that vision.

We anticipate using the statement in contacts with U.S. Administration officials, Members of Congress and the media. We may convert it into a fact sheet or a newspaper advertisement.

Thanks again to those who have already signed. If you want to sign your organization on, please contact:

Fran Teplitz

Peace Action
1819 H Street NW, Suite 420
Washington, DC 20006
phone 202-862-9740
fax 202-862-9762
e-mail <paprog@igc.org>

If you would like a nicely-formatted hard copy, you may ask Fran or me.

Shalom,
Bob Tiller
Physicians for Social Responsibility

"Statement of Support for the Ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and for an End to Nuclear Weapons Development and Production"

We, the undersigned representatives of disarmament, arms control, community, and environmental groups, agree to the following goals:

- * We support an end to the qualitative nuclear arms race and oppose the continued design and development of nuclear weapons;
- * We support the prompt ratification by the U.S. Senate of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, because, among other reasons, it constrains further development of nuclear weapons.

We agree that:

- * Under the NPT, the United States and the other nuclear weapon states are obligated "to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race," (1) and that a fundamental purpose of the CTBT is to constrain "the development and qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and to end the development of advanced new types of nuclear weapons." (2)

- * Nuclear test explosions are not needed to maintain the United States' nuclear arsenal;

- * Despite a policy adopted in 1994 of "no new design production,"(3) the U.S. nuclear weapons labs continue to pursue design and development of new types of so-called "replacement" warheads and modifications of existing warhead types, some of which provide for new military capabilities.(4)

- * The U.S. Department of Energy and its nuclear weapons labs intend to use the current Science-Based Stockpile Stewardship (SBSS) program to maintain and significantly enhance its scientific and technical capabilities for undertaking "development of advanced new types of nuclear weapons," (5) despite the probable requirement for certification of such advanced designs by nuclear tests and the lack of any foreseeable military request or need for such weapons.

- * The pursuit and use of the SBSS program for such activities can undermine the principal purposes of the CTBT: contributing effectively to the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects and to the process of nuclear disarmament; constraining the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons; and ending the development of advanced new types of nuclear weapons.

- * Many of the activities and proposed facilities in the DOE's \$4.5 billion a year (proposed FY 99) SBSS program are not essential and are indeed peripheral to the task of maintaining the nuclear stockpile.

A number of less costly and less ambitious program alternatives exist that can fulfill U.S. stockpile maintenance requirements.

Therefore, we urge the following course of action:

- * prompt ratification of the CTBT by the U.S. Senate and by other countries;
- * re-evaluation of the scope and cost of the SBSS program by the executive and legislative branches and the pursuit of less-costly, alternative stockpile stewardship approaches that are more consistent with the goal of constraining the proliferation and qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons; and
- * adoption by the United States and other nuclear weapon states of national policies that prohibit the design, development, or production of new nuclear warhead types and modification and/or "repackaging" of existing warhead types to endow them with new military capabilities.

Signed,

(organizations)

Citations and Sources:

1. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Article VI, signed July 1, 1968.
2. The Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty, Preamble, signed September 24, 1996.
3. The United States Nuclear Posture Review, completed in 1994.
4. United States Department of Energy, "Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan," February 1996, page IV-11.
5. United States Department of Energy, "Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan," February 1996, page V-9-10.

If your organization would like to add its name to this statement of support, please contact:

Fran Teplitz, Program Director,
Peace Action
1819 H Street, NW, Suite 420
Washington, DC 20006
202-862-9762 (fax)
202-862-9740 (ph)
paprog@igc.org (e-mail)

Happy Easter!
(also at <http://www.pgs.ca/pages/a2/sanucdis.htm>)

Ross Wilcock

Canadian Church Leaders Seek End to Nuclear Weaponry

The Salvation Army War Cry/ April 25, 1998

On Thursday, February 26, 1998, a representative group of church leaders went before the Standing Committee of the House of Commons to talk about the moral urgency of a global drive to abolish nuclear weapons. This is one of the many social justice issues which The Salvation Army in this territory, in partnership with other churches and agencies, is seeking to address and resolve. The following letter addressed to Prime Minister Chretien from church leaders in Canada, was signed by Commissioner Donald V. Kerr, territorial commander.

Salvationists need to be involved actively where we are, in social services, but also in collaboration with others to seek to advocate action on the many and varied social justice issues which threaten to damage and destroy families, and our world.

Dear Prime Minister Chretien

We write in deep appreciation of your government's persistent and courageous leadership in the ongoing effort to rid the world of the scourge of anti-personnel landmines, and to challenge you to bring that same visionary dedication to bear on efforts to rid the world of nuclear weapons.

Our church communities rejoiced with all Canadians, and especially with people in mine-affected countries, in that proud moment in Ottawa last December when Foreign Affairs Minister Lloyd Axworthy signed the land mines treaty on behalf of Canada and when you handed to the UN Secretary-General a copy of the legislation confirming Canada as the first country to ratify the treaty. It was truly a milestone event, showing the world what can be achieved when governments and movements work together, and particularly, when leaders step forward to challenge and encourage others.

We are grateful for your personal commitment to the effort to ban land mines and for the key role played by Mr. Axworthy and many officials in the Department of Foreign Affairs. Our gratitude and congratulations to you and your colleagues also extend to the many thousands of Canadians, individuals and organizations, who provided energy and expertise to make this achievement possible.

Canadian church communities, responding to God's call to all people to be agents of love and healing in a world that still knows great pain, participated in the movement to ban land mines. As church leaders, we believe that obedience to that same call of God requires us now to raise our voices in urgent appeal to our own communities, to all Canadians, and

to you and your government, to bring a new commitment to what we believe to be one of the most profound spiritual challenges of our era -- the challenge to rid the world of the plans and the means to nuclear annihilation.

The willingness, indeed the intent, to launch a nuclear attack in certain circumstances bespeaks spiritual and moral bankruptcy. We believe it to be an extraordinary affront to humanity for nuclear weapon states and their allies, including Canada, to persist in claiming that nuclear weapons are required for their security. Nuclear weapons do not, cannot, deliver security -- they deliver only insecurity and peril through their promise to annihilate that which is most precious, life itself and the global ecosystem upon which all life depends. Nuclear weapons have no moral legitimacy, they lack military utility, and, in light of the recent judgement of the World Court, their legality is in serious question. The spiritual, human and ecological holocaust of a nuclear attack can be prevented only by the abolition of nuclear weapons -- it is our common duty to pursue that goal as an urgent priority.

The Canadian churches have long worked for the elimination of nuclear weapons. In 1982, we leaders wrote to, and met with, Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau to affirm "nuclear weapons in any form and in any number cannot ultimately be accepted as legitimate components of national armed forces." In 1988, we sent the same message to Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, stating that "nuclear weapons have no place in national defence policies."

Since then we have welcomed the substantial progress that has been made to end the nuclear arms race and reduce the size of the superpowers' nuclear arsenals, But these steps, important as they are, are not nearly enough. The end of the Cold War has created an unprecedented opportunity to start the process toward the final elimination of nuclear weapons and the World Court has confirmed that it is a legal obligation.

We are therefore especially disturbed by the refusal of nuclear weapons states to even begin negotiations on the abolition of nuclear weapons and to set clear time frames and objectives - and we are profoundly disappointed that Canada has to date chosen to publicly accept that refusal. Indeed, nuclear weapon states continue to take steps to maintain and improve or modernize" their nuclear arsenals for the indefinite future.

It is our sincere belief that Canada has much to contribute to the effort to make nuclear abolition a reality In this regard, we are heartened by your pledge in *Securing Our Future Together* (the second "Red Book") that "a re-elected Liberal government will... work vigorously to eliminate nuclear and chemical weapons and antipersonnel mines from the planet." We are compelled to note, however, that Canada continues to support, and to seek the illusory protection of, nuclear weapons in a number of ways (see the Appendix, pp. 3-4). Canada's position as an advocate of nuclear disarmament in the UN General Assembly, the Conference on Disarmament, and other forums is compromised by this fact.

The time has come for Canada to take a strong, principled stand against the continued possession of nuclear weapons by any state, affirming abolition as the central goal of Canadian nuclear weapons policy and adding Canada's

voice to the call to immediately begin negotiations on a Nuclear Weapons Convention.

In support of this goal, Canada should immediately take the following actions:

- .Urge all states to negotiate by the year 2000 an agreement for the elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework;
- .Urge all nuclear weapons states, as interim measures and as a sign of good faith in such negotiations, to take all their nuclear forces off alert status and to commit themselves to no-first-use of nuclear weapons;
- .Renounce any role for nuclear weapons in Canadian defence policy, and call on other countries, including Russia and Canada's NATO allies, to do likewise;
- .Review the legality of all of Canada's nuclear-weapons related activities in the light of the International Court of Justice ruling of July 8, 1996, and move quickly upon the completion of this review to end all activities determined to be of questionable legality; and,
- .Embrace publicly the conclusions of the Canberra Commission report of August 14, 1996, including in particular its recommendations that the nuclear weapons states "commit themselves unequivocally to the elimination of nuclear weapons and agree to start work immediately on the practical steps and negotiations required for its achievement" and that the non-nuclear states support this commitment and join in co-operative international action to implement it.

As it approaches the dawn of a new Millennium, Canada could offer no finer demonstration of its commitment to being a constructive and healing presence in the international community than to deploy some of its considerable diplomatic skill and political capital to ensure that the world enters the next Millennium with a formal treaty commitment to rid the world of the scourge of nuclear weapons.

The Canadian churches which we represent are committed to continuing their work toward the abolition of nuclear weapons, in co-operation with other Canadian and international nuclear abolition efforts. In this spirit of co-operation and common cause, we respectfully request the opportunity to meet with you at the earliest possible date to explore ways in which Canadian churches can further support the government in taking bold new steps to make nuclear weapons abolition an urgent priority.

We look forward to your early response. Please know that you and your colleagues in the Government of Canada are supported by the prayers and good wishes of Canadians.

His Eminence Metropolitan Archbishop Sotiros, Greek Orthodox Metropolis of Toronto (Canada); Fr. Anthony Nikolie, Polish National Catholic Church of Canada; Mr. M. L. Bailey, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) in Canada; Jim Moerman, Reformed Church in America; Fr. Marcos Marcos, St. Mark's Coptic Orthodox Church; The Very Rev. Bill Phipps, United Church of Canada; Bishop Telmor Sartison, Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada; Archbishop H. Derderian, Primate, Canadian Diocese of the Armenian Orthodox Church; Marvin Frey, Executive Director, Mennonite Central Committee Canada; The Rev. Dr. Kenneth W Bellous, Executive Minister, Baptist Convention of

Ontario and Quebec; Rt. Rev. Dr. Daniel D. Rupwate, General Superintendent, British Methodist Episcopal Church; The Right Rev. Seraphim, Bishop of Ottawa and Canada, Orthodox Church in America; The Most Rev. Michael G. Peers, Primate, The Anglican Church of Canada; The Rev. Messale Engeda, Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church; Donald V. Kerr Commissioner, The Salvation Army; John Congram, Moderator, Presbyterian Church in Canada; Bishop Francois Thibodeau, c.j.m., President, The Episcopal Commission on Social Affairs, Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops; Gale Wills, Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) in Canada.

The Salvation Army's Positional Statement on World Peace (1990)

The Salvation Army as part of the Universal Christian Church, seeks the establishment of peace as proclaimed by Jesus Christ. The Army recognizes that the world's problems cannot be solved by force, and that greed and pride, coupled with the widespread desire for domination, poison the souls of men and sow seeds of conflict.

Since there exists in thermonuclear weapons a destructive power of vast proportions almost too frightful to contemplate, The Salvation Army believes that nuclear disarmament by all nations is a necessary element of world peace. However, a nation has the right to defend itself against the aggression of another nation.

The Salvation Army continues to be deeply concerned with the investment of huge financial resources to aid the escalating production of terrifying weapons of mass destruction, rather than the diversion of these funds to socioeconomic growth throughout the world. Disarmament, peace and development are inextricably linked.

The Salvation Army pledges its members to pray and work for peace and to seek to realize the Church's unique witness to the source of true peace, God himself.

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates

We are grateful for devoting this session to NGOs presentations hoping that this brief exchange of views will be an established and continuous practice at conferences and after conferences.

This presentation will deal with a question of special concern to peoples of several regions who strive to ward off deadly nuclear threats by establishing Nuclear Weapons Free Zones (NWFZ). We sincerely expect that the official policies of NPT states will positively respond to NGOs programme on this question. Already, the NPT Review and Extension Conference of 1995 adopted a decision on "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non Proliferation and Disarmament" emphasising the conviction of NPT states that "the establishment of internationally recognized conference also endorsed a resolution calling for "the establishment of an effectively verifiable Middle East zone free of weapons of mass destruction". These are politically binding commitments endorsed by all NPT states.

The refusal of the nuclear weapon states (NWS) to start negotiations in good faith on effective measures leading to complete nuclear disarmament has made the establishment of NWFZs a matter of utmost urgency. They express the political will of the countries of a region to refrain from acquiring, producing, testing and storing nuclear weapons, to prevent nuclear states from deploying these weapons on their territories and to distance the people of the region from nuclear threats.

Already, NWFZs have covered several regions and continents including territories under the jurisdiction of big Powers.

Taking them together enables a great part of the Southern Hemisphere comprising Latin America, Africa, South East Asia, South Pacific and the Antarctic Continent to remain outside nuclear arms race.

Other initiatives to expand areas free from nuclear weapons are on the agenda of NGO with the hope that PrepCom delegates will take them in due consideration.

Among them is a NWFZ urgently requested by the peoples and countries of the independent Republics of the former Soviet Union in Central Asia. A conference was held by NGOs last September to this end in Tashkent with the full support of the region's governments. Practical steps are expected to build up this zone before the 2000 NPT Review Conference.

Another zone which requires due consideration is envisaged to release tension engendered by NATO expansion.

NATO member states promised in their Founding Act with Russia of May 1997 that they have no intention to deploy nuclear weapons on the Territory of the new NATO members located close to Russian territories. However, no binding and practical measure is stipulated by the Founding Act to prevent such eventuality in future. Only, legally binding commitment by an internationally recognised treaty on the establishment of a buffer zone free of nuclear weapons between Russia and NATO could release the current tension. This zone may expand in future, instead of NATO current expansion, to strengthen peace and security in Europe.

Saying that, Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates, it should be noted, that Europe was the cradle of NWFZs. Efforts to establish these zones in Central Europe, in the Balkan and the Adriatic region, and in North Europe had been made long before the establishment of the Latin American zone. The reason why they failed to achieve their targets has been totally disappeared of late.

Confrontation between US and USSR does not exist anymore, Warsaw Pact was dismantled and no nuclear threat is levelled at US and its allies. Similar to what had already happened to the former Warsaw member states in Central and Eastern Europe and to the European Republics of the former USSR, NNWSs members of NATO, US-Japan Alliance and other military alliances can be also transformed into Nuclear Weapon Free Countries. All nuclear weapons deployed on their territories should be eliminated.

Regional "security" based on the deployment of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction has been triggered by conflicts in the Middle East and South Asia, and due to the conflict between the two Koreas in North East Asia. Under the pretext of safeguarding national security a state involved in the conflict tends to acquire nuclear weapons or seeks nuclear umbrella from a "friendly" NWS. To counter this act other countries make every effort to possess weapons of mass destruction. Moreover some NWSs pursue a double standard policy condoning the possession of nuclear weapons by their local allies and threatening, at the same time, to prevent other countries by force, including nuclear deterrence, from acquiring any weapon of mass destruction. A deadly connection between conflicts and these weapons has emerged. In this respect, the above mentioned Decision of Principles and Objectives adopted by NPT states stressed that "the development of NWFZs, especially in regions of tension, such as in the Middle East, as well as, the establishment of zones free from all weapons of mass destruction, should be encouraged as a matter of priority".

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates, the components and targets of this programme are of special nature. They seek to establish NWFZs in the Northern Hemisphere after many zones had been established in the south, to start the establishment of the zones in areas where nuclear weapons are deployed whereas all former zones had been established in regions already free from nuclear weapons and to establish zones free from all weapons of mass destruction, as well as, Nuclear zones free from all weapons of mass destruction, as well as, Nuclear Weapons Free Countries to be added to NWFZ-2-s
These new types of zones will give a powerful impetus to the efforts now underway to eliminate all nuclear weapons and conclude a Nuclear Weapon Convention.
Combined efforts by NGO and NPT states are very much needed to implement this programm

April 11 1998, Cairo, Egypt
Bahig Nassar
sent by Mrs. Aruna Ziegler, aruna@intouch.com

Request comments and suggestions to be kindly send to the following address:
Mr. Bahig Nassar
Coordinating Centre of Arab Peace Organizations
16 Mohamed Shafik Street,
El Mohandesseen, 12411 Giza, Egypt fone: 20-2-3467892 fax: 20-2-5786298
e-mail: aruna@intouch.com

Dear Salpy:

Our Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition is responsible for finding a speaker to address the NPT PrepCom with a 10 minute presentation on spiritual and ethical issues. After international consultation I invited Marie-Pierre Bovy of France to undertake this assignment. Unfortunately she can't do it because she has a previous commitment elsewhere that week.

Can you offer a suggestion? Our preference is for a woman, presumably from Europe for convenience, because we have men serving as hosts at the reception: Dr. Raiser and Cardinal Danneels. The presentation will probably occur on Wednesday, April 29, which is fairly short notice. I am working with the two other co-conveners of the Religious Working Group to draft the presentation. However, we would want to work with the speaker to work out the final text. If you have a suggestion, please provide me her or his name, e-mail, fax and phone numbers.

Shalom,
Howard

Happy Easter, Howard.

Yesterday I picked up two invoices from Jahn's Printing. One in the amount of \$28.55 was for a job ordered on 4/7/98 and included a slip that apologized for an accounting problem that delayed their invoicing. The other in the amount of \$89.50 was for work also ordered on 4/7/98. Please guide on how to assign these costs. I'll send the attachments to the invoices along with the checks.

I also picked up, and will deposit today, a check in the amount of \$500 from The Domestic & Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A.. 815 Second Avenue, New York, NY 10017. Perhaps you will send them a note or should I?

Action Alert

Dear Colleague:

The information below is exceptionally important in supporting the efforts of all NGOs participating in the upcoming prepcom in Geneva, Switzerland. Since the great majority of us cannot attend in person, this action will demonstrate the depth of support worldwide for the abolition of nuclear weapons. Please Participate!!!

Cordially, Robert L. Manning

Recycle, Copy and Pass-It-On - Contact Ten More People
If you know how to put this message into another language and post on an additional network, please do so...

Fellow World Citizen:

As you may or may not know, there will be an official meeting of States' parties to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty taking place in Geneva, Switzerland from April 27 to May 9, 1998. In addition, many Non-Governmental Organizations(NGOs) will be meeting in Geneva at the same time...

Since many more NGOs, as well as tens of thousands of individual citizens cannot be present to express their heartfelt opinions, the following 'hometown' campaign has been initiated to make a powerful statement to all world leaders. To wit, "Create a Nuclear Weapons Convention by the year 2000AD that has a definitive timeline to abolish nuclear weapons from the earth forever."

International Day of Non-Violent Action
Monday, April 27, 1998

We call upon all States to make the following
Commitment for a New Nuclear Weapons-Free Century:

1. End the Nuclear Threat
2. Sign a Treaty to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons
3. Reallocate Resources to Meet Human Needs

"Missiles to Sunflowers" Campaign

Action: Organize an action with friends, relatives and neighbors on April 27, 1998. Plan a vigil, meeting, or other non-violent action at your local, state, or national political representative's office to call for the prompt elimination of nuclear weapons. These actions will be coordinated with the presentation, the same day, of 13 Million signatures from Japanese citizens supporting nuclear abolition to international government representatives in Geneva, Switzerland. Your action will also be coordinated with other events taking place throughout the world... Call: 415-995-1991 or website:www.abolition2000.org

Please: Inform us of your participation/action so we can pass it along to the governments and non-governmental organizations gathered in Geneva!
Call: 415-995-1991 Email: abolishnukes@igc.org website:www.abolition2000.org

When: Monday, April 27, 1998

What: Your physical presence at your local representative's office, together with as many other people as possible around the world, will make a powerful statement to world leaders that nuclear weapons should be abolished forever. Suggestion: Bring Sunflower(real or artificial), signs, petitions, resolutions, and copies of the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention with you. If you can't be there in person, be sure to call or write your elected representatives!
(Call: 415-995-1991 or visit our website: www.abolition2000.org)

This is an international action! Please Participate! Copy, Pass On, Contact Ten More People. Once again, if you know how to put this message into another language and post onto an additional network, please do so...

This is a project of Unity Foundation
"Unity Foundation is a part of Abolition 2000, a Global Network to eliminate nuclear weapons."

To: CTBT Organizers
From: Kathy Crandall, Disarmament Clearinghouse
Subject: New Resources

Dear CTBT Organizers,

As we move into high-gear on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW campaign, I want you to be aware of two new resources.

1) A CTBT ACTION! WEB SITE

<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

This new site provides you with up-to-date priority actions along with tools and links to other essential CTBT information and action sites.

Please check it out! and let us know what you think. Your suggestions will be most appreciated, AND please add it as a *link* on your site.

If you have tips and success stories (for example . . .you had 100 letters sent to your Senator as a result of tabling at an event), please share these with us - This will be a featured aspect of the web site.

2) NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY NOW! BUTTONS

We have begun distributing these buttons with the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW! logo (see the attached file). They are really great for events, tabling etc. YOU CAN ORDER THEM ON THE NEW WEB SITE:
<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

Please use the attached Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW logo on your site too - and in other materials as you like.

*If you cannot read the attached file, or access the button order form on the Web, Don't panic... just send me a message. Let me know:

NAME: _____

ORGANIZATION/AFFILIATION: _____

ADDRESS: _____

Phone: Fax: E-Mail:

How many do you need? (Order up to 300 for free - but if you need more than 100, please call me)

When do you need them?

Briefly describe how/where you plan to use them:

Send to: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Kathy Crandall, Coordinator

1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

For WHAT YOU CAN DO for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Now!:
<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>
(or contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse)

(The Disarmament Clearinghouse is a project of:
Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility, and
Women's Action for New Directions)

Attachment Converted: C:\INTERACT\data\download\button.gif

Dear convenors,

Oliver Meier sent his draft presentation with a request for us to distribute it to you for comments and suggestions. These should be addressed to:

Oliver Meier
Berlin Information-centre for Transatlantic Security (BITS)
Rykestr. 13
10405 Berlin
Germany

Tel. ++49/30/441 0220
FAX. ++49/30/441 0221
e-mail: oliver.meier@bits.de

Best wishes,

Jo Tyler and Adam Berry

BEGIN TEXT _____

Draft Statement on NATO nuclear weapons, transfers, and export controls (Art. I&II)

Mr. Chairman, we are grateful for devoting this session to NGOs presentations hoping that this exchange of views will be a continued and expanded practice at future conferences. I would like to draw the attention of this conference to a case of nuclear proliferation that is out of sight of current discussions about proliferation dangers. Under NATO nuclear sharing arrangements 150-200 US nuclear weapons remain deployed in seven European countries. Under these nuclear sharing arrangements, host countries are involved in consultations on the possible use of these weapons as well as training for employment of these weapons of mass destruction.

We believe that these arrangements - which enable some non-nuclear weapon states to be actively involved in the nuclear weapons policies of the Western nuclear powers - are contradicting the spirit and possibly the letter of the NPT. It is therefore timely and appropriate for these issues to be addressed in the NPT Review Process. NATO nuclear weapons and the associated arrangements represent a major hurdle to the further and substantial steps for nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Chairman, the continued deployment of these weapons in Europe and especially the continued practice of nuclear sharing harms the nonproliferation regime in several respects:

First, it runs counter to the NPT's main purpose of limiting the access to nuclear weapons. It actually widens the access to nuclear weapons for training purposes in peacetime and use during wartime.

NATO's system of nuclear sharing enlarges the number of states who participate in nuclear planning. Currently, all NATO member states who wish to do so can participate in discussions on nuclear planning and doctrine. With the planned enlargement of the Alliance, the number of states eligible to participate in these arrangements will again increase.

Further, in case of war, the United States is still planning to transfer control over nuclear weapons to Allied countries. Currently, pilots of six non-nuclear weapons states are trained in peacetime for nuclear weapons missions. In times of war, the pilots of these nonnuclear weapon states could receive orders to deliver US nuclear weapons to targets predetermined within NATO.

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that these arrangements contradict the spirit of the NPT which after all was negotiated to limit access to nuclear weapons. Nuclear sharing does in fact expand access to nuclear weapons.

There is a second reason why the continued existence of NATO nuclear sharing arrangements undermines the nonproliferation regime: These arrangements represent a dangerous precedent. Upon signing the NPT, the US and several European states argued that the treaty could not be interpreted in such a way that it could hamper European integration. This statement is interpreted by some in such a way that it would be legal under the NPT to integrate French and British nuclear weapons into a future Common Foreign and Security policy of the European Union.

Already, some in Europe are arguing that NATO nuclear sharing is in fact a precedent for joint nuclear sharing arrangements in a future EU state. At the same time, European Union member states are postponing the decision on what will happen to French and British nuclear weapons, when the process of European integration continues to move forward. Until today, no official statement exists that the European Union intends to become a non-nuclear weapon state under the NPT.

A joint statement of the EU, saying that the European Union intends to become a nonnuclear member to the NPT is overdue. If such a statement were made in the context of the NPT Review Process it would clearly strengthen the nonproliferation regime. Such a step would signal a willingness on behalf of the nuclear weapon states that are members of the European Union to live up to their Article VI commitments, thereby fulfilling part of the nuclear bargain that is at the core of the NPT.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that the political arguments made in support of NATO nuclear sharing are unsound and that the legal arguments are highly questionable. NATO nuclear sharing, which still includes the option to use nuclear weapons first during a conflict, is a political anachronism. The legal basis for nuclear sharing arrangements can be questioned as well. For example it is unclear whether the reservations made by the United States and other Western States made at the time of the signing of the NPT where in fact made available to all relevant parties in time and whether these reservations are sufficient to

construct an exception to the general prohibition of nuclear sharing under the NPT.

We therefore believe that NATO nuclear sharing should be made a high priority during the NPT Review Process. NATO nuclear sharing arrangements are an appropriate topic for this year's PrepCom because the mandate of this conference includes discussions on such issues as negative security assurances. NATO on the other hand still maintains the right to use nuclear weapons first.

In addition, NATO nuclear sharing is an obstacle for the fulfillment of Art. VI commitments. By involving non-nuclear weapon states in nuclear planning and training in peacetime, more states get drawn into the nuclear sphere. Ending nuclear sharing arrangements is therefore a prerequisite for fulfilling Art. VI commitments to move towards a nuclear weapon-free world.

Mr. Chairman, making NATO nuclear sharing a high priority of the work of the NPT Review process is especially timely, because NATO is in the process of revising its entire strategy, including the nuclear aspects. This process is taking place in secret. NATO's new Strategic Concept is supposed to be finished in April 1999 shortly before the Third PrepCom for the 2000 Review Conference of the NPT. If NATO will not change the nuclear paragraphs of its current Strategic Concepts, current NATO nuclear policies will be extended for the foreseeable future. The coming year therefore presents you with unique opportunities to influence this process of reformulating NATO's nuclear policies.

Making NATO nuclear sharing a high priority of the work of the NPT Review process is especially urgent, because there is a danger that the role of nuclear weapons will be expanded again. Using nuclear weapons to counter the threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is one possibility being discussed in the context of counterproliferation scenarios in NATO. Preventing such an expansion of the role of nuclear weapons is of utmost importance. Furthermore, preventing such a development is one prerequisite for the abolition of nuclear weapons, which is part of the nuclear weapon states' commitment under the NPT.

There are a number of ways in which NATO nuclear sharing can and should be addressed in the Review process.

First, we think it is timely for the NPT to explicitly and clearly state that the treaty remains in force in times of war. By doing this, one major ambiguity about the interpretation of treaty clauses could be ended. The PrepCom could build on the results of the 3rd Review Conference, where it was agreed that the strict observance of the terms of Articles I&II remains central to achieving the shared objectives of preventing under any circumstances the further proliferation of nuclear weapons".

Secondly, the PrepCom should urge EU member to state that eventually the EU will become a non-nuclear member to the NPT. By doing so, the

development of European nuclear forces through integration of French and British nuclear forces could be made less likely. Such a joint statement by all European member states would be a strong symbol that the European Union does not intend to become another NATO.

Mr. Chairman, whether NATO nuclear sharing arrangements are compatible with Articles I&II of the NPT is one of the open questions that has to be dealt with in the Review Process. This issue has repeatedly been addressed by a number of states before and after the 1995 decision to extend the NPT for an indefinitely. Questions were raised then about the legality of these arrangements and the Western nuclear weapon states were also criticized for extending nuclear privileges to non-nuclear weapon states. The issues at the heart of the debate have never been resolved and will come up again repeatedly. We believe that now is the time to clearly state that ending nuclear sharing would be step that would strengthen the NPT.

Oliver Meier
Berlin Information-centre for Transatlantic Security (BITS)
Rykestr. 13
10405 Berlin
Germany

Tel. ++49/30/441 0220
FAX. ++49/30/441 0221
e-mail: oliver.meier@bits.de

Draft NGO presentation to the NPT PrepComm, 27 April - 8 May 1998, Geneva

(to be presented to the delegates on Tuesday 28 May, afternoon)

Presentation on Nuclear Weapon-Free Zones (article VII of Non-Proliferation Treaty)

Please send comments and suggestions to the following address:

Bahig Nassar
Cordinating Centre of Arab Peace Organizations
16 Mohamed Shafik st, El - Mohandissin, 12411,
Giza, Egypt
Tel: 20-2-3467892 / 355502
Fax: 202-2-5786298
e.mail (c/o AAPSO): aapso@idsc.gov.eg
OR c/o Aruna Gabriele: aruna@intouch.com

Draft text on NWFZ

Mr Chairman

We are grateful for devoting this session to NGOs presentations hoping that this brief exchange of views will be an established and continuous practice at conferences and after conferences.

This presentation will deal with a question of special concern to peoples of several regions who strive to ward off deadly nuclear threats by establishing Nuclear Weapon Free Zones (NWFZ). We sincerely expect that the official policies of Npt states will positively respond to NGOs programme on this question. Already, the NPT Review and Extension Conference of 1995 adopted a Decision on "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non Proliferation and Disarmament" emphasising the conviction of NPT states that "the establishment of internationally recognised NWFZ... enhances global and regional peace and security". The Conference also endorsed a Resolution calling for "the establishment of an effectively verifiable Middle East zone free of weapons of mass destruction". These are politically binding commitments endorsed by all NPT states.

Mr. Chairman;

The refusal of the nuclear weapon states NWS to start negotiations in good faith on effective measures leading to complete nuclear disarmament has made the establishment of NWFZs a matter of utmost urgency. They express the political will of the countries of a region to refrain from acquiring, producing, testing and storing nuclear weapons, to prevent nuclear states from deploying these weapons on their territories and to distance the people of the region from nuclear threats.

Already, NWFZs have covered several regions and continents including territories under the jurisdiction of big Powers. Taking them together enables a great part of the Southern Hemisphere comprising Latin America, Africa, South East Asia, South Pacific and the Antarctic Continent to remain outside nuclear arms race.

Other initiatives to expand areas free from nuclear weapons are on the agenda of NGOs with the hope that PrepCom delegates will take them in due consideration.

Among them is a NWFZ urgently requested by the peoples and countries of the independent Republics of the former Soviet Union in Central Asia. A conference was held by governments last September to this end in Tashkent with international participation. Practical steps are expected to build up this zone before the 2000 NPT Review Conference. Another zone which requires due consideration is envisaged to release tension engendered by NATO expansion. NATO member states promised in their Founding Act with Russia of May 1997 that they have no intention to deploy nuclear weapons on the Territory of the new NATO members located close to Russian territories. However, no binding and practical measure is stipulated by the Founding Act to prevent such eventuality in future. Only, legally binding commitment by an internationally recognised Treaty on the establishment of a buffer zone free of nuclear weapons between Russia and NATO could release the current tension. This zone may expand in future, instead of NATO current expansion, to strengthen peace and security in Europe.

Saying that, Mr. Chairman, it should be noted that Europe was the cradle of NWFZs. Efforts to establish these zones in Central Europe, in the Balkan and the Adriatic region, and in North Europe had been made long before the establishment of the Latin American zone. The reason why they failed to achieve their targets has been totally disappeared of late. Confrontation between US and USSR does not exist anymore, Warsaw Pact was dismantled and no nuclear threat is levelled at US and its allies. Similar to what had already happened to the former Warsaw member states in Central and Eastern Europe and to the European Republics of the former USSR, NNWSs members of NATO, the US-Japan Alliance and other military alliances can be also transformed into Nuclear Weapons Free Countries. All nuclear weapons deployed on their territories should be eliminated.

Mr. Chairman

Regional "security" based on the deployment of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction has been triggered by conflicts in the Middle East and South Asia, and due to the conflict between the two Koreas in North East Asia. Under the pretext of safeguarding national security a state involved in the conflict tends to acquire nuclear weapons or seeks nuclear umbrella from a "friendly" NWS. To counter this act other countries make every effort to possess weapons of mass destruction.

Moreover some NWSs pursue a double standard policy condoning the possession of nuclear weapons by their local allies and threatening, at the same time, to prevent other countries by force, including nuclear deterrence, from acquiring any weapon of mass destruction. A deadly connection between conflicts and these weapons has emerged. In this respect, the above mentioned Decision of Principles and Objectives adopted by NPT states stressed that "the development of NWFZs, especially in regions of tension, such as in the Middle East, as well as, the establishment of zones free from all weapons of mass destruction, should be encouraged as a matter of priority".

Mr Chairman,

The components and targets of this programme are of special nature. They seek to establish NWFZs in the Northern Hemisphere after many zones had

been established in the South, to start the establishment of the zones in areas where nuclear weapons are deployed whereas all former zones had been established in regions already free from nuclear weapons and to establish zones free from all weapons of mass destruction, as well as, Nuclear Weapons Free Countries to be added to NWFZs.

These new types of zones will give a powerful impetus to the efforts now underway to eliminate all nuclear weapons and conclude a Nuclear Weapon Convention.

Combined efforts by NGO and NPT states are very much needed to implement this programme.

End of Text .

NPT PREPCOMM 1998: CALENDAR OF EVENTS.

Updated 14 April 1998.

All events will be held in room XXV, Palais des Nations unless otherwise stated.

DAILY throughout the PrepComm:

8.00 - 9.00: Abolition 2000 Daily Caucus.

9.00 - 10.00: NGO Disarmament Committee daily briefings.

Sunday, April 26

12th Anniversary of Chernobyl Disaster

14.00-18.00: NGO Disarmament Committee Orientation Session (Part 1) for all NGOs present.
Eglise Paroisse de Montbrillant, 14 rue Baulacre, Geneva.

Monday, April 27

Morning: 1998 NPT PrepComm opens. Room XX.

Time TBA: Orientation Session (Part 2), for groups not present on Sunday.

9.00 - 10.00 (provisional time): Public action/demonstration on the Place des Nations. Inflatable nuclear reactor with missile chimney: "Nuclear Power Powers the Bomb." Contact IPPNW -Germany.

13.00: Presentation to Ambassador Eugeniusz Wyzner of over 13,000,000 signatures calling for nuclear abolition by the Abolition 2000 Network. Room XX, Palais des Nations.

13.00 - 15.00: Multimedia performance - artists Vijali Hamilton and Edie Hartshorne present their work for World Peace.

18.30 - 20.30: Reception and Meeting, Religious Working Group of Abolition 2000, including leaders of various faith communities. Palais des Nations, 8th Floor Restaurant.

Tuesday, April 28

13.00 - 14.00: HEU for research reactors, the case of the new FRMII in Garching: Wolfgang Liebert.

NB: 15.00 - 18.00: NGO PRESENTATIONS

18.30 - 21.30: INESAP/NAPF/INES/IALANA/IPB/LCNP/A2000. Towards a Nuclear Weapons Free World. Distinguished speakers include: Joseph Rotblat, Doug Roche, Mioko Matsubara. Facilitator: David Krieger (invited). (Includes a sandwich break.)

Wednesday, April 29

14.00 - 15.00: Briefing - Cut-off for NW-usable materials. INESAP. Martin Kalinowski, Wolfgang Liebert.

17.00 - 19.00: Beyond the CTB: Laboratory Testing and Article VI Obligation for Disarmament. Abolition 2000 Working Group, Western States Legal Foundation, INESAP. Jacqueline Cabasso, Ted Taylor, Andrew Lichterman,

Andre Gsponer, Greg Mello, Arjun Makhijani.

Thursday, April 30

10.00 - 13.00: Panel - Nuclear Weapon Abolition Days Network. And workshop - Citizens' Inspections. Pol D'Huyvetter, George Farebrother, John Burroughs, Ak Malten, Katri Sivonen.

13.00 - 14.00: Briefing - Multilateralizing the Nuclear Disarmament Process, with Owen Green.

14.00 - 16.00: INESAP/LCNP - The Nuclear Weapons Convention: Political Strategies and Verification: Alyn Ware, Marav Datan, Martin Kalinowski, Wolfgang Liebert, Juergen Scheffran.

17.00 - 19.00: Hague Appeal for Peace 1999 - campaign development and plans for the world congress in May 1999.

Friday, May 1

13.00 - 14.00: INESAP. Briefing: Regional monitoring and verification for WMDFZ in Middle East.

14.00 - 22.00: Abolition 2000 annual meeting (part 1).

Saturday, May 2

9.00 - 12.00: Abolition 2000 annual meeting (part 2). Holy Trinity Anglican Church, 14 bis rue du Mont Blanc.

13.00 - 18.00: Middle Power Initiative for Nuclear Abolition - Consultation Session, MPI Steering Committee. (Venue as morning.)

Monday, May 4

13.00 - 15.00: Abolition 2000 Working Group on Health Effects of Radiation with The Atomic Mirror, Hiti Tau and WEDO. "The Toxic Legacy of the Nuclear Age": Pamela Meidell, Tricia Pritikin, Pamela Ransom, Janine Allis-Smith and Gabriel Tetiarahi.

17.00 - 19.00: NATO Expansion, OSCE, the South: IPB with Cora Weiss, Rae Street, Bahig Nasser and Ben Cramer.

Tuesday, May 5

8.45 - 10.00: Panel with Ambassador Dhanapala, Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament. NGO Committee for Disarmament.

13.00 - 15.00: The World Court Opinion Versus Nuclear Strategies. International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms, A2000. John Burroughs, George Abi Saab, Merav Datan, Robert Green and Peter Weiss.

17.00 - 19.00: Abolition 2000 Working Group on Sustainable Energy with: Plutonium Free Future and GRACE: Nuclear Energy and Environmentally Sustainable Alternatives. Claire Greensfelder, Alice Slater, Ted Taylor.

Wednesday, May 6

17.00 - 19.00: Abolition 2000, Women for a Free and Independent Pacific. Nuclear Waste, Colonialism and Environmental Racism with: Myrla Baldonado, Gabriel Tetiarahi, Michael Simmons.

Thursday, May 7

13.00 - 15.00: Landmines and Nuclear Weapons - strategy-sharing, lessons from the Ottawa process. IPB

17.00 - 19.00 (provisionally): Eliminating nuclear weapons as a way to enhance human development and cooperation.

World Peace Council. Speakers from 3-4 continents.

Friday, May 8

NPT PrepComm Closes

10.00 (time to be confirmed): Final Meeting for Evaluation

Canadian Church Leaders'
1998 Statement on Nuclear Weapons
February 18, 1998
The Right Honourable Jean Chrétien, P.C., M.P.,
Prime Minister of Canada,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, ON
K1A 0A6

Dear Prime Minister Chrétien,

We write in deep appreciation of your government's persistent and courageous leadership in the ongoing effort to rid the world of the scourge of anti-personnel landmines, and to challenge you to bring that same visionary dedication to bear upon efforts to rid the world of nuclear weapons.

Our church communities rejoiced with all Canadians, and especially with people in mine-affected countries, in that proud moment in Ottawa last December when Foreign Affairs Minister Lloyd Axworthy signed the landmines treaty on behalf of Canada and when you handed to the UN Secretary-General a copy of the legislation confirming Canada as the first country to ratify the treaty. It was truly a milestone event, showing the world what can be achieved when governments and citizen movements work together, and particularly, when leaders step forward to challenge and encourage others. We are grateful for your personal commitment to the effort to ban landmines and for the key role played by Mr. Axworthy and many officials in the Department of Foreign Affairs. Our gratitude and congratulations to you and your colleagues also extend to the many thousands of Canadians, individuals and organizations, who provided energy and expertise to make this achievement possible.

Canadian church communities, responding to God's call to all people to be agents of love and healing in a world that still knows great pain, participated in the movement to ban landmines. As church leaders, we believe that obedience to that same call of God requires us now to raise our voices in urgent appeal to our own communities, to all Canadians, and to you and your government, to bring a new commitment to what we believe to be one of the most profound spiritual challenges of our era - the challenge to rid the world of the plans and the means to nuclear annihilation. The willingness, indeed the intent, to launch a nuclear attack in certain circumstances bespeaks spiritual and moral bankruptcy. We believe it be an extraordinary affront to humanity for nuclear weapon states and their allies, including Canada, to persist in claiming that nuclear weapons are required for their security. Nuclear weapons do not, cannot, deliver security - they deliver only insecurity and peril through their promise to annihilate that which is most precious, life itself and the global ecosystem upon which all life depends. Nuclear weapons have no moral legitimacy, they lack military utility, and, in light of the recent judgement of the World Court, their legality is in serious question. The spiritual, human and ecological holocaust of a nuclear attack can be prevented only by the abolition of nuclear weapons - it is our common duty to pursue that goal as an urgent priority.

The Canadian churches have long worked for the elimination of nuclear weapons. In 1982, we leaders wrote to, and met with, Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau to affirm that "nuclear weapons in any form and in any number cannot ultimately be accepted as legitimate components of national armed forces." In 1988, we sent the same message to Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, stating that "nuclear weapons have no place in national defence policies."

Since then we have welcomed the substantial progress that has been made to end the nuclear arms race and reduce the size of the superpowers' nuclear arsenals. But these steps, important as they are, are not nearly enough. The end of the Cold War has created an unprecedented opportunity to start the process toward the final elimination of nuclear weapons - and the World Court has confirmed that it is a legal obligation.

We are therefore especially disturbed by the refusal of nuclear weapons states to even begin negotiations on the abolition of nuclear weapons and to set clear time frames and objectives - and we are profoundly disappointed that Canada has to date chosen to publicly accept that refusal. Indeed, nuclear weapon states continue to take steps to maintain and "improve" or "modernize" their nuclear arsenals for the indefinite future.

It is our sincere belief that Canada has much to contribute to the effort to make nuclear abolition a reality. In this regard, we are heartened by your pledge in *Securing Our Future Together* (the second "Red Book") that "a re-elected Liberal government will... work vigorously to eliminate nuclear and chemical weapons and anti-personnel mines from the planet." We are compelled to note, however, that Canada continues to support, and to seek the illusory protection of, nuclear weapons in a number of ways (see the , pp.3-4). Canada's position as an advocate of nuclear disarmament in the UN General Assembly, the Conference on Disarmament, and other forums is compromised by this fact.

The time has come for Canada to take a strong, principled stand against the continued possession of nuclear weapons by any state, affirming abolition as the central goal of Canadian nuclear weapons policy and adding Canada's voice to the call to immediately begin negotiations on a Nuclear Weapons Convention.

In support of this goal, Canada should immediately take the following actions:

- * Urge all states to negotiate by the year 2000 an agreement for the elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework;
- * Urge all nuclear weapons states, as interim measures and as a sign of good faith in such negotiations, to take all their nuclear forces off alert status and to commit themselves to no-first-use of nuclear weapons;
- * Renounce any role for nuclear weapons in Canadian defence policy, and call on other countries, including Russia and Canada's NATO allies, to do likewise;
- * Review the legality of all of Canada's nuclear-weapons-related activities in the light of the International Court of Justice ruling of 8 July 1996, and move quickly upon the completion of this review to end all activities determined to be of questionable legality; and
- * Embrace publicly the conclusions of the Canberra Commission report of

14 August 1996, including in particular its recommendations that the nuclear weapons states "commit themselves unequivocally to the elimination of nuclear weapons and agree to start work immediately on the practical steps and negotiations required for its achievement" and that the non-nuclear states support this commitment and join in cooperative international action to implement it.

As it approaches the dawn of a new millennium, Canada could offer no finer demonstration of its commitment to being a constructive and healing presence in the international community than to deploy some of its considerable diplomatic skill and political capital to ensure that the world enters the next millennium with a formal treaty commitment to rid the world of the scourge of nuclear weapons.

The Canadian churches which we represent are committed to continuing their work toward the abolition of nuclear weapons, in cooperation with other Canadian and international nuclear abolition efforts. In this spirit of co-operation and common cause, we respectfully request the opportunity to meet with you at the earliest possible date to explore ways in which Canadian churches can further support the government in taking bold new steps to make nuclear weapons abolition an urgent priority.

We look forward to your early response. Please know that you and your colleagues in the Government of Canada are supported by the prayers and good wishes of Canadians.

Yours sincerely,

Mr. M.L. Bailey
Moderator
Christian Churches (Disciples of Christ) in Canada

The Rev. Dr. Kenneth W. Bellous
Executive Minister
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec

John Congram
Moderator
Presbyterian Church in Canada

Archbishop H. Derderian
Primate
Canadian Diocese of the Armenian Orthodox Church

The Rev. Messale Engeda
Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church

Marvin Frey
Executive Director
Mennonite Central Committee Canada

Donald V. Kerr
Commissioner
The Salvation Army

Fr. Marcos Marcos

St. Mark's Coptic Orthodox Church

Jim Moerman
Reformed Church in America

Fr. Anthony Nikolic
Polish National Catholic Church of Canada

The Most Rev. Michael G. Peers
Primate
The Anglican Church of Canada

The Very Rev. Bill Phipps
United Church of Canada

Rt. Rev. Dr. Daniel D. Rupwate
General Superintendent
British Methodist Episcopal Church

Bishop Telmor Sartison
Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada

The Right Rev. Seraphim
Bishop of Ottawa and Canada
Orthodox Church in America

His Eminence Metropolitan Archbishop Sotirios
Greek Orthodox Metropolis of Toronto (Canada)

Bishop François Thibodeau, c.j.m.
President of the Episcopal Commission on Social Affairs
Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops

The Rev. Arie G. Van Eek
Council of Christian Reformed Churches in Canada

Gale Wills
Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) in Canada

Background Notes to the Canadian Church Leaders' 1998 Statement on Nuclear Weapons

>From the beginning of the nuclear age, the world community has recognized the necessity of abolishing nuclear weapons. Governments, including the Canadian government, have long acknowledged their obligation to work for the elimination of these weapons.

* In 1946, the United Nations General Assembly established the UN Atomic Energy Commission and mandated it, inter alia, to make proposals for "the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction." [1]

* In 1968, the Non-Proliferation Treaty established a legal obligation

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..."[2]

* In 1978, the first Special Session on Disarmament of the United Nations reaffirmed that "nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization. It is essential to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race in all its aspects in order to avert the danger of war involving nuclear weapons. The ultimate goal in this context is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons."[3]

The end of the Cold War did not reduce the need to eliminate these weapons.

* In 1992, UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali issued a report on arms control and disarmament priorities in the post-Cold War world, reaffirming that "The international community can aim for no less a goal than the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons."[4]

* In July 1996, the International Court of Justice confirmed that all countries are obligated under international law "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."[5]

* In August 1996, the Australian government-sponsored Canberra Commission also concluded that "immediate and determined efforts need to be made to rid the world of nuclear weapons and the threat they pose to it."[6]

Significant progress has been made in recent years to end the nuclear arms race and reduce the size of the superpowers' nuclear arsenals. In the last decade we have seen the signing of the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) I Treaty, the START II Treaty, the beginning of co-operative American-Russian nuclear weapon dismantlement and security efforts, and a significant series of unilateral stand-downs, reductions, cancellations, and production halts by both countries.

There also have been heartening developments in the rest of the world, including South Africa's decision in 1991 to unilaterally eliminate its nuclear arsenal, the permanent extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1995, the accession in recent years of Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine to the NPT as non-nuclear weapon states, the continued strengthening of the Latin American and South Pacific nuclear weapon free zones, and the creation of new nuclear weapon free zones in Africa and South East Asia. The completion in 1996 of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, prohibiting all further tests of nuclear weapons, was a major step forward, even though the treaty's formal entry into force is likely to be delayed for many years. In addition, progress continues to be made towards a ban on the production of fissile materials for weapons purposes and measures to eliminate other weapons of mass destruction, including the recent entry into force of the Chemical Weapons Convention and on-going talks to improve the Biological Weapons Convention.

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs), institutions, and individuals have played an important role in focusing increased attention on abolition. The World Court Project, a coalition of NGOs and individuals from around the world, was instrumental in bringing the issue of the legality of nuclear weapons before the International Court of Justice. The Abolition 2000 network, an international coalition of more than 700 NGOs, was created in

1995 to co-ordinate political work for the abolition of nuclear weapons. A similar Canada-focused network, the Canadian Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (CNANW), was created in 1996. Project Ploughshares is a member of both networks. Another important example of citizen advocacy took place in December 1996 when some 60 former Generals and Admirals from around the world signed a statement calling on governments to eliminate nuclear weapons.

These various developments have combined to make this an opportune moment for a review of Canada's nuclear weapons policies. In September 1996 Project Ploughshares sponsored a cross-Canada series of community roundtables led by former Ambassador for Disarmament Doug Roche to help focus Canadian attention on the importance of working for abolition. One month later, Foreign Affairs Minister Lloyd Axworthy asked the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade (SCFAIT) to review Canada's nuclear weapons policies, citing, among other developments, the final report of the roundtables, Canada and the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons.

The SCFAIT began its review in March 1997, but all work was adjourned almost immediately as a result of the federal election. The committee is currently considering whether it will resume the review. [The review resumed in February 1998.]

Nuclear weapon states continue to resist efforts at the United Nations to begin taking, or even conceptualizing, the concrete steps required to move to nuclear abolition. Instead, these states and their allies persist in claiming that nuclear weapons are required for their security.

The NATO Nuclear Planning Group, for example, still maintains that the "supreme guarantee of the security of the Allies is provided by the strategic nuclear forces of the Alliance." [7] The nuclear weapons states have resisted all attempts to begin negotiations on the abolition of nuclear weapons and they continue to take steps to maintain the viability of their nuclear arsenals for the indefinite future.

The three nuclear weapon states that are members of NATO, the US, the UK, and France, are deliberately pursuing new deployments of nuclear weapons, despite their assurances that they stand for "ultimate" nuclear disarmament:

- * In 1997 the United States deployed the new B61-11 bomb (known as a "bunker-busting" nuclear weapon) designed to strike command bunkers buried hundreds of metres below the ground and other deeply buried targets. Despite the new Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which was supposed to end all nuclear testing in all environments for all time, the US continues to conduct underground "subcritical" tests to learn how to design more reliable and survivable nuclear weapons.

- * The UK is currently in the process of deploying four Trident missile submarines to replace its retired Polaris missile subs. Each UK Trident submarine has a killing capacity equivalent to 640 Hiroshima bombs.

- * France has two new nuclear weapons programs underway: the M-5 submarine-launched strategic nuclear missile, and a more powerful version of the Air-Sol Moyenne Portee (ASMP) air-launched nuclear missile.

- * Russia and China, the other acknowledged nuclear weapon states, also continue to maintain and modernize their nuclear forces.

More than fifty years after the advent of the nuclear age, Canada still maintains a fundamentally ambiguous policy toward nuclear weapons. The Canadian government rules out acquiring its own nuclear weapons, opposes nuclear proliferation, and supports, at least in principle, the abolition of all nuclear weapons. But it also supports the continued possession of nuclear weapons by its allies, participates in a nuclear-armed alliance, and "[does] not foresee any future need" to change "any aspect" of NATO's nuclear posture or policy. Canada is a non-nuclear-weapon-state signatory of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, but the Canadian government continues to believe that the defence of Canada relies on the "nuclear umbrella" that the United States and other NATO allies have unfurled above this country, and it continues to provide both physical and political support for those weapons in a variety of ways. In short, while the Canadian government condemns any reliance on nuclear weapons by non-allied countries, it continues to treat those same weapons as a useful - even necessary - element of Canada's defences and those of its allies.

Among other forms of nuclear co-operation, Canada:

- * provides airspace and facilities for nuclear bomber training;
- * hosts visits by nuclear-armed submarines;
- * maintains communications sites for nuclear forces;
- * has agreed to permit the deployment of nuclear-armed bombers and support forces to Canadian airfields during nuclear crises;
- * produces and exports components for nuclear weapon delivery vehicles, such as bombers and submarines; and
- * provides political and diplomatic support for American and NATO nuclear policies.

In its 1995 foreign policy statement, *Canada in the World*, the Government stated that "[Canadian security] is increasingly dependent on the security of others. More than ever, the forces of globalization, technological development and the scale of human activity reinforce our fundamental interdependence with the rest of the world... As the Special Joint Committee stated: 'We will have shared security, shared prosperity and a healthy environment for all or none will have any in the long-term.'"[8] Nuclear weapons provide not shared security, but shared insecurity. They cannot exist indefinitely without being used, some day, in a moment of desperation, madness, miscalculation, or accident. In May 1994 Canada decided to end the testing of air-launched cruise missiles in Canadian airspace, but Canada continues to support, and to seek the illusory protection of, nuclear weapons in a number of ways. Unlike earlier statements, the current statement of Canadian defence policy, the 1994 Defence White Paper, is silent on the role of nuclear weapons in Canada's defence.[9] Nonetheless, it is evident that nuclear weapons continue to play a role in Canadian defence policy, and that Canada's position as an advocate of nuclear disarmament in the UN General Assembly, the Conference on Disarmament, and other forums is compromised by this fact. *Canada in the World* affirms that "nuclear weapons still threaten us,"[10] but the "highest priority" for Canadian action identified in that statement is the indefinite extension of the NPT. Now that this immediate objective has been achieved, Canada should affirm abolition as the central goal of Canadian nuclear weapons policy and add its voice to the call to begin negotiations on a Nuclear Weapons Convention as soon as possible. *Securing Our Future Together* (the second Liberal Party "Red Book") contained a dramatic, although little-noticed, promise that may herald a

shift in the government's nuclear policies in this direction: "a re-elected Liberal government will... work vigorously to eliminate nuclear and chemical weapons and anti-personnel mines from the planet." [11] The government has done outstanding work on the elimination of chemical weapons and landmines; the time has come to put its commitment to the elimination of nuclear weapons into action.

Canada should take the following actions in support of the goal of initiating firm negotiations toward the elimination of nuclear weapons:

- * Renounce any role for nuclear weapons in Canadian defence policy, and call on other countries, including Canada's NATO allies, to do likewise;
- * Review the legality of all of Canada's nuclear-weapons-related activities in the light of the International Court of Justice ruling of 8 July 1996, and move quickly upon the completion of this review to end all activities determined to be of questionable legality;
- * Embrace publicly the conclusions of the Canberra Commission report of 14 August 1996, including in particular its recommendations that the nuclear weapons states "commit themselves unequivocally to the elimination of nuclear weapons and agree to start work immediately on the practical steps and negotiations required for its achievement" and that the non-nuclear states support this commitment and join in cooperative international action to implement it; and
- * Urge all states to negotiate by the year 2000 an agreement for the elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework.

1 Resolution 1 (I), United Nations General Assembly, 24 January 1946.
2 Article VI, Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, 1 July 1968.

3 Final Document, United Nations first Special Session on Disarmament, para. 47.

4 Boutros Boutros-Ghali, *New Dimensions of Arms Regulations and Disarmament in the Post-Cold War World*, 28 October 1992.

5 Advisory opinion: *Legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons*, International Court of Justice, 8 July 1996.

6 Report of the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, August 1996.

7 NATO communiqué M-DPC/NPG-2(95)117, 29 November 1995.

8 *Canada in the World*, Government of Canada, February 1995, pp. 10-11.

9 1994 Defence White Paper, December 1994; compare to, e.g., *Challenge and Commitment: A Defence Policy for Canada*, 1987, pp. 17-19; *Canadian Defence Policy*, April 1992, p. 6.

10 *Canada in the World*, p. 32.

11 *Securing Our Future Together*, Liberal Party of Canada, 1997, p. 98.

Information & Communications

Coordinator

YWG Liaison

The Canadian Council of Churches

Tel: 416-232-6070 ext. 2021

Fax: 416-236-4532

E-mail: ccchurch@web.net

Web-page: <http://www.web.net/~ccchurch>

****WE HAVE MOVED****

Our new address as of Feb. 1 is

3250 Bloor St.W.

Etobicoke ON M8X 2Y4

April 14

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

For those of you tracking the important and disconcerting developments in South Asia, the following story provides a good summary of the past couple of weeks of India-Pakistan nuclear weapons events.

DK

Reuters 04/14 0731

India says nuclear decision after strategic review

NEW DELHI- Indian Defence Minister George Fernandes said on Tuesday that the government would decide whether to build nuclear weapons after a strategic defence review.

"We will have a strategic defence review. If, at the end of the strategic defence review, we believe we have to exercise (our) option to have nuclear weapons, then (the) decision will have to be taken," Fernandes told a news conference.

He said a new National Security Council would conduct the review, but he gave no details about how long it would take.

Last week the new Hindu nationalist-led coalition government set up a task force that will spell out the nature and constitution of the National Security Council.

Fernandes said the National Agenda of the coalition government reiterated a national policy which had been in force for years.

"In other words, we don't sign the NPT, CTBT. We keep our options," the defence minister said. "You are obviously keeping it (the nuclear option) open because there can be many eventualities."

India, which exploded a nuclear device in 1974 but says it has no nuclear bomb, has refused to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) or the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) because it says the accords are discriminatory.

Defence analysts believe that fear of its nuclear-armed neighbour across the Himalayas, China, lies at the heart of India's often ambiguous nuclear and missile programme.

Islamabad last week announced that it had succeeded with the 1,500-km (935-mile) Ghauri missile and analysts on both sides of the tense border said Pakistan could now reach targets in India that were previously out of range.

Fernandes said that India had enough missiles to deter Pakistan, which announced last week it had test-flown a new 1,500-km (935-mile) missile called the Ghauri.

"As far as I am concerned our missile programme is well tuned to meet our security needs," said Fernandes, who last week accused China of providing Islamabad with the technology to build its Ghauri missile.

India and Pakistan have fought three wars, two over the divisive issue of Kashmir.

The defence minister noted that India had three versions of the surface-to-surface missile Prithvi, including a new 350-km (217-mile) naval version, but insisted that there was no war of words with Pakistan.

India had earlier said it had developed two versions of the Prithvi -- a 250 km (160-mile) for the air force and a 150-km (95-mile) for the army.

Fernandes made clear that there were no plans to test the controversial intermediate-range ballistic missile, Agni, which some domestic political groups say has been mothballed under Western pressure.

Last week Fernandes said there was no need to run more tests of the 2,500-km (1,500-mile) nuclear-capable Agni and on Tuesday said he stood by his comment.

Experts say that Agni, which has been test-launched three times -- one of which was a failure -- could hardly be a credible deterrent unless more tests are done.

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: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

At 06:00 PM 4/14/98 +0100, you wrote:

>To Howard W. Hallman

>

>I received your Nuclear Abolition Appeal on my desk to-day. Thanks for
>a very good initiative. I am translating parts of the text to go to
>the Swedish churches. It is not clear to us if it is enough to send
>you the names, mailing addresses, etc - it would be much more easy for
>the church leaders - then I can collect them here at the Christian
>Council of Sweden and forward them to you - or do you need the
>actual signature by mail?

>

>Could you please answer this by returning mail.

>

>May God bless the campaign!

>

>With Spring greetings from a cold Stockholm!

>

>Margareta Ingelstam

>

>To: Margareta Ingelstam

No, we don't need actual signatures, just names, etc. We will greatly appreciate your collecting names of church leaders and sending us the list.

With my family I spent a delightful six weeks in Sweden in July and August 1963, so I know how nice a place it can be.

Shalom,
Howard W. Hallman

Dear Howard,

Sorry for the delay in sending this (our email was not functioning properly for most of last week), but here is Marie Pierre's correct fax number (David Atwood asked us to find it out because he had to leave town quickly): +33-3-85508216

I hope it works now.

See you in Geneva.

With best wishes,

Jo Tyler

SPECIAL NGO COMMITTEE FOR DISARMAMENT

Joint NGO Project

for the Second Session of the NPT PrepComm

c/o International Peace Bureau

ipb@gn.apc.org

tel: +41 22 731 64 29

fax: +41 22 738 94 19

41 rue de Zurich

CH - 1201 Geneva

Switzerland

NGO Committee Secretariat:

womensleague@gn.apc.org

Dear Colleagues:

After a brief delay on my part, I drafted the following outline on what needs to be done in arranging for a Hill news conference of religious leaders on the CTBT. I would like your comments and additions before sending this out to more people in our network with an appropriate covering note. Please reply by e-mail or call me at 301 896-0013.

I leave for Geneva for two weeks on Friday evening, April 24. I'll do what I can in the next ten days to get this news conference set up and find others who will bring it to conclusion.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Religious Leaders News Conference on CTBT

Why: To release "A Statement of American Religious Leaders: Ratify the CTBT" and indicate broad support for the CTBT ratification.

To urge prompt hearings on the CTBT and floor action before the session ends.

When: Soon after the Senate completes its action on NATO.

Where: Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing room.
Or alternative?

Who: Protestant: Philip Wogamon, or ELCA Bishop Theodore Schneider, or Thom Fassett
of UM General Board of Church and Society

Catholic: Hallman to confer with Jerry Powers

Peace churches: Joe Volk

Jewish: David Saperstein

Muslim: Mr. Alamoudi

Black churches: Tyrone Pitts, Progressive Baptist National Convention
(suggestion added by Hallman)

Invitees: Senators Helms and Biden

Other members of Foreign Relations Committee?

Arrangements and assignments

Confer with Biden's staff, arrange for room: (Hallman, David Culp, Mark Brown's contact)

Invite speakers: Volk talk with Saperstein, Brown with Alamoudi, Hallman with others except Brown talk with Bishop Schneider if he is chosen)

Prepare letter with final list of signers: FCNL

Arrange for press coverage: consultant

Find funds, hire consultant: Hallman, Culp, Volk (?)

Invite senators: to be determined

Other matters (to be completed)

Dear Doug:

I would like to share with you a statement on nuclear abolition, issued by Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, and Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches. It is addressed to the NPT Preparatory Committee. The Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, which I serve as a co-convener, has sent it to the foreign ministries of the NPT signatory states, asking them to take the ideas into consideration as they instruct their delegates for the forthcoming meeting of the PrepCom. We are in the process of obtaining additional signers from regional and national councils of churches, Catholic bishops in various continents, and persons from other faiths.

On the opening night of the PrepCom in Geneva, we will have a reception for delegates, sponsored by the Religious Working Group and hosted by Cardinal Danneels and Dr. Raiser. We hope that you will join us. It will take place at Palais des Nations, 8th Floor Restaurant from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m.

I look forward to meeting you in Geneva and learning more about your Middle Powers Initiative.

Shalom,

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

###

ACT NOW FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION

A Statement Addressed to the
Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee

The time has come to rid planet Earth of nuclear weapons -- all of them, everywhere. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee has a remarkable opportunity at its upcoming meeting to set the course resolutely for the achievement of this goal.

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. This was quite apparent in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The same result would probably occur in any further use, and indeed would be worse because of the increased destructive power of modern nuclear weapons.

When used as an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt. It loses sight of the inviolable connection between means and end by failing to recognize that just ends cannot be achieved through wrongful means.

During the past 50 years the production and testing of nuclear weapons has proven grievously harmful to individuals and the environment in the vicinity of mining operations, processing plants, production facilities, and test sites. Numerous locales are burdened with lingering radioactivity and deadly waste products that will take decades to clean up. Some sites may never be restored to safe occupancy.

Psalm 24 teaches, "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and those who dwell therein." The First Book of Moses, also known as Genesis, indicates that God made Earth available to humankind to till and keep, that is, to use for mutual benefit and to preserve. Because production and use of nuclear weapons causes grave harm to Earth and its inhabitants, we as good stewards of God's Earth have an obligation to rid the world of this perilous threat.

Numerous religious bodies have condemned nuclear weapons and have called for their abolition. Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemn as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See before the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 15, 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino stated: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....This is a moral challenge, a legal challenge and a political challenge. That multiple-based challenge must be met by the application of our humanity."

In principle the nations of Earth agree on the need to eliminate nuclear weapons. Indeed, they have made a strong commitment in Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) "to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." After reviewing this article at the request of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice unanimously agreed 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."

Now is the time to take this obligation seriously. We call upon the members of the NPT Preparatory Committee to make the 1998 session a notable landmark in the journey toward the abolition of all nuclear weapons.

First, we ask the delegates to call resolutely upon the nuclear weapon states to embark upon a series of steps along the road leading to nuclear abolition. There is broad consensus among study commissions, retired generals and admirals, scientists, and other civilian experts on what these steps should be. They include:

- Declare a policy of no first use amongst themselves and non-use in relation to non-nuclear weapon states.
- Cease all research, development, production, and deployment of new nuclear weapons.
- Refrain from modernizing the existing nuclear arsenal and increasing the number of deployed nuclear weapons.
- Take all nuclear forces off alert and remove warheads from delivery vehicles.
- Achieve faster and deeper bilateral reduction of nuclear weapons by the United States and Russia.

It would be appropriate for the NPT Preparatory Committee to require the nuclear weapon states to provide annual progress reports on how they are carrying out such measures.

Second, we ask the delegates to take the lead in commencing the process of developing a nuclear weapons convention to outlaw and abolish all nuclear weapons. One appropriate method would be to establish a working group of the NPT Preparatory Committee for this purpose. Although the nuclear weapons states should be part of this process, other nations need not wait until they are willing to become engaged. Rather as stewards of God's Earth, non-nuclear weapon states can begin the task of developing a nuclear weapons convention that specifies a fair and effective program to abolish all nuclear weapons.

We appeal to delegates to the NPT Preparatory Committee to consider what is best for the whole Earth and its inhabitants when they vote on issues of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. Loyalty to all humankind exceeds that of loyalty within political blocs of nations. We urge delegates to act now decisively and courageously for the benefit of all the peoples of Earth.

Godfried Cardinal Danneels, President Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, General Secretary
Pax Christi International World Council of Churches

March 1998

Dear friends,

What follows is the written statement we have prepared for the delegates to the NPT PrepCom. I'd welcome your thoughts and suggestions.

Can anyone inform me if it's clear that Russia or any NWS other than the U.S. has also conducted subcritical nuclear tests.

David Krieger

STATEMENT TO DELEGATES TO THE 1998 NPT PREPCOM

THE DETERMINED PURSUIT OF SYSTEMATIC AND PROGRESSIVE EFFORTS TO IMPEDE NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT
by David Krieger*

In exchange for the indefinite extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1995 certain promises were made by the nuclear weapons states. These included their promises of determined pursuit "of systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goals of eliminating those weapons...." These promises reflected the obligation to achieve nuclear disarmament already enshrined in Article VI of the NPT. They also foreshadowed the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice, which stated on July 8, 1996:

"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."

Unfortunately, the nuclear weapons states have ignored both their own promises and their obligations under international law. The reasonable expectations of the proponents of a nuclear weapons free world have been frustrated, and those who yearn for a safer world have been disappointed by the lack of good faith on the part of the nuclear weapons states. Rather than following a path of systematic and progressive efforts to achieve nuclear disarmament, the nuclear weapons states have engaged in the determined pursuit of efforts to impede nuclear disarmament. This is their record:

- Opposition to commencing multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament, including opposition to setting up an Ad Hoc Committee on Nuclear Disarmament in the Conference on Disarmament;
- Continued maintenance of nuclear arsenals on hair-trigger alert, despite the end of the Cold War;
- Continued U.S. testing of nuclear weapons in "subcritical" tests, U.S. promises to assist other nuclear weapons states with subcritical testing, and indications that other nuclear weapons states plan to conduct subcritical tests;
- Continued development by the U.S. of laboratory facilities for nuclear weapons testing, and U.S. expenditures of \$4.5 billion per year on nuclear weapons programs;
- Development and testing by the U.S. of nuclear weapons with new functions such as the B61-11 earth-penetrating warhead;
- Development and testing by the U.S. of anti-satellite lasers (MIRACL);
- Failure to make unequivocal no first use pledges, or enter into negotiations on a No First Use Agreement;
- Russian retraction of its no first use promise, and its adoption of a lower standard similar to that of the Western nuclear weapons states;
- Undermining of existing inadequate security assurances of non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapons states in U.S. Presidential Decision Directive 60;
- U.S. revision of its nuclear warfare policy to include the threat of nuclear retaliation against chemical or biological attacks;
- Failure to make any progress on a promised treaty controlling the production of weapons-grade fissile materials;
- Failure to provide a complete and accurate accounting of all weapons-grade fissile materials in their possession;
- Publicly emphasizing policies of detargeting, but failing to make clear that retargeting is automatic and immediate;

- Continued reliance on policies of launch on warning;
- Continued maintenance of nuclear pits, even after the dismantling of nuclear weapons;
- Continued maintenance of nuclear arsenals large enough to destroy all of humanity;
- Deferring for five years, until the end of 2007, the achievement of the START II goals for reductions in the number of deployed strategic nuclear weapons to 3,500 on each side;
- Failure to commence negotiations on START III to achieve further reductions in nuclear arsenals;
- Failure of the United States to withdraw its nuclear weapons deployed in Europe, and failure of members of NATO to require this;
- Determination by NATO, led by the U.S., to exclude use of nuclear weapons as a war crime or crime against humanity from the statute of the planned International Criminal Court; and
- Failure to acknowledge and respond to the obligations set forth in the opinion of the International Court of Justice.

The people of the world, including those in the nuclear weapons states, are nearly unanimous in their support of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. Nearly all states are also in strong support of this goal. It is the governments of the five declared nuclear weapons states that are systematically and progressively impeding efforts to achieve the elimination of their own arsenals. By this behavior they continue to threaten the security of all peoples of the world and the sustainability of the biosphere of the Earth.

The record of the nuclear weapons states on their promise for the determined pursuit of systematic and progressive efforts to achieve nuclear disarmament shows contempt for the other parties to the NPT and for the future of humanity. The most important question before the 1998 NPT Prepcom is: How can the nuclear weapons states be persuaded to bring their actions for the elimination of nuclear weapons into line with their obligations?

We are in a race against time. Continued failure by the nuclear weapons states to live up to their obligations under international law and to abide by their promises is undermining the NPT and risks its ultimate disintegration. It will result in missing what may be the most significant opportunity since the beginning of the Nuclear Age to achieve the abolition of nuclear weapons.

If we miss the current opportunity to achieve complete nuclear disarmament, promised in Article VI of the NPT and repledged at the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference, the consequences could be dire for the citizens of world in the twenty-first century. So long as the nuclear weapons states continue to rely upon their nuclear arsenals for security, humanity will remain threatened by the future use -- by accident, miscalculation or design -- of these instruments of genocide. To avoid this, before the next NPT PrepCom in 1999 the nuclear weapons states should be pressed to take five critical steps: 1. Take their nuclear weapons off alert status; 2. Enter into an unequivocal no first use agreement; 3. Provide a full public accounting of all nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons grade materials; 4. Cease subcritical nuclear testing; and 5. Begin multilateral negotiations on achieving a Nuclear Weapons Convention for the phased elimination of all nuclear weapons. We strongly urge that a NPT intersessional Working Group be established to move this process forward.

 *David Krieger is president of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation. He can be reached at the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123, Santa Barbara, CA 93108, (805) 965-3443, Email: 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>

As you plan your tax day events tomorrow, or reflect about how much of your tax dollars go to nuclear weapons:

Go to the Web Site of the Nuclear Weapons Cost Study Project
<http://www.brook.edu/FP/PROJECTS/NUCW/COST/WEAPONS.HTM>

and look forward to this forthcoming book:(you can order a copy at the above site)

Atomic Audit
The Costs and Consequences of U.S. Nuclear Weapons Since 1940

Stephen I. Schwartz, editor

Since 1945, the United States has manufactured and deployed more than 70,000 nuclear weapons to deter nuclear war. By 1950, nuclear weapons were considered relatively inexpensive—"a bigger bang for the buck." The threats, perceived and actual, arising during the Cold War, and the absence of nuclear war, have led many observers to conclude that the U.S. investment in nuclear weapons was a prudent insurance policy. Yet, this assumption has never been systematically analyzed. Indeed, scant attention has been paid to the costs of this enormous effort—more than \$4 trillion thus far—and its consequences for the nation.

Atomic Audit traces the history of U.S. nuclear weapons and unearths the comprehensive costs of their infrastructure—from design and fabrication facilities, to command, control, and communications networks, to the eventual dismantlement of weapons systems and the management of decades of accumulated toxic and radioactive wastes. The consequences of these expenditures—from the deterrence of major war, to the risk of accidental nuclear war, to the environmental and economic impacts of mass production of nuclear weapons—are carefully assessed.

Utilizing archival and newly declassified government documents and data, this book demonstrates how a range of factors—the indeterminate requirements of deterrence, faulty assumptions about the cost-effectiveness of nuclear weapons, regular misrepresentation of and overreaction to the Soviet (and later Chinese) threat, the desire to maintain superior nuclear forces, bureaucratic and often arbitrary decisions, pork barrel politics, and excessive secrecy—all drove the acquisition of an arsenal far larger than what many contemporary civilian and military leaders deemed necessary. These factors also contributed to lax fiscal oversight of the entire effort by Congress and the executive branch. Atomic Audit concludes with recommendations for improving government financial oversight of nuclear weapons programs and fostering greater public understanding of such issues in the post-Cold War era.

Contributing authors are Bruce G. Blair, The Brookings Institution;

Thomas S. Blanton and William Burr, the National Security Archive; Steve M. Kosiak, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments; Arjun Makhijani, Institute for Energy and Environmental Research; Robert S. Norris, Natural Resources Defense Council; Kevin O'Neill, Institute for Science and International Security; John Pike, Federation of American Scientists; and William J. Weida, The Colorado College.

Stephen I. Schwartz is a guest scholar with the Foreign Policy Studies program at the Brookings Institution and director of the U.S. Nuclear Weapons Cost Study Project.

June 1998 / c. 500 pp.
Photographs and Maps

May 1998 / c. 500 pp. cloth 0-8157-7774-4 \$59.95 paper 0-8157-7773-6 \$24.95t

Defense & Security / Nuclear Weapons
Brookings Institution Press

Estimated 1998 Spending on U.S. Nuclear Weapons and Weapons-Related Programs
(in billions of current dollars)

Department of Defense

- Strategic nuclear forces — \$7.5
- Tactical nuclear and dual-capable forces — \$1.0
- Command, control, communications, and intelligence — \$6.0
- Operation and maintenance — \$4.0
- Research and development — \$.400
- Defense Special Weapons Agency — \$.300

Department of Energy

- Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program — \$4.3
- Other defense programs (safeguards and security, intelligence, verification and arms control technology, nonproliferation, security investigations, fissile material control and disposition, worker transition) — \$.968
- Naval nuclear propulsion — \$.335

Subtotal operational nuclear forces — \$24.8

Department of Defense

Defense Environmental Restoration Account — \$.500

Department of Energy

Environmental restoration and waste management — \$5.4

Department of Justice

Radiation Exposure Compensation Act payments —\$.030

Subtotal cold war legacies — \$5.9

Department of Defense

National and theater missile defense — \$3.8

Cooperative Threat Reduction — \$.400

On-Site Inspection Agency — \$.040

Arms Control and Disarmament Agency — \$.035

Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board — \$.020

International Atomic Energy Agency (U.S. payments to) — \$.050

Congressional oversight — \$.050

Subtotal defensive and other programs — \$4.4

Total Estimated 1998 Nuclear Weapons Budget — \$35.12

Notes

1 Adapted from Atomic Audit: The Costs and Consequences of U.S. Nuclear Weapons Since 1940 (forthcoming, Brookings Institution Press).[

2 This figure is 14 percent of all appropriated spending for "national defense." Not included are a portion of the Navy's costs for strategic antisubmarine warfare, the Bureau of Export Administration (Department of Commerce), Environmental Protection Agency, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Department of Labor), the U.S. Customs

Service (Department of the Treasury), and the U.S. Geological Survey
(Department of the Interior).

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse
1101 14th Street NW #700
Washington, DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

>From Bahig Nassar - Comments on NWFZ presentation already prepared on April the second, 1998.

Dear friends,

This message was sent to

Adam Berry and Jo Tyler, Special NGO Committee for PrepCom.

The following is comment from NGOs on the draft NWFZ presentation.

Kindly forward these comments to all NGOs interested in PrepCom presentations.

I seized the occasion of a conference held in Cairo and discussed the presentation with several participants from outside Egypt who are concerned over conflicts, nuclear disarmament and peace :

1- Some participants request elaboration and further discussions on specific NWFZs of special importance to their regions.

Answer : The aim of the presentation is to present the NGOs program. If we elaborate and discuss a certain NWFZ, the others should be also elaborated and discussed and more time needed for the presentation (between 20 - 30 minutes). However new formulation are needed since my English is not my mother tongue.

2- A comment asks to raise the question of nuclear weapon free seas and oceans.

Answer : I have no objection since already I discuss this issue in a paper under the title "NWFZs : From non proliferation to nuclear disarmament" At the time of the cold war many governments and NGOs raised slogans to free the Baltic, the Adriatic, the Mediterranean and the Indian ocean from fleets carrying nuclear weapons in order to avoid nuclear confrontation between US and USSR fleets.

However, huge nuclear capable fleets are moving freely now in the water of seas and oceans, ready to intervene in any region particularly in the South. Raising this slogans once more will benefit on peoples. I need your advise because inserting this issue in the "presentation requires two more minutes.

3- Some experts ask whether NGOs in Germany, Italy, Japan and other NNWSs members of nuclear capable military alliances will agree to eliminate nuclear weapons deployed in their countries?

Answer : There are already forces in Japan which call for the transformation of their country into a NWF country. Several NGOs in Greece, Spain and Portugal are even campaigning for the dismantlement of NATO or the withdrawal of their countries from NATO. I don't know the position of NGOs in Germany and Italy, but since several NGOs in several countries are ready to raise the slogan they should be supported and the involvement of others in their campaign must be encouraged. This is a major issue of nuclear disarmament which has many positive implications.

4- NGOs from the Middle East mention that it was agreed to discuss Middle East zone at the PrepCom. Meeting and it is advisable if the presentation will draw due attention to this issue.

Answer : No objection, and possibly the following sentence can be added at the end of the para. Which deals with regions of tensions "NGOs appreciate your decision to discuss the issue of eliminating all WMD from the Middle East hoping that your effort will prompt the parties concerned to start negotiation in good faith to achieve this target as soon as possible".

Bahig Nassar

14/4/1998

Friends/Opponents of Things Nuclear,

As stated in a posting of mine

last week, the New York Times did an in depth series of articles on nuclear issues from August 16-21, 1994. Specifically re the N-Power/N-Weapons Abolition-2000 debates, the following is very relevant. It's from the Saturday, August 20, 1994 NY Times, starting at the second column on page 1. The article is by David Sanger, dateline Tokyo. The 6th column on page 1 starts, "But the long-promised economies have evaporated and the spread of weapons projects in the last several years- in North Korea, Iraq, Pakistan and elsewhere- has only underscored the inherent dangers of a world energy system based on recycled plutonium. Nuclear weapon science is everywhere, it is now clear, and the greatest obstacle to bomb production is not know how, but access to plutonium or highly enriched uranium- materials which, under the energy strategies being pursued by several countries, will remain in plentiful supply.

The new supplies of seperated plutonium are the result of "reprocessing"- extraction of plutonium and uranium from the spent fuel of CONVENTIONAL NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS [my emphasis]. Because the extraction of plutonium is rapidly outpacing the building of the breeder reactors it was intended to fuel, a surplus of plutonium is building.

The International Atomic Energy Agency estimates there are now over 100 tons of seperated civilian plutonium stockpiled around the world. Most of it is stored in Britain, France, and Russia. Japan plans to obtain 50 tons more over the next 15 years, mainly produced in European plants, and within seven years, it plans to open up a huge new reprocessing plant of its own. *IF DIVERETED TO WEAPONS USE, THOSE SUPPLIES COULD PRODUCE THOUSANDS OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS* [my italics]."

Skipping to the bottom of the second paragraph on page 4, The Times continues under the headlines THE THREAT and

CAN NUCLEAR FUEL PRODUCE A BOMB?

At the core of the allies justification for their elaborate plans is a traditional argument that there are two types of plutonium: "Reactor-grade" plutonium suitable for nuclear power generation , and "weapons-grade" for making bombs. In weapons grade plutonium, 93 per cent or more of the material is in the form the of Pu-239 isotope. Reactor grade plutonium has a lesser grade concentration of Pu-239.

Japan has always insisted that because it deals only in the first type and never in the second, any suspicions that it could decide to make nuclear weapons , or that terrorists could seize its supplies , are unfounded and alarmist.

In June, after former prime Minister Tsutomu Hata took Japan's bureaucracy by surprise when he said that "Japan has the capability to possess nuclear weapons, but it has not made them," those arguements were rolled out again.

The government repeated its commitment never to make or possess nuclear weapons and insisted that "does not have any expertise" in building bombs and therefore "does not have the capability to produce them."

While many experts doubt these protestations of insufficient expertise, certainly there is no public will in Japan today for the

country to acquire nuclear arms.

"It is impossible, it is just simply impossible," Ryo Ikegame, the executive vice president of Tokyo Electric Power, Japan's largest utility company, said in April at an industry conference held quite deliberately in Hiroshima, in an effort to turn plutonium into a symbol for the peaceful use of energy. "No one has produced weapons from reactor fuel," he said.

U.S. TEST IN 1962

In fact, information de-classified in recent years by the Department of Energy and statements by a number of American weapons designers suggest that Japan's official argument is wrong. In 1962, American weapons laboratories built and tested AT LEAST [my italics] one bomb built from reactor grade fuel. American officials say that while perhaps four kilograms of bomb-grade plutonium are needed to make a bomb, only slightly more reactor-grade plutonium is needed.

For terrorists or countries desiring only a few weapons, "the theft of weapon grade material or of actual weapons is likely to be the preferred path," Richard L. Garwin, a senior researcher at I.B.M., wrote recently. "BUT REACTOR GRADE MATERIAL IS ALSO A FEASIBLE APPROACH TO THE MANUFACTURE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS." [my italics].

But, as Mr. Garwin concluded recently, "The Japanese don't want to hear this."

THERE'S NO NEED FOR SPECULATION, THIS LAYS IT ON THE LINE- THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE DOE [1962 TEST]. ALSO, DON'T FORGET THE CLINTON OUTRAGE/CONCERN RE IRANIAN "UPGRADING" & ACQUISITION OF COMMERCIAL NUCLEAR FACILITIES. DITTO CLINTON ADMINISTRATION & N. KOREA, AND THE 1981 BOMBING BY ISRAEL OF IRAQI COMMERCIAL FACILITIES!!! Atoms for Peace, huh?

1. NUCLEAR POWER POWERS NUCLEAR WEAPONS

2. ATOMS FOR WAR

Best/Peace/No-Nukes,
Bill Smirnow

Dear Salpy:

You may be aware of what is described in the following message, and perhaps are a part of it. But if not, let me share the information with you.

Shalom,
Howard

>Return-Path: <thor@peace.is>

>Date: Wed, 15 Apr 1998 03:22:36 GMT

>From: Thor Magnusson <thor@peace.is>

>

>To: "undisclosed-recipients:;"

>

>Introducing the Partner's for Peace program to STOP VIOLENCE.

>-----

>X-Sender: thor@peace.is (Unverified)

>X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.5 (32)

>Date: Wed, 15 Apr 1998 02:13:04 +0000

>To: mupj@igc.apc.org

>From: thor@peace.is <Thor Magnusson>

>Subject: NEW!!! - STOP VIOLENCE

>Mime-Version: 1.0

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

>

>We have recently launched the Peace 2000 Television Project together with a
>group from the television and film industry. The first two PSA's (Public
>Service Announcements) in the series: STOP VIOLENCE have been produced.
>The PSA's are being shown by our local television networks free of charge
>or at a reduced cost. Sponsors pay for film production. The PSA's can be
>produced in any language.

>

>This is the first of a series of films to STOP VIOLENCE that we will be
>producing for international distribution. The films are made in the highest
>quality so that they can be accepted both by local networks and large
>national television networks. At the end of each film sponsors get their
>logo displayed.

>

>Is your organisation interested to get involved in the campaign against
>violence? We are looking for partners to operate the marketing and
>distribution of PSA's to television networks, cinemas, video distributors
>and sponsors in their community. This may offer a unique and good
>promotional opportunity for your organisation. The name of your
>organisation could be shown at the end of each PSA. It may also offer you
>an excellent fund-raising opportunity. Are you interested?

>

>We intend to appoint a coordinator for this program in your area. Please
>let us know by return if you are interested to participate in this program.
> Please let us also know what of the following your organisation might be
>able to coordinate:

>

>1. Distribution to Television stations, Cinemas and Video distributors in
>your area. This will give you a good promotional opportunity as we can

>include the name of your organisation in any PSA's shown in your area.

>

>2. Introduction of the program to corporate sponsors in your area. This
>will give you the opportunity to raise funding for your own organisation.

>

>3. Organise evening courses for parents in your area. This is intended to
>teach parents how to guide their children to television viewing. You can
>charge each participant a small fee for attending.

>

>

>**BACKGROUND:**

>

>Physical violence is increasing at an alarming rate in our society. There
>are diverse opinions about the cause of the problem and many are now
>expressing a concern that violence on television is at fault. A recent
>survey has revealed that a child living in a western society, will on
>average have watched on television more than 8000 murders and 100,000 acts
>of violence by the time they have graduated from elementary school.
>Several studies have revealed a link between virtual violence and physical
>violence. Children are at a particular risk to become affected by watching
>violence on the screen if no preventive education is provided about the
>line between virtual entertainment and reality.

>

>Peace 2000 Television was founded by a group of people from the television
>and film industry together with a leading peace organisation for the
>purpose of providing non-violence education through the media. We have
>allocated a certain amount of our resources to help reduce the culture of
>physical violence that is increasingly becoming a threat to public safety
>in our society and this needs to be addressed, quickly and effectively. We
>are producing short inserts (PSA's) for television and cinemas that will
>help young people realise the difference between virtuality and reality.
>The viewer will be influenced to steer away from violence and to use
>alternative modes of expression.

>

>We offer television networks to become a participant in this important
>contribution to public safety. We supply on regular basis free of charge
>PSA's of up to one minute to be inserted prior to the screening of features
>containing violence, or into other available space in networks programming.

>

>Peace 2000 is a not for profit organisation with affiliates in more than 60
>countries. Peace 2000 was initiated by Thor Magnusson the founder of
>Eurocard/Mastercard Iceland and Presidential Candidate, who founded the
>organisation with more than 500 individuals and almost 100 organisations
>from around the world. Peace 2000 has flown humanitarian aid into war
>zones under a special clearance of the United Nations Security Council and
>airlifted children out for medical treatment.

>Further information on the background and activities of Peace 2000 can be
>found on our website: <http://www.peace.is>

>

>We look forward to hear from you

>Yours in peace

>

>Beggi Jonsson - Media Coordinator. tel:354 8977728

>Thor Magnusson - email: thor@peace.is - tel: +354 896 1252

>
>Peace 2000 Institute
>Tel: +354 557 1000
>FAX: +354 557 1047
>Email: info@peace.is
>Website: www.peace.is

>
>Mailing address:
>P.O.Box 190
>121 Reykjavik
>ICELAND

>
>
>
>

Dear Dave and Clayton:

I have produced the attached draft statement for presentation to the NPT PrepCom. Please give me your comments and suggestions for changes, additions, deletions.

Thanks,
Howard

###

Draft PrepCom Presentation

Mr. Chairman and delegates to the 1998 session of the NPT Preparatory Committee, I greatly appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and to present some ideas developed by the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition.

You meet at a propitious time. With a new millenium rapidly approaching, the people of this planet would like to enter the new century free from the threat of nuclear holocaust. In the next two weeks you delegates here assembled have a great opportunity to take decisive action to set the course for the abolition of all nuclear weapons on Earth.

The moral grounds for nuclear abolition was expressed in a statement by Cardinal Danneels and Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, which you have received. Their words reflect a broad consensus with the world's religious community. They stated:

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

I believe that most of you in your heart of hearts, in the deep recesses of your mind, agree with this conclusion. The challenge to you is to let your moral judgment guide your actions.

The religious viewpoint is elaborated in a statement developed by the Christian Peace Conference in the Czech Republic. In advocating the total rejection of nuclear weapons, the statement stresses two fundamental points: the threat to Creation and the contribution to moral degradation. Please listen carefully to the words.

"Nuclear weapons fundamentally differ from all other weapons because of their potential to destroy all life on this planet. They are terminal in relation to Nature. They can destroy the divine Creation. In religious and theological understanding, they take from God the sole power to end the created order, and thus usurp the divine prerogative. They put Man on an equal with God. Nuclear weapons can destroy what God has created and is creating; they have the potential to frustrate the divine purpose in Creation on our world. Nuclear weapons stand condemned because they can destroy "the sacred gift of life" and are thus innately demonic and blasphemous.

"The terrible suffering caused by nuclear weapons, their potential for total destruction, and their perversion of the fundamental nature of matter have contributed immeasurably to the moral degradation of humanity in our time. The latter has escalated terribly: from the mass slaughter of World War I, the mass bombing of cities in World War II, and the Nazi concentration camps to the development of nuclear weapons and their use on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the 1945. The appalling moral decline is readily evident. The East-West nuclear confrontation with the readiness of states to commit global genocide further hugely contributed to the moral de-sensitization of our age, now so evident in many aspects of contemporary life.

"The continuing readiness of nuclear weapon states to inflict huge suffering and awesome destruction, inherent in nuclear deterrence policy, indicates a "genocidal mentality" wholly incompatible both with the moral tenets of

Christianity and other world religions and with building a moral human community and peaceful global community."

We thank our Czech brothers and sisters for these eloquent words. Not only does possession of nuclear weapons represent genocidal mentality, it also contains a self-destructive tendency, hidden by a false sense of security.

Thus, while the nuclear weapon states believe that their arsenal provides them with security, but it is their own people who are at greatest risk due to their doctrine of mutually assured destruction. Although the residents of Washington, London, Paris, Moscow, and Beijing don't think much about it, they live at ground zero of where nuclear-armed missiles could strike. Likewise citizens of the allies of nuclear weapon states are vulnerable to nuclear attack because of the established doctrines of the nuclear powers. Any other nation gaining nuclear weapons would join the ranks of the insecure.

As Psalm Two in the Hebrew scripture indicates,

Why do the nations conspire, and the peoples plot in vain?
He who sits in the heavens laugh, the Lord has them in derision.

Yet God must also ache for the people of the nuclear weapon states because of their addiction to nuclear weapons, a self-imposed and self-destructive addiction.

Like many other addictions cure can come in two ways.

First, the addicted can exercise self-will, can renounce the additive substance or orientation, and can through great determination and inner strength free itself from the addiction that is sapping its vitality. In this case, the nuclear weapon states can say individually or join together in a covenant that says, "We renounce the use of nuclear weapons for war-fighting purposes. We renounce nuclear deterrence as an instrument of foreign and military policy." Renunciation would remove the fundamental blockage to carrying out a series of actions that lead to nuclear abolition. Other speakers on this program will describe the steps that can be taken.

Second, friends of the addicted can apply "tough love". They can talk firmly and insist that the addicted take the necessary steps leading out of addiction. In the matter at hand, you delegates from non-nuclear weapon states can exercise tough love by insisting that the nuclear weapon states embark upon a course of action that moves toward nuclear abolition. You can even develop a plan in the form of a nuclear weapons convention to outlaw and abolish nuclear weapons. Even if you are part of a political bloc with one or more nuclear weapon states, true friendship may require you to apply tough love by acting independently and supporting measures leading to nuclear abolition. Beyond that you have a higher loyalty to all humankind, to the well-being of all peoples on Earth.

In a few moments we want to offer you a short period of reflection on how you can exercise your responsibility at this session of the NPT Preparatory Committee. But before doing so, we want you to hear how the development of the nuclear arsenal has adversely affected real people in real situations. For that purpose, I present....[name of speaker from South Pacific]

[After that speaker]

We are greatly indebted to you, [name], for that moving story on how nuclear testing has affected the people of [place]. A similar story could be told of the affects of nuclear testing on indigenous people and other inhabitants living in the vicinity of test sites in the Western United States, Kazakhstan, Siberia, (test site in China), Algeria, and Australia, as well as the South Pacific. But not they alone have suffered. In the days of atmospheric testing radioactive material drifted over most of the United States and many other regions of the world. Others have been harmed by the side effects of mining operations and weapon production facilities. And more than 50 years ago the people of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were victims of the first, and so far only, use of nuclear weapons in war.

In the memory of all these affected people, we ask you to observe one minute of silence. You can use this time in shared contrition for the harm on the human race perpetrated in the nuclear weapon era. You can also reflect what you

and your fellow delegates can accomplish in the next two weeks. You can re-dedicate yourself to working courageously and with imagination to find ways to end the nuclear arms race and rid Earth of this horrible plague on human existence.

May we pause now in silence.

[After one minute.]

In the spirit of renewal and re-dedication, the NGO community would now like to offer you a series of ideas on steps that can be undertaken to achieve the abolition of nuclear weapons.

4/15/98

Howard,

I want to acknowledge that I got your email. I don't have time to look at it now because I'm facing deadlines for mailings of FCNL board materials and agendas. FCNL will continue working on collecting signatures to build the usefulness of the sign on letter. We don't have time now to work on a press conference, as good and important as that project is.

JV

At 11:00 AM 4/14/98 -0700, you wrote:

>Dear Colleagues:

>

>After a brief delay on my part, I drafted the following outline on what
>needs to be done in arranging for a Hill news conference of religious
>leaders on the CTBT. I would like your comments and additions before
>sending this out to more people in our network with an appropriate covering
>note. Please reply by e-mail or call me at 301 896-0013.

>

>I leave for Geneva for two weeks on Friday evening, April 24. I'll do
>what I can in the next ten days to get this news conference set up and find
>others who will bring it to conclusion.

>

>Shalom,

>Howard

>

>###

>

>Religious Leaders News Conference on CTBT

>

>Why: To release "A Statement of American Religious Leaders: Ratify the
CTBT" and

>indicate broad support for the CTBT ratification.

> To urge prompt hearings on the CTBT and floor action before the
>session ends.

>

>When: Soon after the Senate completes its action on NATO.

>

>Where: Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing room.

> Or alternative?

>

>Who: Protestant: Philip Wogamon, or ELCA Bishop Theodore Schneider, or Thom
>Fassett

> of UM General Board of Church and Society

> Catholic: Hallman to confer with Jerry Powers

> Peace churches: Joe Volk

>Jewish: David Saperstein

> Muslim: Mr. Alamoudi

> Black churches: Tyrone Pitts, Progressive Baptist National Convention
> (suggestion added by Hallman)

>

- >Invitees: Senators Helms and Biden
- > Other members of Foreign Relations Committee?
- >
- >Arrangements and assignments
- > Confer with Biden's staff, arrange for room: (Hallman, David Culp, Mark Brown's
- > contact)
- > Invite speakers: Volk talk with Saperstein, Brown with Alamoudi, Hallman with
- > others except Brown talk with Bishop Schneider if he is chosen)
- > Prepare letter with final list of signers: FCNL
- > Arrange for press coverage: consultant
- > Find funds, hire consultant: Hallman, Culp, Volk (?)
- > Invite senators: to be determined
- >
- >Other matters (to be completed)
- >
- >
- >

Joe Volk
Executive Secretary
Friends Committee on National Legislation
245 Second Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002
Phone: 202/ 547-6000
Fax: 202/ 547-6019
E-mail: joe@fcnl.org
Web page: <http://www.fcnl.org/pub/fcnl>

The CTBT grassroots meeting will be as follows:

Date: Thursday, April 16 (tomorrow)

Time: 10:30 a.m. to 12:00 noon

Place: FCNL, 245 Second Street N.E.

We will hear BRIEF reports on what has been accomplished since the last meeting.

The main focus of the meeting will be --- where do we want to be with our CTBT work a month from now? Please come with your ideas and with your willingness to take responsibilities.

Some of us are optimistic and some of us are pessimistic, but all of us need to be involved. This fight needs all of us. So please come to the meeting.

I can report that Sen. Kennedy's staffer recently told some of us that she is hearing absolutely nothing about CTBT. Nothing from the Administration, nothing from other Senators, nothing from the grassroots, nothing from anyone anywhere. Coming in the midst of what we thought was a fairly serious effort by NGOs, those were sobering words.

See you tomorrow.

Shalom,

Bob Tiller

Dear Convenors,

Hope your statements are all coming along well. I have news that the NGO Presentations will be done on the afternoon of Tuesday 28th of April - this gives us less time as we thought they would be done on the Wednesday morning. No matter - all will be well, although I would like to encourage those who have not yet circulated a draft to do so as soon as possible.

I received this message from Simon Carroll on the issue of having names on statements. I would like to suggest, along the same lines as Simon, that there be a general disclaimer in the first speech and again in the last one, stating that these statements have been done in a collaborative effort to reflect the variety of views and do not represent one NGO's position etc etc that the names of the convenors and their contact details be printed in the written version of the speeches which will be distributed to each delegation.

The secretariat has asked that I provide them with the names of the people actually speaking by Tuesday morning which should be no problem, so the speakers will be introduced by name but I will make it clear when I transmit this information to the secretariat that these people are not necessarily representing their organisation per se but a coalition of groups that have formed to produce these statements. Something like that.

How do people feel about this?

love felicity

Simon said:

>
>I believe that statements need to have contact names on them so that
>delegations can follow-up issues raised in them if they so wish --
>its a way of transforming a few minutes of words into something that
>might have an effect long after the PrepCom. Also, I think it may be
>of relevance to media.

>
>I would suggest that as a minimum the following are included:-

>
> 1. a disclaimer along the lines established;
>
> 2. the name and contact details of the presenter (preferably
>including contact details in Geneva).

>
>I would also suggest that the presenter then has obligation and the
>necessary details to refer any enquiries to the relevant contributors
>(if they so wish) to the statement.

>
>best regards,

>Simon.

>

Dear Howard,

Thanks for forwarding the draft of your statement to the NPT PrepCom. It reads very well and I'm confident that it will have a strong impact on the delegates. Here are a few suggestions:

1. The statement from the Christian Peace Conference in the Czech Republic is profound, but a bit lengthy. If you drop the final paragraph, you could insert another statement from a different, perhaps non-Christian, source. (One that I particularly like is from the Native American Iriquois Confederation, which speaks of the principle that all decisions made by tribal leaders must be mindful of the impact of those decisions not only on the present generation, but also on the next seven generations of inhabitants of the earth. Responsible global leadership must insure the well being of all future generations.. Nukes are antithetical to future life. Something like that. You get the drift, I'm sure.

2. I recommend that you add language that states that nuclear weapons are quintessentially dangerous even when unexploded... that all aspects of the mining of fissionable material, the retransport of that material, the contamination of the environment by radioactive waste and the by-products of weapons production, creates enormous damage to the natural environment and incalculable peril all living things.

3. Please say something about the COST of producing, deploying, transporting, safeguarding, launching nukes... the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists estimates the total cost to the United States from 1945-1995 at something like \$ 3.9 trillion... with worldwide cost for all the nuclear powers exceeding \$ 8 trillion over the same period. These are resources stolen from the future generations of the earth.

But I like it very much, and these are only minor suggestions, which you might want to think about including if time allows.

Great job.

Mr. Hallman, I would like to be on your mailing list.

Susan Campbell ---Suspeace@aol.com

Thank you very much, Susan

I want to sign the statement: ACT NOW FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION

Rev. Tord Ström, General Secretary
The Free Church Council of Sweden
Box 1770
S-11 87 Stockholm, Sweden
Phone:+ 46-8 453 68 31
Fax:+ 46-8 453 68 29
E-mail: t.Strom@ekuc.se

At 05:38 AM 4/16/98 +0100, you wrote:

>Howard,

>

>I have received two requests from people who would like to have input into
>this speech

>

>Susan Campbell 424 Haverford Ave, Narberth PA 19072 she said she would get
>back to me with an email soon.

>

>and Hiroyuki Sakurai, from Soka Gakkai International, 212 727 7018 Fax 727
>7020 email sguinny@pop.net

>

>Just letting you know

>

>love felicity

Dear felicity,

We welcome input, but time is running out. I hope they will get in touch with me no latter than tomorrow, Friday, April 17. We've had our request for input out since early March, and it's hard to respond to last minute suggestions. But we'll try.

Shalom,
Howard

>

>

>

At 06:38 PM 4/15/98 +0000, you wrote:

>Dear Howard,

>

>Thanks for forwarding the draft of your statement to the NPT

>PrepCom. It reads very well and I'm confident that it will have a strong

>impact on the delegates. Here are a few suggestions:.....

Dear Clayton,

Thanks for your helpful suggestions. I'll try to work them in, within the limits of space. Do you have the exact quote from the Iriquois Confederation?

Shalom,

Howard

>From Bahig Nassar - Comments on NWFZ presentation already prepared on April the second, 1998.

Dear friends,

This message was sent to

Adam Berry and Jo Tyler, Special NGO Committee for PrepCom.

The following is comment from NGOs on the draft NWFZ presentation.

Kindly forward these comments to all NGOs interested in PrepCom presentations.

I seized the occasion of a conference held in Cairo and discussed the presentation with several participants from outside Egypt who are concerned over conflicts, nuclear disarmament and peace :

1- Some participants request elaboration and further discussions on specific NWFZs of special importance to their regions.

Answer : The aim of the presentation is to present the NGOs program. If we elaborate and discuss a certain NWFZ, the others should be also elaborated and discussed and more time needed for the presentation (between 20 - 30 minutes). However new formulation are needed since my English is not my mother tongue.

2- A comment asks to raise the question of nuclear weapon free seas and oceans.

Answer : I have no objection since already I discuss this issue in a paper under the title "NWFZs : From non proliferation to nuclear disarmament" At the time of the cold war many governments and NGOs raised slogans to free the Baltic, the Adriatic, the Mediterranean and the Indian ocean from fleets carrying nuclear weapons in order to avoid nuclear confrontation between US and USSR fleets.

However, huge nuclear capable fleets are moving freely now in the water of seas and oceans, ready to intervene in any region particularly in the South. Raising this slogans once more will benefit on peoples. I need your advise because inserting this issue in the "presentation requires two more minutes.

3- Some experts ask whether NGOs in Germany, Italy, Japan and other NNWSs members of nuclear capable military alliances will agree to eliminate nuclear weapons deployed in their countries?

Answer : There are already forces in Japan which call for the transformation of their country into a NWF country. Several NGOs in Greece, Spain and Portugal are even campaigning for the dismantlement of NATO or the withdrawal of their countries from NATO. I don't know the position of NGOs in Germany and Italy, but since several NGOs in several countries are ready to raise the slogan they should be supported and the involvement of others in their campaign must be encouraged. This is a major issue of nuclear disarmament which has many positive implications.

4- NGOs from the Middle East mention that it was agreed to discuss Middle East zone at the PrepCom. Meeting and it is advisable if the presentation will draw due attention to this issue.

Answer : No objection, and possibly the following sentence can be added at the end of the para. Which deals with regions of tensions "NGOs appreciate your decision to discuss the issue of eliminating all WMD from the Middle East hoping that your effort will prompt the parties concerned to start negotiation in good faith to achieve this target as soon as possible".

Bahig Nassar

14/4/1998

Dear Mr. Howard W. Hallman,

The Executive Secretary of the Ecumenical Association of Churches in Romania - AIDRom, Mr. Christian TEODORESCU has authorized me to respond to your letter dated April 4, 1998.

AIDRom's Administrative Council (Bishop NIFON of Slobozia and Calarasi - President, Bishop Christoph KLEIN of the Evangelical AC Church in Romania - Vice-President, Bishop Kalman CSIHA of the Reformed Church of Transsylvania - Member, Christian TEODORESCU - Executive Secretary) agree to be added to the signers of the statement on "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition".

Yours in Christ

Adalbert SZAKATS - office secretary AIDRom

Dear Howard Hallman,

With apologies for the delay, I offer the following input on the ICJ/legitimacy issue for your Preamble statement for the NGO Presentations in Geneva on 28 April. I will be attending the whole PrepCom, so would be happy to help you make any last-minute changes. Please let me know if you'd like to discuss this before then. I arrive in Geneva PM Sunday 26 April, and will try to attend the NGO orientation session. I look forward to meeting you.

Best wishes,
Rob Green
Chair, World Court Project (UK)

* * *

NPT PREPCOM, GENEVA: 27 April-8 May 1998

NGO PRESENTATIONS 28 April 1998

PROPOSED DRAFT TEXT ON ICJ/LEGITIMACY FOR PREAMBLE STATEMENT

Most of the nuclear weapons deployed by the nuclear weapon states are far more powerful than those which brought indiscriminate death and suffering to the civilians of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. For example, both the USA and the UK deploy Trident missiles with up to 8 warheads in the 100 kiloton range, a yield 8 times greater than the Hiroshima bomb. The International Court of Justice, in its 8 July 1996 Advisory Opinion, decided that any threat, let alone use of nuclear weapons should comply with international humanitarian law. It is inconceivable that Trident could do so.

The Court also referred to Article VI of the NPT, and went further by agreeing unanimously that all States are under a legal 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." In so doing, it omitted the clause from Article VI relating to a treaty on general and complete disarmament - which hitherto the nuclear States have hidden behind.

Speaking for the Holy See before the First Committee of the UN General Assembly on 15 October 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino stated: "With the valuable admonition offered in the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice, the international community can now see how the legal and moral arguments against nuclear weapons intertwine with the strategic; since nuclear weapons can destroy all life on the planet, they imperil all that humanity has ever stood for, and indeed humanity itself...The gravest consequences for mankind lie ahead if the world is to be ruled by the militarism represented by nuclear weapons rather than the humanitarian law espoused by the International Court of Justice."

Judge Mohammed Bedjaoui, then President of the Court, said: "The nuclear

weapon, the ultimate evil, destabilises humanitarian law which is the law of the lesser evil. The existence of nuclear weapons is therefore a challenge to the very existence of humanitarian law, not to mention their long-term effects of damage to the human environment, in respect to which the right to life must be exercised."

ENDS

Dear Felicity,

Please send draft of religious statement for Geneva. Thank you.

Susan Campbell

Suspeace@aol.com

To: CTBT organizers
From: disarmament
Subject: Clark to Helms on CTBT

North Carolina

The News & Observer

Sunday March 29, 1998

Listening Post
Ideas and issues under discussion in the Triangle

"Helms, Release The Hostage"

>From the Wednesday speech by Gordon Clark, Executive Director of Peace Action, a national anti-nuclear group, given as part of Human Rights Week at N.C. State University.

In September 1997 President Clinton sent the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to the Senate where a two-thirds majority is required for ratification. But so far, Sen. Jesse Helms is using his position as chair of the powerful Foreign Relations Committee to ensure that the test ban — the longest-sought, hardest-fought prize in the history of arms control — doesn't see the light of day . . . He is literally by refusing even to schedule hearings on the topic.

The senator has every right to oppose nuclear arms control treaties, but there are 99 other senators who should be able to cast a vote on this historic agreement as well.

Senator Helms, release the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington, DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

For WHAT YOU CAN DO for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW!
Go to: <http://www.psr.org.ctbtaction.htm>

Dear Dwain:

Since we're now ten days from the reception for NPT Preparatory Committee delegates, you're probably beginning to think about the remarks that Dr. Raiser will make at the reception. It will take place from 18:30 to 20:30 at the Palais des Nations, 8th Floor restaurant, Monday 27 April.

We would like Dr. Raiser to preside, welcome the delegates, and make some remarks. Cardinal Danneels is arriving from Brussels at 6:40 p.m. If his plane is on time, he could arrive at the reception by 7:15. That's probably about the time for Dr. Raiser to start his remarks. He can then introduce Cardinal Danneels. Ambassador Wyzner, chair of the PrepCom, has agreed to speak in response.

The reception can set the tone for the two-week session. It will be an opportunity to inspire the delegates and hold before them the opportunity they have for making substantial progress in the quest for nuclear abolition. This can be based upon underlying morality, as expressed in the statement co-signed by Dr. Raiser and Cardinal Danneels, which has gone out to all the delegations in advance. The statement's point that loyalty to humankind is greater than their loyalty to political blocs deserves repeating.

This relates to political dynamics of the PrepCom. A major challenge is to get members of NATO to split with the United States and support the establishment of a working group to start developing a nuclear weapons convention. The U.S. wants to keep negotiations bilateral with Russia at what I consider a very slow pace. At the UN General Assembly most of the NATO bloc voted against a Malaysian resolution favoring the beginning of multilateral negotiations.

I feel that Dr. Raiser doesn't need to go in depth into substantive policy issues, such as the recommendation in the last part of the Danneels-Raiser statement. Rather his remarks can challenge and inspire, seeking to convince the delegates that this should not be another business-as-usual meeting.

I'll be arriving midday on Saturday, April 25. I will stay at Hotel Luserna, av. de Luserna 12, telephone 345 4676, if you want to get in touch with me.

Do you have a suggestion for a church service in English that I can attend on Sunday?

Shalom,
Howard

Here's an interesting list of U.S. government weblinks obtained from the Washington Times on 4/16/98 at <http://www.washtimes.com/links/links.html>

GOVERNMENT

Agriculture, Department of

.... <http://www.usda.gov>

Air Force

.... <http://www.af.mil>

ArmyLink

.... <http://www.army.mil>

Central Intelligence Agency

.... <http://www.odci.gov/cia>

Code of Federal Regulations (CFR)

.... <http://law.house.gov/cfr.htm>

Commerce, Department of

.... <http://www.doc.gov>

Congressional Voting Records

.... <http://pathfinder.com/CQ>

Defense, Department of

.... <http://www.dtic.dla.mil/defenselink>

Defense Intelligence Agency

.... <http://www.dia.mil>

Education, Department of

.... <http://www.ed.gov>

Embassy Directory

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

Embassies

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

Energy, Department of

.... <http://www.doe.gov>

Environmental Protection Agency

.... <http://www.epa.gov>

FBI

.... <http://www.fbi.gov>

Federal Aviation Administration

.... <http://www.faa.gov>

Federal Documents

....

http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/sale/asale001.html

Federal Register

....

http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/aces/aaces001.html

Federal Information Exchange, Inc.

.... http://www.fie.com/www/us_gov.htm

Federal Trade Commission

.... <http://www.ftc.gov>

Fedworld

.... <http://www.fedworld.gov>

Food & Drug Administration

.... <http://www.fda.gov>

Government Printing Office

.... <http://www.access.gpo.gov>

Health & Human Services

. . . . <http://www.os.dhhs.gov>
House of Representatives (U.S.)
. . . . <http://www.house.gov>
Housing & Urban Development
. . . . <http://www.hud.gov>
Intelligence Community
. . . . <http://www.odci.gov/ic>
Internal Revenue Service
. . . . <http://www.irs.ustreas.gov/>
Interior, Department of
. . . . <http://www.doi.gov>
Justice, Department of
. . . . <http://www.usdoj.gov>
Labor, Department of
. . . . <http://www.dol.gov>
Library of Congress
. . . . <http://www.loc.gov>
. . . . <http://www.lcweb.loc.gov>
Marine Corps
. . . . <http://www.usmc.mil>
NASA
. . . . <http://www.nasa.gov>
National Institutes of Health
. . . . <http://www.nih.gov>
Navy
. . . . <http://www.ncts.navy.mil>
NOAA
. . . . <http://www.noaa.gov>
Peace Corps
. . . . <http://www.peacecorps.gov>
Postal Service
. . . . <http://www.usps.gov>
Senate (U.S.)
. . . . <http://www.senate.gov>
Social Security Administration
. . . . <http://www.ssa.gov>
Social Security benefits
. . . .
<http://www.ssa.gov/OACT/ANYPIA/anypia.html>
Small Business Administration
. . . . <http://www.sbaonline.sba.gov/intro.html>
Smithsonian Institution
. . . . <http://www.si.edu/newstart.htm>
State, Department of
. . . . <http://www.state.gov>
State Dept. Travel Warnings
. . . . <http://travel.state.gov>
Treasury, Department of
. . . . <http://www.ustreas.gov>
Transportation, Department of
. . . . <http://www.dot.gov>
United Nations
. . . . <http://www.un.org>
U.S. Code

.... <http://law.house.gov/usc.htm>
U.S. Constitution
....

<http://www.law.cornell.edu/constitution/constitution.overview.html>
U.S. Customs Service

....
<http://www.ustreas.gov/treasury/bureaus/customs/npr.html>
U.S. Govt Consumer Information Center
.... <http://www.pueblo.gsa.gov>
U.S. Tax Code
.... <http://www.fourmilab.ch/ustax/ustax.html>
Veterans Administration
.... <http://www.va.gov>
Visa Information
.... http://travel.state.gov/visa_services.html
White House
.... <http://www.whitehouse.gov>

MEDIA

Links to web sites of affiliated publications of
The Washington Times:

Insight Magazine

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

The Middle East Times (Cairo)

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

The Washington Times National Weekly
Edition

.... <http://www.washtimes-weekly.com>

The World & I

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

The Washington Times "top"

English-language newspapers and news sites:

Asahi Shimbun

.... <http://www.asahi.com/english/english.html>

Asia Times

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

The Australian

.... <http://www.australian.aust.com/>

Brazil Financial Wire (Agencia Estado)

.... <http://www.ageestado.com/bfw/>

C-SPAN

.... <http://www.c-span.org>

The Calgary Sun

.... <http://www.canoe.ca/CalgarySun/>

Central Europe Online

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

China News Service

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

CNN Interactive

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

Gulf News (UAE)
.... <http://www.gulf-news.com>
Inside China Today
.... <http://www.insidechina.com>
ITAR-Tass Russian News Agency
.... <http://www.itar-tass.com/>
The Jerusalem Post
.... <http://www.jpost.co.il>
The Korea Herald
.... <http://www.koreaherald.co.kr/>
Kyodo News Service
.... <http://home.kyodo.co.jp>
London Daily Telegraph
.... <http://www.telegraph.co.uk>
Malaysia Star
.... <http://www.jaring.my/~star>
Mexican Electronic Monitor
.... <http://ciac.cem.itesm.mx/monitor/>
NET Political Newstalk Network
.... <http://net.fceref.org/comm/commlin1.htm>
Russia today
.... <http://www.russiatoday.com>
Sri Lanka Sunday Times
.... <http://www.lacnet.org/suntimes>
The Straits Times (Singapore)
.... <http://straitstimes.asia1.com/>
Taiwan News
....
http://ww3.sinanet.com/news/0515news/index_E.html
To the Contrary
.... <http://www.pbs.org/ttc>
Toronto Globe and Mail
.... <http://www.globeandmail.ca/>
Vladivostok News
.... <http://vlad.tribnet.com>
Zambia Post
....
<http://www.zamnet.zm/zamnet/post/post.html>

NATIONAL SECURITY

Advanced Research Projects Agency
.... <http://www.arpa.mil>
Air Force
.... <http://www.af.mil>
Armed Forces Staff College
.... <http://www.ndu.edu/ndu/afsc/afscstop.html>
ArmyLink
.... <http://www.army.mil>
Center for Strategic & International Studies
.... <http://www.csis.org>
Central Intelligence Agency
.... <http://www.odci.gov/cia>
Centre for Strategic Studies

.... <http://www.vuw.ac.nz/css>
Defense, Department of
.... <http://www.dtic.dla.mil/defenselink>
Defense Intelligence Agency
.... <http://www.dia.mil>
FBI
.... <http://www.fbi.gov>
Intelligence Community
.... <http://www.odci.gov/ic>
Jane's Information Store
.... <http://www.janes.com/janes.html>
Justice, Department of
.... <http://www.usdoj.gov>
Marine Corps
.... <http://www.usmc.mil>
National Defense University
.... <http://www.ndu.edu>
Navy
.... <http://www.ncts.navy.mil>
RAND Corp
.... <http://www.rand.org>
State, Department of
.... <http://www.state.gov>
State Dept. Travel Warnings
.... <http://travel.state.gov>
War, Peace and Security/Canadian Forces
College
.... <http://www.cfcsc.dnd.ca/>

REFERENCE

MATERIALS

Almanac (Old Farmer's
.... <http://www.almanac.com/>
Census Bureau (U.S.)
.... <http://www.census.gov>
CIA World Factbook
....
<http://www.odci.gov/cia/publications/95fact/index.html>
Dictionaries
.... <http://www.rahul.net/lai/glossaries.html>
Encyclopaedia Britannica
.... <http://www.eb.com/>
"Homework Helper"
.... <http://www.elibrary.com>
Jane's Information Store
.... <http://www.janes.com/janes.html>
Maps
.... <http://www.mapquest.com>
Telephone prefix lookup
.... <http://www.natltele.com/form.html>
Thesaurus (Roget's)
.... <http://www.thesaurus.com/>
Thomas (Library of Congress)
.... <http://thomas.loc.gov>

Toll-free directory
.... <http://www.tollfree.att.net>
U.N. Treaty database
.... <http://www.un.org/Depts/Treaty>
U.S. National Debt Clock
.... http://www.brillig.com/debt_clock
Virtual Law Library
....
<http://www.law.indiana.edu/law/lawindex.html>
Weather Forecasts
.... <http://iwin.nws.noaa.gov/iwin/main.html>
White Pages
....
<http://www.switchboard.com/bin/cgiqa.dll?MG=>
Who's Who Online
.... <http://www.whoswho-online.com>
World Fact Book (CIA)
....
<http://www.odci.gov/cia/publications/95fact/index.html>
World History Chart
.... <http://www.hyperhistory.com>
World Population Chart
....
<http://www.census.gov/cgi-bin/ipc/popclockw>
ZIP Code lookup and address information
.... <http://www.usps.gov/ncsc>

Dear Felicity,

To keep you up to date: We're making progress on the draft on spiritual and ethical perspective and should soon have a copy ready to circulate more widely. We asked Marie Pierre Bovy of France to be the presenter, but she has another engagement elsewhere at the time. We've learned that Catholic Bishop Thomas Gumbleton from Detroit is going to be in Geneva during the first days of the PrepCom, so we're going to ask him to make the presentation. He was on the committee that drafted the Catholic bishops' pastoral letter in 1983 and has always favored more radical policies of nuclear abolition than the U.S. bishops as a whole have been willing to adopt. We will be able to get his input on the final draft.

Shalom,
Howard

Howard,

Thanks for this. I'll share it with Konrad.

On Sunday, you might enjoy worshiping in the English-speaking Lutheran church where many WCC stamm members attend. It is located in Rue de Verdaine.

We are getting quite a number of calls from missions about the reception. We are also at a loss, since we have never received a copy of it ourselves, except for the email version. Could you please fax me a copy ASAP, and send a couple of the printed ones today?

Racing on, but with gratitude for your note,

Dwain

Dear Mr Hallman

I am pleased to add my name to the statement "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition".

My details are as follows:

Rev John Reardon
General Secretary
Council of Churches for Britain and Ireland
Inter-Church House
35-41 Lower Marsh
London SE1 7RL
Great Britain
Telephone: 0171-620 4444
Fax: 0171-928 0010
E-mail: gensec@ccbi.org.uk

Yours sincerely

John Reardon

To: dave@paxchristiusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Request for copy of invitation
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Dave:

I have received the following message from Dwain Epps at the World Council of Churches:

"We are getting quite a number of calls from missions about the reception. We are also at a loss, since we have never received a copy of it ourselves, except for the email version. Could you please fax me a copy ASAP, and send a couple of the printed ones today?"

Would you please respond to his request? His fax number is 41 22 791 6409. His e-mail address is dce@wcc-coe.org, and his mailing address is World Council of Churches, 150, route de Ferney, P.O. Box 2100, 1211 Geneva 2, Switzerland.

I've never seen one either. Please send one to my home: 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817.

Thanks,
Howard

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Fri, 17 Apr 1998 11:26:32 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: how to augment the CTBT effort -- your comments welcome

April 17, 1998

TO: Test Ban Colleagues
FR: Daryl Kimball, Director, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

RE: Augmenting the Test Ban Treaty Campaign - PLEASE DO NOT CIRCULATE THIS MEMO OUTSIDE OF YOUR OFFICE/ORGANIZATION

As we approach the possible "final" phase of our test ban campaign, we need to consider what efforts can be undertaken to strengthen and broaden our effort. This is all the more important given that an anonymous donor has expressed interest in making a major contribution to the CTBT effort. The donor is working through a go-between who, in the last few days, has asked me and several others what could be done to improve the CTBT effort. Initial decisions about which projects might receive additional support and how those projects might be implemented need to be made within approximately one week (by April 24).

To avoid having our go-between receive numerous unsolicited calls, I've been asked to help advance the process by forwarding additional views and suggestions from Coalition members about practical suggestions for strengthening the community's CTBT work. If you have not been contacted by the "go-between" for your suggestions, feel free to e-mail them to me and I will immediately forward them.

As a starting point for your comments and/or suggestions, I have attached below the memo that I drafted and sent on the 14th to the go-between about what I believe are worthwhile projects that could be undertaken with additional funding. It is based on my perspective, as director of the Coalition, of our overall CTBT effort and what holes need to be filled, what work is valuable and needs to be bolstered, and who is out there to do the work, whether they are Coalition members or plain old CTBT supporters. Tom Collina has reviewed this memo and provided his comments and suggestions.

Timing for NGO and Decisions About Funding:

If events play out as we hope and plan, the CTBT could be a "front and center" foreign policy issue as soon as late-May or more likely, early-June. (See my memo from earlier this week, "Outlook for CTBT.") We should have a clearer, though not entirely precise, idea about whether the CTBT will be front and center and will be voted on this year, or not, by some time around the second to third week in May.

Given the possibility of this timeframe, we should be mindful of which items can be implemented relatively quickly and easily and which would take longer to put into place so as to help our effort.

The memo is divided into four parts:

PART 1 provides further detail and suggestions about a) media work, b) lobbying, c) grassroots/outreach, and d) polling work that can significantly boost our effort;

PART 2 describes a plan, with cost estimates from the Mellman and Wirthlin polling groups for substantial, new state-specific polling work on the CTBT;

PART 3 summarizes specific CTBT projects that are planned or underway. Most of these projects are being coordinated through the CTBT Working Group of the Coalition, some are projects of individual member groups or other groups supporting the CTBT;

DK

PART 1: OVERVIEW & COMMENTS ON PROJECTS TO AUGMENT THE CTBT EFFORT

The following is a list of new or existing projects in four categories (media; lobbying; polling; grassroots/outreach) that I believe can make the biggest difference to the CTBT effort. It also suggests how such work might be implemented. In some cases, the work might best be coordinated through the Coalition, in other cases it could most effectively be done by individual organizations, and in other cases, it is important to make sure that there are sufficient resources to ensure that good people doing good work can continue doing that work.

It is also based on the view that our effort will be most effective if we can communicate the strong support of a wide and diverse range of public and elite opinion. In other words, we can't afford to simply mobilize the already converted -- although that is very important also. The key to success, I believe, lies in motivating a small number of undecided Republicans to publicly support the Treaty weeks before the vote.

Cost estimates are rough guesses -- further definition of the scope of work and solicitation of bids from consultants would be needed to nail down the figures.

I have also listed, within each category, the relative priority order of the projects.

A. Media Work:

To date, our success in raising awareness and attention to the CTBT has been limited because the issue is simply not considered to be "in play" by most reporters and editors. However, when and if the Senate takes on the issue, this will change drastically. At the moment we have a basic "infrastructure" in place to deliver our message. We have in place, with NSNS, a very good editorial board effort, with the support of certain NGOs the Coalition has the ability

to organize small to medium scale press briefings, and the Coalition has an up to date media lists and a fax-blast capability in place.

However, we do not have the ability at the moment to reach major radio talk show markets, to place a significant number of op-eds on the CTBT, or to blanket a few key states with advertising. It would be a stretch to organize a major press event here in DC (even if several groups worked together through the Coalition) without reducing our ability to accomplish work in other areas, and we do not, as far as I can see, have the ability to support well-done locally organized press events. Some or all of these could be very useful in the weeks ahead.

High Priority:

* Editorials: these are universally considered to be very influential. Bill Eisenstein has been doing a great job with 2 mailings to editors and follow-up calls. Despite the paucity of news on the issue, about 25 pro-CTBT editorials have been written since September.

More editorials from more papers are needed. With necessary funding and staff for the NSNS work, we are in shape to continue the effort.

* Op-Eds: less influential than editorials, op-eds are nevertheless important vehicles to demonstrate support by "unusual suspects," local figures, and to define the term of the public debate. The Coalition will be hiring Elliott Negin for 2 weeks for 40 hours of work (for \$2000) to help place op-eds to be written by Coalition members and others. Elliott will be working out of the NSNS office in May on this project.

This effort will depend on the number and quality of op-eds I can encourage Coalition members to write and it is limited by the funds available to for Elliot's time. This effort could be greatly augmented with the addition of a writer to draft op-eds for placement.

This would require hiring a writer/consultant and/or an appropriate P.R. firm. COST: \$5,000 in addition to the \$2,000 committed by the Coalition.

* Radio Talk Shows: this is where most people get their "news." Ideally, in June and July, we need to make the CTBT an issue on these shows. As Mark Sommer has said, it is difficult to work an issue on radio if it is not considered "in play." However, if an effort is made, some placements will be achieved -- a net plus for our effort. The Coalition has a long list of excellent experts for such an effort. What would be helpful would be for the Mainstream Media Project to get involved and/or hire the appropriate consultant or P.R firm to assist. COST: \$5,000-10,000 ?

* Media Consultation Assistance for Various DC Press Events: there are a few opportunities to generate good press with some small additional expert assistance to each of the groups working on these projects.

-- FCNL and Meth. United for Peace with Justice is working on a religious leaders sign-on letter, which is due to be finalized by about May 10. MUPJ and FCNL could use the help of a media consultant or P.R. firm to help. COST: \$3,000 ?

-- The Stimson Ctr. is working on a June 10 event featuring Joe Biden. Daryl and Tom have agreed to help, but the event will be time-consuming and, in my view, it might be useful to be able to hire a part time-consultant for that project or to hire a P.R. firm to assist. COST: \$2,000 ?

-- UCS is organizing a scientists/defense experts letter that should be finalized in May. Additional resources for publicizing the event would help ensure that UCS can do the job really well. COST: \$3,000 ?

Lower Priority:

*Advertising: radio advertising could have a very useful effect in the days leading up to a vote on CTBT. Given our limited staff resources, this might ideally be part of the workplan for a P.R. firm that might be hired. COST: ??? (20/20 will check into approximate costs.)

Other types of advertising would not, in my view, be cost effective, except possibly a short series of print ads in Roll Call. COST: \$10,000 - \$15,000

* Organizing Events for Prominent Spokesperson in Key States: to date, only a few organizations have sent newsworthy individuals into the field for speaking/organizing/press events (Peace Action, 20/20, FCNL, UCS, APS). We do not have any group organizing speaking events by notables such as Herb York, Paul Warnke, Tom Graham, former Reps or Senators, etc.

Such an effort could provide a strong local news angle that helps prompt local stories, editorials, and talk show coverage. It also can help to fire-up the local organizers and assist in outreach to new constituencies.

This project would require significant lead time to put into place (with speakers going into the field no earlier than early June) and would require a staff person in DC working at least half-time for about 8 weeks. COST: ???

B. LOBBYING ASSISTANCE FROM A FORMER SENATOR

At the moment, our ability to reach Republican Senators, either in their home states or in DC is very limited. Our access to Democrats is extremely good. Our access to the Rs may improve as a vote nears, but it will likely only be with staff. The number of people in our community who are actively engaged in direct lobbying is very limited and the amount of time actually spent lobbying is unfortunately too limited: the list includes David Culp, John Isaacs, Tom Collina, Daryl Kimball, Joe Volk, Marie Rietmman, Bob Tiller, Erik Pages (who is primarily focused on other issues now), Howard Hallman, and Francis Slakey of APS, and Mary Brooks at LWV (who would be assisting if other issues did not at this time occupy her energy.)

Therefore, the addition of lobbying support by a firm with excellent direct access to Senators would be beneficial and could be a major factor in either a) simply providing us with more accurate intelligence on the positions of Senators; b) helping to win them over; or c) both. The key questions are who this person/firm might be and how much they might cost. Ideally we are talking about a former Senator. John Isaacs has been exploring this

possibility and may have more details to offer.

It does not seem to me that a high-priced lobbying firm that only has access to Senate Rep. staffers is of sufficient benefit.

It is also important to that the community continues to have David Culp's very valuable help on the CTBT campaign.

C. GRASSROOTS & OUTREACH WORK

At this point there are a large number of individuals and organizations involved in the grassroots effort, however, our ability to mobilize action in the states from our offices here in Washington has only recently begun to deliver significant results and we need to augment and accelerate work in several key states if we are to see the CTBT approved in 1998.

Thus far, most efforts have been aimed at:

- mobilizing letters, calls, etc. from our base
- the members of grassroots NGOs
- meetings in the states with Senators and/or staff
- letters to the editor

We are beginning to see some results, especially in states where we have concentrated our efforts over the last several months -- Maine, Oregon, Penn., Ohio, Alaska, Tenn., and Nebraska.

However, we are not now in good shape to replicate that work in several other key states and more work needs to be done in the states we have been concentrating on. Specifically, there has been, in my view, too little emphasis on outreach at the local level and here in DC to engaging the support of "unusual suspects" (i.e. labor unions, religious leaders, environmental groups, civic groups, veterans, elected leaders, etc.)

High Priority:

* Field Organizers in Key States: the addition of new staff resources at the local level could make a major difference. Ideally there might be 5-6 field organizers in 5-6 states who would work from approximately June 1- July 31 to: identify and recruit new constituencies to support the CTBT; encourage those constituencies to write, meet, and call their Senators; and support similar work by peace, religious, and disarmament groups in the state. Ideally, there should be a "supervisor" or liaison for their activities. I would suggest that the process for identifying states and potential grantees should be based on:

- 1) relative political importance of the state to ratification
 - 2) whether there is a person or existing organization available to do the job in that state;
 - 3) whether the organizer can begin work in time to have an impact
 - 4) whether a state-specific poll is being conducted in that state.
- Organizers could substantially increase the punch of the polling results

through letters to the editor and editorial board visits.

My initial take on the states where such an effort might have a substantial impact are: Oregon and/or Washington (it is not clear whether Oregon Peaceworks will be able to do the job); Nebraska and/or Kansas (unless Neb. for Peace are committing major resources to CTBT already); Utah (WAND has recently conducted a CTBT field expedition there, please check with Kim Robson); Kentucky and/or Tenn., Ohio; Iowa (there is an existing group, STAR that FCNL has contact with); Mississippi (where we do not have a good base).

Other states that are important include: Maine; Colorado; Missouri; Indiana, Virginia.

COST: would vary depending on the size of the grants and the number of states, but \$25,000 to \$30,000 to at least four states would be necessary, in my view, to make a significant difference.

* action alert postcards: the production of an updated, perhaps more interesting looking 20/20 style postcard would be useful in activating and reaching out to new groups, not yet involved, such as environmental and religious organizations. COST: for 35,000 cards, \$3000-\$5000.

* additional 20/20-style conference calls: the recent 20/20 Vision Alaska organizing poll was quite successful. Additional conference calls, particularly in states where there is not a strong grassroots infrastructure could generate much needed call and letters in those areas. COST: a 20 person, 1hr call costs approx. \$350, plus staff time to organize the call.

* letters to the the editor: letters to the editor are very effective to our effort.

I would recommend that if it is necessary, additional funds would be well spent to make sure that 20/20 or another group can devote part of a full-time staff person to the task. This staff person might be the same person that is responsible for pulling together additional conference calls. COST: ???

* Focused Outreach to NGOs from DC: despite have the tools (the Danforth/Exon/Hatfield sign- on letter and other sign-on letters) to recruit additional constituencies to support our effort, we have not really succeeded in expanding the base of support beyond the peace, disarmament, and progressive religious denominations.

It would be highly beneficial to have a well-trained staff person available to work with Coalition organizations and others to solicit the support of "unusual suspects" constituencies (i.e. labor unions, religious leaders, environmental groups, civic groups, veterans, elected leaders, etc.) through a "door-to-door" campaign among offices, organizations, and through the telephone. This person would ideally be working in close coordination with the state field organizers who would be aiming to get support for the CTBT from the same types of constituencies, although at the local level.

Depending on the skill level, scope of work, and length of the job, this "Outreach Coordinator" might cost anywhere from \$5,000 to \$10,000.

Lower Priority:

* Student Organizing: some modest efforts have been undertaken by Michael Pancook at UCS, Lisa Ledwidge at PSR, Bridget Moix at FCNL, and Kathy Crandall to mobilize students on the CTBT. A packet was organized and mailed by UCS. Such work could help generate important additional numbers of contacts with Senate offices. However, given that the semester ends for most campuses in late May, perhaps the best approach here would be to ensure that those who are already working on student organizing can continue to do so through the summer.

Other Projects to Consider:

* Disarmament Clearinghouse: I think that it is important that the Clearinghouse is available for the remainder of the 1998 CTBT campaign. Among other reasons, Kathy's work has been important in keeping communication lines open among grassroots groups in DC and in the field. There is no easy way to compensate for the absence of these services.

* Marie Rietmman: I think that it is important that 20/20 is able to keep Marie on board for the remainder of the 1998 CTBT campaign. Marie has been a real boost to our efforts.

D. PUBLIC OPINION POLLING: see Part 2, below

PART 2: Draft Plan for Augmenting State-Wide Polling Efforts on the CTBT

The American public's strong and consistent support for the test ban is one of the most influential factors working in favor of the CTBT. We have successfully demonstrated this with the often cited September 1997 national polling survey that the Coalition commissioned The Mellman Group to conduct. (Seventy-percent support for Senate ratification, 13.5 percent opposed.) Our colleagues in the Clinton Administration and on the Hill tell us that they believe that additional polling work could be one of the most important contributions to the CTBT effort.

However strong, the national polling numbers do not seem to have forced enough Senators to take note of the public's support of the CTBT. Even if we were to conduct a more thorough bipartisan national poll on the CTBT, I do not think that it would have a substantial impact on the key Senators nor would it be considered especially newsworthy by editors, especially given that the poll showing 70% support was conducted very recently.

But, given that several undecided Senators are running for re-election this fall, the polling numbers demonstrating strong, bipartisan public support for the CTBT could play an pivotal part in their decision-making. The

Coalition, at John Isaacs suggestion, has been trying since November to "tag-on" our basic CTBT question to statewide polls being conducted by well-known Democratic and Republican pollsters. I am now a strong supporter of this novel approach.

One such poll has been conducted (Colorado in December-Jan.) showing great numbers in support of the CTBT, but with mixed success in getting the information into news articles. (I think this was mainly due to releasing the results just before the Superbowl and before the CTBT issue was considered relevant by the CO news media.) Unfortunately because there are just too few state-wide polls to which we can add our question, it is now clear that this "tag-along" strategy will not give us the state-wide results that might make a difference in time for the CTBT debate.

Proposal for Bipartisan Statewide Polling in Seven Key States:

Additional financial support would help us overcome the polling challenges described above and could provide us with the ability to rapidly and more pointedly focus attention on the public's support for the Treaty and expectation for Senate action, not delay. If these or other CTBT efforts help encourage 2-3 Republican Senators to openly express their support for CTBT ratification in '98, the chances that we can pry the Treaty out of Helms' clutches would significantly improve.

Based on initial estimates from the Mellman and Wirthlin polling groups, the Coalition could commission a set of 5-7 minute, bipartisan polls covering 7 key states for approximately \$42,000. A 5-7 minute poll would allow for 2-4 questions, plus relevant demographic information. This price would include questionnaire development, telephone interviewing, sampling design, data processing, cross-tabulation of data, oral and written report of the findings, and ongoing consultation and Hill/Administration/press briefings, plus consultation fees for the Wirthlin group to partner in the research.

Before committing the entire sum to this approach, we could "test" the results of this polling approach by conducting the poll in one or two states, quickly judging its success, and then moving ahead with the other states.

The key states where we would most likely poll are:

- * Washington/Oregon -- this would be a combination poll, with a sample size of 500. Washington has one undecided Republican Senator (Gorton); Oregon has another undecided Republican who is also on the SFRC (Smith).

- * Utah -- sample size 400. Utah has two undecided Republican Senators.
- * Tennessee -- sample size 400. Tenn. has two undecided Republican Senators.

- * Nebraska/Kansas -- this would be a combination poll, with a sample size of 500. Nebraska has one swing Republican Senator (Hagel) who is also on the SFRC; Kansas has 2 undecided Republicans, one of whom is on the SFRC (Brownback).

- * Maine - sample size 400. Maine has 2 undecided Republican Senators.

With such a significant investment such additional polling, it is important that we have sufficient resources and staff to move the information in the news media. I estimate (and I have not had time to get bids from potential media consultants) that an additional \$3,000 to \$4,000 would be necessary to hire a dedicated media consultant to assist the Coalition with some or all of the following tasks:

- press release/polling results presentation materials
- national press conference/briefing summarizing results from all states
- op-ed development/placement based on results
- press outreach in individual states
- liason with state and local NGOs on the use of the polling results

This additional media consultant cost could be covered with existing Coalition resources if necessary.

It is my sense, based on informal discussions, that Coalition groups -- of both the grassroots and "think tank" varieties -- would find additional state-specific polling very helpful and they would strongly support the project if additional funds were available.

Summary:

This plan would allow us to conduct seven new, bipartisan state-wide polls and enable us to do a profession job of releasing the results within about four to five weeks of deciding to do so. The total price tag: approximately \$42,000, plus \$3,000-\$4,000 to assist in publicizing the results.

The Coalition's remaining financial resources might still allow us to conduct a 5-7 minute national poll on the CTBT (at a cost of roughly \$9,000 - \$10,000) if we find that to be useful. We would however have to redirect some funds from other areas of our budget to accomplish this. We also would still have the option of conducting 1-2 more state-wide "tag-along" polls (approx. \$750), with the best possibility in Ohio in May or June.

PART 3: CTBT WORKING GROUP ACTIVITIES (Planned and Underway)

A. Media Work/Briefings:

- *placing op-eds after conclusion of NATO vote (May) -- Coalition & NSNS with op-ed consultant hired by Coalition
- *editorial board mailing followup (ongoing) -- Bill Eisenstein, NSNS
- *collecting pro-CTBT editorials on Coalition web site (Jenny Smith of Coalition & NSNS, ongoing)
- * encouraging and tracking letters to the editor on CTBT (ongoing) -- 20/20 Vision, others
- * Monterrey Inst. sponsored Hill/reporters luncheon on CTBT entry into force issues (May ?) -- Parachini
- * Stimson-sponsored CTBT event on Hill featuring Sen. Biden (June 10) - Earle, Krepon, Collina, Kimball, J. Smith
- * national radio talk show circuit -- ??? Mainstream Media Project w/Coalition grps?

- * regular contact with CTBT "beat" reporters (ongoing) -- Coalition, UCS, APS, ACA, others ???
- * encouraging letters to the editor (ongoing) -- primarily 20/20 Vision
- * CATO Institute "debate" on the CTBT (held on March 31) -- prompted by Rietmann and Collina

B. Polling:

- * possible state-wide polls on CTBT in Ohio two or other states (May ?) -- Coalition
- * with substantial additional support, 7 state-specific bipartisan polls -- Coalition

C. Outreach to other constituencies:

- * Nobel Laureates letter in support of CTBT (finalized, awaiting high-level support from Administration)-- American Physical Society
- * Scientists and defense experts letter (UCS)
- * Hatfield/Danforth/Exon/Kopetski/Green/Downey outreach letter to NGOs (issued Feb. 9, finalized in May?) -- Jenny Smith &, CLW, with limited support from several Coalition groups
- * gathering support of medical associations ??? -- PSR??
- * gathering support of university students (ongoing) -- UCS, 20/20 Vision, Disarm. Clearinghouse
- * History/foreign affairs professors letter (finalized in March, for release in May) -- Coalition & CLW
- * Religious leaders letter (finalized in March, for release in May) -- FCNL, MUPJ

D. Analysis and Briefing Materials:

- * Coalition booklet distribution (ongoing) -- Jenny Smith of the Coalition
- * additional issue briefs for fax-blast to Hill staff, reporters, editors (ongoing) -- Kimball, Collina & exp. adv. grp.
- * Council for a Livable Wld. briefing book for Senate staff (done) -- Isaacs at CLW
- * Coalition Report on CTBT Verification Issues (complete, for release in May or June) -- Collina, Kimball & exp. adv. grp
- * BAS article rebutting points raised by Kathleen Bailey in Senate testimony against CTBT - - Collina, Paine

E. Web Sites and E-mail dedicated to CTBT:

- * the Coalition maintains extensive CTBT site and sends regular CTBT updates via e-mail to DC-based NGOs, the Hill, and the Administration
- * the Disarm. Clearinghouse has just started a CTBT Action Alert Site for any and all grassroots-based groups to link to and it also sends regular CTBT/disarmament updates via e-mail to CTBT contacts and activists across the country

F. The Executive Branch:

- * regular contact/strategy discussion/info. sharing with NSC and CTBT IWG and other key agencies (Kimball with Collina, Culp (DOE), Isaacs)

G. The Senate: work conducted by Ad Hoc Hill Wkg. Group (Collina; Isaacs; Culp; Slakey; Brooks; Reitman; Teplitz; Tiller; Robson; others) which meets after each CTBT Working Group Meeting.

- * gathering support for Bingaman letter to Helms on Treaty (April) -- Culp and others
- * DC meetings with key Senate staff (ongoing) -- Isaacs, Culp, Kimball, Collina, Hallman, Reitman, others)
- * organizing June 10 floor speeches on the CTBT -- Kimball, Culp, Collina, others
- regular contact & info. sharing with Sen. Democratic leaders (Collina, Culp, Isaacs, Kimball, others)
- * master file on Senate positions -- Isaacs
- * collect Senators' statements and letters from constituents --Coalition office, 20/20 Vision, Disarmament Clearinghouse
- * maintain swing list -- Culp
- * completing profiles on individual Senators -- ??
- * coordination with state visits by activists -- Nuclear Weapons Working Grp. organizations, Am. Phys. Soc.
- * monitoring CTBT discussion in relevant Senate budget and foreign policy hearings -- Culp

H. Grassroots Outreach and Education Highlights: Grassroots educational work in being undertaken at the national level primarily by PSR, Peace Action, WAND, 20/20 Vision, Disarmament Clearinghouse, FCNL, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, Women's Action for New Directions, UCS. Other organizations that are devoting effort include WFA, LWV, some ANA groups.

These and other grassroots organizations discuss CTBT field strategy at the weekly Nuclear Weapons Working Group Meeting, once monthly meetings on CTBT organizing convened by PSR, and monthly meetings involving the broader religious community convened by Howard Hallman. A short report on field work is delivered at each CTBT Wkg. Grp. mtg. of the Coalition.

i. Postcards; letter; phone calls; e-mail to Senate offices --

- * since November, at least 35,000 action alert postcard produced by 20/20 have been distributed by dozens of national and local groups in key states
- * on February 1, 7500 postcards were sent to member of religious denominations in states of members of the Senate Foreign Rel. Committee
- * in March, an updated 20/20 Vision action alert card will be distributed in key states by dozens of groups
- * in April, Working Asset Long Distance made the CTBT one of their two priority actions, which is likely to produce 35,000 communications to 50 Senate offices
- * several other organizations (national and state) have sent action alert to all or part of their memberships
- * CTBT Action Kits have been assembled and distributed to key state contacts by the Disarmament Clearinghouse

iii. Local coalition building/outreach -- by local organizations and chapters where possible, with support primarily from national staff at 20/20 Vision, Dis. Clearinghouse, Peace Action, PSR, WAND, FCNL, MUJ, UCS, WFA.

Examples of significant projects from recent weeks include:

- * 20/20 has conducted one national, grassroots conference call on the CTBT, another in Alaska

- * World Federalists Assoc. devoted its April "Program Associates" teleconference call to the CTBT, with Kimball as a presenter. 180 pple in approx. 12 states were on the call

- * The Disarmament Clearinghouse has held 2 grassroots organizing summits (Denver in Nov., Seattle in Jan., Pittsburgh in Feb.) with support from local groups, FCNL, 20/20, UCS, the Coalition, PSR and others.

iv. Speaker "tours" to: address mainstream audiences; news media and editors --

- * several grassroots based groups are also sending national staff or leaders to key states to address local activists and newspaper editors on the CTBT. (See Disarmament Clearinghouse "Fieldwork Timeline" for more details.)

- * Also, the Coalition is trying to connect and prod Administration officials to appear at major public affairs events, such as the Cleveland City Club.

v. State visits with Senators in key states -- national staff at 20/20 Vision, Dis. Clearinghouse, Peace Action, PSR, WAND, FCNL, MUPJ, UCS in cooperation with "state contacts"

vi. DC visits with Senators in conjunction with organizational meetings this spring:

- *March 7, United States Student Assoc. mtg, Wash. DC

- *March, World Federalists mtg. Wash. DC

- *March 13-17, Peace Action National Meeting and Lobby Day (approx. 200 people)

- *March 29-April 1, Interfaith Action Meeting (approx. 500 people)

- *May 1-4, PSR National Conference (approx. 200 people)

- *May 3-6, Alliance for Nuclear Accountability DC Days (approx. 100 people)

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: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <cccgsec@web.net>
Date: Fri, 17 Apr 1998 12:06:10 -0400 (EDT)
X-BlackMail: ts69-11.tor.istar.ca, cccadmin.kaja, cccgsec@web.net, 204.191.147.42
X-Authenticated-Timestamp: 12:06:10(EDT) on April 17, 1998
X-Sender: cccgsec@pop.web.net
To: mupj@igc.org
From: General Secretary <cccgsec@web.net>
Subject: Statement on Nuclear Abolition

Dear Mr. Hallman:
Thank you for faxing me a copy of the statement Act Now for Nuclear Abolition.

The full name and title of Archbishop Curtis is:

Archbishop J. Barry Curtis
President
The Canadian Council of Churches.

I am compiling several other signatories for the above statement and will be able to send you a list of names at the beginning of next week.

Regards.
We have MOVED!!!

Canadian Council of Churches
3250 Bloor St. W., 2nd Floor
Toronto ON M8X 2Y4
Tel: 416-232-6070
Fax: 416-236 4532
E-mail: cccgsec@web.net
<http://www.web.net/~ccchurch>

Return-Path: <cccgsec@web.net>
Date: Fri, 17 Apr 1998 13:03:25 -0400 (EDT)
X-BlackMail: ts9-12.tor.istar.ca, cccadmin.kaja, cccgsec@web.net, 204.191.151.107
X-Authenticated-Timestamp: 13:03:25(EDT) on April 17, 1998
X-Sender: cccgsec@pop.web.net
To: mupj@igc.org
From: General Secretary <cccgsec@web.net>
Subject: Correction of previous e-mail re Statement on Nuclear Abolition

Dear Mr.

Please correct title of Archbishop J. Barry Curtis, to read:

The Most Rev. J. Barry Curtis
President
Canadian Council of Churches.

Thank you.

We have MOVED!!!

Canadian Council of Churches
3250 Bloor St. W., 2nd Floor
Toronto ON M8X 2Y4
Tel: 416-232-6070
Fax: 416-236 4532
E-mail: cccgsec@web.net
<http://www.web.net/~ccchurch>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Fri, 17 Apr 1998 14:10:15 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: Call for CTBT op-eds

April 17, 1998

To: Coalition member groups and other CTBT supporters
From: Daryl Kimball (CRND) and Bill Eisenstein (NSNS)

Re: Call for CTBT op-eds

Next month, the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers will be hiring a media consultant -- Elliott Negin - - to help stimulate the publication of op-eds on the Comprehensive Test Ban. Up until now, we have produced very few op-eds and none or very few are available for placement when and if editorial interest in the issue emerges. We hope that you will help us help you place your op-eds on the CTBT as the issue heats up.

Elliott Negin will be working out of the National Security News Service offices beginning the 2 week of May. He will:

- * receive your finished op-eds
- * distribute the columns to selected newspapers
- * conduct follow-up calls to opinion page editors.

We Need Your Help and Eloquent Words (generally 500-750):

What is needed are your finished op-eds no later than May 4. Coalition member groups and other CTBT supporters are asked to solicit, ghost-write, or otherwise assemble 1-2 draft op-eds by the most well-known or expert persons in your organizations that you would like to have the consultant assist in placing. Ideally you might solicit an op-ed by a prominent member of your organization who lives outside Wash. DC. Your level of interest and ability to follow through with some op-eds is vital to making this work.

Please send your op-eds directly to Elliot Negin at National Security News Service via e-mail, c/o Bill Eisenstein <billeisen@rocketmail.com>

If you already have op-eds written and are trying to place them, please let Elliot know about your effort to help improve overall coordination.

If you have any questions feel free to contact us. Thank you.

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: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Fri, 17 Apr 1998 14:55:57 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: UN Ponders Special Session on Disarmament

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: news from the U.N., FYI

Disarmament: U.N. Explores Special Session on Disarmament

Inter Press Service
14-APR-98

UNITED NATIONS, (Apr. 14) IPS - The United Nations is exploring the possibility of convening a Special Session of the 185-member General Assembly on a politically and militarily sensitive issue: global disarmament.

"We would like to see the early convening of such a session," says Ambassador Anwarul Karim Chowdhury of Bangladesh, who points out that there is an "excessive accumulation" of both conventional arms and weapons of mass destruction in the world today.

Chowdhury said it was time for the international community to review the implementation of decisions taken at the first Special Session in 1978 and also take stock of the post-Cold War security situation.

"Budgetary constraints notwithstanding, a Special Session would further the cause of general and complete disarmament," he noted.

The United States has already pointed out that a cash-strapped world body cannot afford the luxury of a Special Session at a time when it is faced with more pressing needs.

The U.N.'s last Special Session on disarmament in 1988 cost about \$7.5 million. A new session could possibly cost an estimated \$20 million, according to U.S. officials.

The General Assembly has had three Special Sessions on disarmament so far: in 1978, 1982 and 1988. Although a declaration was adopted unanimously at the first session, the second and third sessions failed to reach agreement on a program of action on global disarmament.

Among the most important multilateral arms agreements are the 1963 Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, and the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

The United Nations also played an important role in the 1997 Chemical Weapons Convention which was painstakingly negotiated over a period of 20 years. In the area of conventional weapons, the only global agreement is the 1981 convention prohibiting "inhumane weapons" such as booby traps and incendiary weapons.

Chowdhury said that developing nations were emerging both as major users and victims of conventional weapons. While these countries should limit their acquisitions to a level commensurate with legitimate security needs, the arms exporting nations should also exercise restraint in selling them, he added.

At a meeting of the U.N. Disarmament Commission

last week, there was unanimous agreement among developing nations for a fourth Special Session on unanimous agreement among developing nations for a fourth Special Session on disarmament.

Ambassador Makirim Wibisono of Indonesia, chairman of the 132-member Group of 77 developing nations, said the main focus in the disarmament field should be the pursuit of further deep reductions in current weapons stockpiles, with a view to their ultimate elimination. At the same time, he said, there was a need to curb the vertical and horizontal proliferation of nuclear weapons and banning the use of fissile materials for weapons purposes.

"All aspects of nuclear disarmament should be considered at the fourth Special Session on disarmament," he added.

Wibisono said the international community should also focus on such issues as the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments. "There was a need to enhance and strengthen the U.N. role in the disarmament field, and practical measures were needed to increase the effectiveness of the existing disarmament machinery," he added.

The Indonesian envoy also called for guidelines and recommendations for the establishment of new nuclear-free zones "as a viable means of enhancing peace, and security, both globally and regionally."

Western nations, and the U.S. in particular, have expressed reservations over the proposal for a Special Session both for financial and political reasons. Most of the major nuclear powers fear that a Special Session would raise the issue of a time-frame for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

The nuclear weapon states -- the U.S., France, Britain, China and Russia -- are also concerned that a Special Session would spark a multilateral debate on nuclear disarmament at a time when there are ongoing bilateral negotiations to achieve the same objectives.

Ambassador Sergey Martynov of Belarus, chairman of the Disarmament Commission, told delegates last week that although there are "certain differences" in approach to the objectives, agenda and timing of the proposed session, it offered an opportunity to assess achievements and failures, and devise future recommendations.

Hisao Yamaguchi of Japan said the proposal for a Special Session appealed to many delegations. "Remarkable progress was underway in the reduction of nuclear weapons, and a Special Session would catalyze further disarmament developments, if the international community could reach a common understanding as to its timing, purpose and agenda," he added.

In trying to reach a common understanding, it was imperative to forge an agreement between the nuclear-weapon states and the non- nuclear-weapon states, Yamaguchi noted. The world body, he said, should also take into consideration the fact that holding a Special Session "had huge financial implications."

Speaking on behalf of the European Union, Ian Souter of Britain said if the Special Session is to fulfil its true potential, there should be consensus on its objectives. The international community should agree on what it wanted to get out of the session.

"It should not be convened without such consensus. Its agenda should strike a balance between issues relating to weapons of mass destruction and conventional weapons," he added.

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: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

To: "Dwain Epps: <dce@wcc-coe.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Remarks for NPT PrepCom reception
Cc:
Bcc: dave@paxchristiusa.org
X-Attachments:

Dear Dwain:

Thanks for sending me your draft of Dr. Raiser's remarks. It certainly sets the tone we are trying to achieve. I would like to offer a couple of suggestions for the concluding paragraphs.

For the third paragraph from the end, I would suggestion adding a sentence, such as: "They will support far-reaching initiatives that you might undertake."

For the next to last paragraph (if I were a theologian I would call it "penultimate"), I suggest being a firmer with the nuclear weapon states. A suggested rewrite (with one sentence relocated is as follows:

"The burden, as ever, is on the nuclear weapon states themselves. We are grateful for the steps they have taken to reduce the threat of nuclear war. But they have a long ways to go to live up to their treaty obligation to pursue the course to nuclear disarmament. We hope they will join a broad consensus of world opinion that favors commencing work on the total abolition of nuclear war. But the responsibility is not theirs alone. If they do not move ahead, then other nations must take the lead, for now is the time to proceed from talk to action."

On a technical (picky) matter, the third paragraph speakers of "your debates", and the third from last refers to "the glare of publicity which accompanied you in the past". In a sense these references are appropriate for they consider the NPT regime as a continuing body. During the first 25 years there was a Review Conference that met every five years. The 1995 NPT extension created the Preparatory Committee to meet annually in preparation for the five-year Review Conference. I'm not certain whether the delegates to the Preparatory Committee in 1998 will identify with work of the past as "theirs". But I don't have an alternative to suggest, so it won't hurt to ignore my remark.

I'll be leaving Friday evening, April 24 in case you want to reach me again before my departure.

Shalom,
Howard

To: dave@paxchristiusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Draft of Dr. Raiser's remarks
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Dave:

Here is the draft of Dr. Raiser's remarks that Dwain Epps sent me. I've sent you a blind copy of my response to him.

Shalom,
Howard

D R A F T
Reception in Honor of the Chairman and Delegates attending
the NPT Preparatory Committee
27 April 1998
Palais des Nations, Geneva

WELCOMING REMARKS

Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser
General Secretary
World Council of Churches

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates, Friends,

Thank you all for accepting Cardinal Danneels's and my invitation to join us in this informal gathering at the beginning of your work here in Geneva. It gives us the welcome opportunity to greet you, and to assure you that we shall be accompanying you with our hopes and prayers during these days.

It would be unfair to burden you with long speeches on the eve of your meeting where you will certainly get your full! We shall not do this tonight. Nevertheless, Cardinal Daneels and I do wish to convey to you the importance we attach to what you are called to do here.

We all remember the decades of the 1970s and 1980s when world public opinion followed your debates with a sense of great urgency. Millions of people were in the streets of major capitals around the world pressing for an immediate reversal of the nuclear arms race. Now you meet without such immediate pressure from world public opinion. Indeed the world press has paid quite little attention to the fact that you are gathered here.

We should not, however, allow ourselves to be complaisant. What you are called to do here is of central importance to the peoples of the world. Your task remains as difficult as ever, and it must be undertaken with wisdom, courage, and a sense of great urgency.

By the grace of God, the nuclear arms race has been reversed, and for the first time since Hiroshima, nuclear weapons and delivery systems are being destroyed. But the nuclear threat remains. The pace of nuclear disarmament has slowed to a snail's pace. Testing has also been halted, but nuclear arms research and development continues. And although the major nuclear weapons powers have stepped back cautiously from their absolute reliance on doctrines of nuclear deterrence, nuclear weapons remain the pillar of global defense strategies.

As the Psalmist put it, we live still "in the valley of the shadow of death." We in the World Council of Churches firmly

believe that this is not what God intended for humanity. God wills Peace, Justice, the integrity of all Creation.

Since it was formed fifty years ago, the World Council of Churches has called repeatedly and insistently for the total elimination of atomic and nuclear weapons. The Protestant, Anglican and Orthodox from around the world who are joined in this Council have always made this appeal in a spirit of humility, confessing to God our own complicity, and our own failure to trust more in our Creator than in arms. Yet we know that true security is never to be found in arms of any sort, and certainly not in these most terrible weapons ever devised by human beings. Nuclear weapons are sinful, and their production, possession and deployment, and the very threat of their use in an extreme case constitute crimes against God and humanity.

Friends,

Now is the time. The task before you is weighty indeed. And though you meet now without the glare of publicity which accompanied you in the past, you may be assured that people of faith around the world are following with care and great anticipation your work in these days.

The burden, as ever, is on the nuclear weapons states themselves. But it is not theirs alone. We are grateful for the steps they have taken to reduce the threat of nuclear war. We hope that they will join a consensus of commencing work on the total abolition of nuclear arms. But if they do not, then other nations must take the lead, for now is the time.

For my part, I wish to assure you of our confidence in your ability to reach achieve significant agreements in this sense, to work in the spirit of compromise and mutual respect, and with bold resolve. Our prayers are with you. May God inspire your thoughts, your deliberations and your spirit of determination to do what will be pleasing in God's sight.

Return-Path: <dce@wcc-coe.org>
Date: Mon, 20 Apr 1998 09:36:47 +0200
From: Dwain EPPS <dce@wcc-coe.org>
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: Remarks for NPT PrepCom reception -Reply

Dear Howard,

Thanks for the helpful comments. I will try to work them in.

I also got from Dave Robinson a stack of invitations. Please thank him for me!

Best,

Dwain

Return-Path: <acc@internetegypt.com>

From: acc@internetegypt.com

Date: Mon, 20 Apr 1998 21:57:45 +0200

Reply-To: acc@internetegypt.com

To: ippnwbos@igc.apc.org

CC: phon@bpb.nl, jfousek@andromeda.rutgers.edu, bottomup@access.ch,
gw@ss.gu.se, tobdam@aol.com, womensleague@gn.apc.org, ipb@iprolink.ch,
CXJ15621@nifyserve.or.jp, LCNP@aol.com, aslater@igc.apc.org,
basecin@gia.psdn.org.ph, oliver.meier@igc.org, oliver.meier@bits.de,
kalinowski@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de, arjun@ieer.org,
Simon.Carroll@ams.greenpeace.org, dkimball@clw.org, wslf@igc.apc.org,
datan@igc.org, jbloomfield@gn.apc.org, pmeidell@igc.org,
mupj@igc.apc.org, kwood@igc.org, scheffran@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de,
robwcpuk@gn.apc.org, pbidwai@pb.unv.ernet.in, R.Praun@lilly.ping.de,
acronym@gn.apc.org, wagingpeace@napf.org, magoo@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in,
nayyar@sputnik.sdnpk.undp.org, naunack@math.uni-hamburg.de,
mvtpaix@globenet.org, aruna@intouch.com, IANUS@HRZPUB.TU-DARMSTAT.DE,
IANUS@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de, colin archer <ipb@iprolink.ch>

Subject: NWFZ

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id HAA15653

Attention : Adam Berry and Jo Tyler
Special Committee for Disarmament-Geneva
Joint NGO Project for NPT PrepCom

The following is the last draft presentation on NWFZs prepared by Bahig Nassar after inserting results of comments already received. Other comments can be considered in Geneva on my arrival. Kindly forward this draft to all NGOs interested in PrepCom presentations .

Bahig Nassar
Arab Coordination Center of NGOs
18 Darih Saad Zaghoul st. Cairo, Egypt.
Tel: office 3555502, home 3467892
Fax:5786298
Email:acc@internetegypt.com

Mr. Chairman

We are very grateful for devoting this session to NGOs presentations hoping that this brief exchange of views will be an established and continuous practice at conferences and after conferences .

This presentation will deal with a question of special concern to peoples of several regions who strive to ward off deadly nuclear threats by establishing Nuclear Weapon Free Zones (NWFZs). We expect that the official policies of NPT states will positively respond to NGOs programme on this question .Already, the NPT Review and Extension Conference of 1995 adopted a Decision on "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non Proliferation and Disarmament" emphasising the conviction of NPT states that "the establishment of internationally recognized NWFZ...enhances global and regional peace and security" .The Conference also endorsed a resolution calling for "the establishment of an effectively verifiable Middle East zone free of weapons of mass destruction" .These are politically binding commitments by all NPT states.

Mr. Chairman ;

The refusal of the nuclear weapon states (NWS) to start negotiation in good faith on effective measures leading to complete nuclear disarmament has made the establishment of NWFZs a matter of utmost urgency. They express the political will of the countries of a region to refrain from acquiring ,producing ,testing and storing nuclear weapons , to prevent nuclear states from deploying these weapons on their territories and to distance the people of the region from nuclear threats .

Already , NWFZ have covered several regions and continents including territories under jurisdiction of big powers .Talking them together enables a great part of the Southern Hemisphere comprising Latin America , Africa , South East Asia ,South Pacific and Antarctic Continent to remain outside nuclear arms race . In addition to these internationally recognized treaties ,hundreds of cities and towns had been declared NWFZs by their local authorities.

Other initiative to expand areas free from nuclear weapons are on the agenda of NGOs with the hope that PrepCom delegates will take them in due consideration.

Among them is a NWFZ urgently requested by the countries of the independent Republics of the former Soviet Union in Central Asia .A conference was held by NGOs last September to this end in Tashkent with the full support of the region governments .Practical steps are expected to build this zone before the 2000 NPT Review Conference . Another zone which requires due consideration is envisaged to release tension engendered by NATO expansion .NATO member states promised in their Founding Act with Russia of May 1997 that they have no intention to deploy nuclear weapons in the Territory of the new NATO members located in Central and Eastern Europe . However , no binding and practical measure is stipulated by the founding Act to prevent such eventuality in future . Only ,legally binding commitment by internationally recognized Treaty on the establishment of a buffer zone free of nuclear weapons between Russia and NATO could release this tension .This zone may expand in the future ,instead of NATO expansion ,to strengthen peace and security in Europe .

Saying that it should be noted that Europe was the cradle of NWfZs . Efforts to establish these zones in Central Europe ,in the Balkan and the Adriatic region ,and in North Europe had been made long before the establishment of the Latin America Zone .The reason why they failed to achieve their targets has been totally disappeared of late .Confrontation between US and USSR does not exist any more , Warsaw Pact was dismantled and no nuclear threat is levelled at Us and its allies . Similar to what had already happened to the former Warsaw member states in Central and Eastern Europe and to the European Republics of the Former USSR, NNWSs members of NATO ,US-Japan alliance and other military alliance can be also transformed into Nuclear Weapon Free Countries .All nuclear weapons together with their delivery systems deployed in the territories of all NNWSs, members of nuclear capable alliances should be eliminated .

Mr. Chairman;

At the time of the cold war NGOs together with many governments called for the removal of nuclear weapon capable fleets from the Baltic,Adriatic and Mediterrean Seas, and from the Indian Ocean to avoid possible nuclear confrontations between US and USSR fleets. These slogans disappeared since the end of the cold war . However, another

danger is looming at present . Huge nuclear capable fleets carrying effective land and air nuclear capable forces are freely moving in seas and oceans ready to intervene in defence of the so called "vital interests" of certain powers .To inhibit these operations Third World countries try to acquire WMD. Consequently , the nuclear Genie could be released and grown uncontrollably beyond any region .

Establishing NWF Seas and Oceans particularly those close to regions of tension is a matter of urgency. International water is the heritage of the entire humanity and should benefit all peoples.

Finally , regional "security" based on the deployment of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction has been triggered by conflicts in the Middle East and South Asia , and due to the conflict between the two Koreas in North East Asia . Under the pretext of safeguarding national security a state involved in the conflict tends to acquire nuclear weapons or seeks nuclear umbrella from a "friendly" NWFS. To counter this act other countries make every effort to possess weapons of mass destruction. Moreover some NWSs pursue a double standard policy condoning the possession of nuclear weapons by their local allies and threatening, at the same time , to prevent other countries by force , conventional and non - conventional , from acquiring any weapons of mass destruction . A deadly connection between conflicts and these weapons has emerged.

In this connection, we welcome your decision to place on your agenda the question of establishing a Middle East Free from WMD , hoping that your effort will prompt the parties concerned to immediately start negotiation to achieve this target .

Mr. Chairman ,

The components and targets of this programme are of special nature . They seek to establish NWFZs in the Northern hemisphere after many zones had been established in the South, to start the establishment of zones where nuclear weapons are deployed whereas the former zones had been established in regions already free from nuclear weapons, to free the international water of seas and oceans from nuclear weapons while former zones had been only established in the territories of several regions and to establish zones free from all WMD, as well as, nuclear weapon free countries to be added to NWFZs.

These new types of zones will give a powerful impetus to the efforts now underway to eliminate all nuclear weapons and conclude a Nuclear Weapon Convention .

Combined efforts by NGOs and NPT states are very much needed to implement this programme . (20-4-1998)

April,20,1998.

To: LCNP <LCNP@aol.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: NPT papers
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 08:38 AM 4/20/98 EDT, you wrote:

>The Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy has written papers for the NPT prep
>Com on Article IV and Article VI.

>

>Contact us if you would like a copy and specify hard copy or electronic
>version.

>

>Alyn Ware

>Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy

>666 Broadway, #625, New York, NY 10012, USA

>Phone (1) 212 674 7790. Fax (1) 212 674 6199. Email lcnp@aol.com

>

>

Dear Alan,

Please send me an e-mail copy of your papers.

Thanks,
Howard
mupj@igc.org

To: flick@igc.org, basecln@gaia.psdn.org.ph, oliver.meier@bits.de, kalinowski@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de, arjun@ieer.org, Simon.Carroll@ams.greenpeace.org, dkimball@cllw.org, wslf@igc.org, jdean@ucsusa.org, datan@igc.org, jbloomfield@gn.apc.org, aruna@intouch.com, disarmtimes@igc.org, ipb@gn.apc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: NPT PrepCom Presentation

Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

Here is a draft of the presentation on "A Spiritual, Ethical, and Humanitarian Perspective on Nuclear Weapons" for the NPT Preparatory Committee. If you have any comments, please get them to me by Wednesday, April so that I can take them into consideration in preparing the final draft before I leave for Geneva on Friday evening, April 24.

Shalom,
Howard W. Hallman
E-mail: mupj@igc.org
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013

###

A Spiritual, Ethical, and Humanitarian Perspective on Nuclear Weapons
A Presentation to the NPT Preparatory Committee

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition

Mr. Chairman and delegates to the 1998 session of the NPT Preparatory Committee, I greatly appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and to present some ideas developed by the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition.

You meet at a propitious time. With a new millenium rapidly approaching, the people of this planet would like to enter the new century free from the threat of nuclear holocaust. In the next two weeks you delegates here assembled have a great opportunity to take decisive action to set the course for the abolition of all nuclear weapons on Earth.

The moral grounds for nuclear abolition are expressed in a statement by Godfried Cardinal Danneels and Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, which you have received. Their words reflect a broad consensus within the world's religious community. They state:

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

I believe that most of you in your heart of hearts, in the deep recesses of your mind, agree with this conclusion. The challenge to you is to let your moral judgment guide your actions.

A statement developed by the Christian Peace Conference in the Czech Republic for this conference offers a pair of reasons for the total rejection of nuclear weapons: first, the threat to Creation and, second, the contribution to moral degradation.

"Nuclear weapons," say the Czechs, "fundamentally differ from all other weapons because of their potential to destroy all life on this planet. They are terminal in relation to Nature. They can destroy the divine Creation....They take from God the sole power to end the created order, and thus usurp the divine prerogative....Nuclear weapons stand

condemned because they can destroy 'the sacred gift of life' and are thus innately demonic and blasphemous."

Secondly, the Czech statement notes, "The terrible suffering caused by nuclear weapons, their potential for total destruction, and their perversion of the fundamental nature of matter have contributed immeasurably to the moral degradation of humanity in our time." This moral decline has escalated from the mass slaughter of World War I to the Nazi concentration camps to the mass bombing of cities in World War II to the development of nuclear weapons and their use on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the 1945. "The East-West nuclear confrontation," the Czechs conclude, "with the readiness of states to commit global genocide further hugely contributed to the moral de-sensitization of our age, now so evident in many aspects of contemporary life."

From an ethical perspective, Judge Mohammed Bedjaoui, when he was president of the International Court of Justice, indicted: "The nuclear weapon, the ultimate evil, destabilizes humanitarian law which is the law of lesser evil. The existence of nuclear weapons is therefore a challenge to the very existence of humanitarian law, not to mention their long-term effects of damage to the human environment, in respect to which the right to life must be exercised."

Judge Bedjaoui spoke in connection with an unanimous ruling of the International Court of Justice that under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all aspects under strict and effective international control."

Even if no other nuclear bomb is exploded, the Earth will remain scarred by the nuclear weapons era. Earth and its people have suffered grave harm in the mining of fissionable material, in production of nuclear warheads with the byproduct of radioactive waste, and through nuclear testing in the atmosphere and below the ground..

Beyond harm to people and environmental damage, nuclear weapons have taken an enormous economic toll. Since the 1940s the nuclear weapon states have spent more than \$8 trillion to develop, test, produce, transport, deploy, and safeguard their nuclear arsenal. This vast waste of resources brings to mind the words of U.S. President Dwight D. Eisenhower, himself a former general, words deemed so important that they are engraved beside his tomb in Abilene, Kansas. " Every gun made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed....This is not a way of life at all....Under the cloud of threatening war, it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron."

The great irony is that the nuclear weapon states through these vast expenditures have failed to produce the security they seek. Indeed, it is their own people who are at greatest risk due to their doctrine of mutually assured destruction. Citizens of the allies of nuclear weapon states are themselves vulnerable to nuclear attack because of the established doctrines of the nuclear powers. Any other nation gaining nuclear weapons would join the ranks of the insecure.

Tragically the nuclear weapon states and their allies are victims of a self-imposed and self-destructive addiction to nuclear weapons. Yes, an addiction. Like many other addictions cure can come in two ways.

First, the addicted can exercise self-will, can renounce the addictive substance or orientation, and can through great determination and inner strength free itself from the addiction that is sapping its vitality. In this case, the nuclear weapon states can say individually or join together in a covenant that says, "We renounce the use of nuclear weapons for war-fighting purposes. We renounce nuclear deterrence as an instrument of foreign and military policy." Renunciation would remove the fundamental blockage to carrying out a series of actions that lead to nuclear abolition. Other speakers on this program will describe the steps that can be taken along this road.

Second, friends of the addicted can apply "tough love". They can talk firmly and insist that the addicted take the necessary steps leading out of addiction. In the matter at hand, you delegates from non-nuclear weapon states can exercise tough love by insisting that the nuclear powers embark upon a course of action that moves toward nuclear abolition. You can even develop a plan in the form of a nuclear weapons convention to outlaw and abolish nuclear weapons. Even if you are part of a political bloc with one or more nuclear weapon states, true friendship requires you to apply tough love by acting independently and supporting measures leading to nuclear abolition. Beyond that each and everyone of you has a higher loyalty to all humankind, to the well-being of all peoples on Earth.

As you prepare to meet the challenges before you during this session of the NPT Preparatory Committee, I invite you to pause and observe one minute of silence. Use this minute to reflect upon the human suffering caused by nuclear weapons in their more than fifty years of existence: the victims at Hiroshima and Nagasaki; the indigenous people and other inhabitants living in the vicinity of test sites in the Western United States, Algeria, Russia, Kazakhstan, China, the South Pacific, and Australia; persons far from away from test sites but harmed by drifting radioactive fallout; the people who have suffered by the side effects of mining operations and weapon production facilities.

In silence we can remember all who have suffer. We can share together feelings of regret and contrition. You who are delegates can also use this moment to reflect on what you can accomplish in the next two weeks. You can re-dedicate yourself to working courageously and with imagination to find ways to end the nuclear arms race and rid Earth of this horrible plague on human existence.

May we pause now in silence.

[After one minute.]

In the spirit of renewal and re-dedication, the NGO community this afternoon would like to offer you a series of ideas on steps that can be undertaken to achieve the abolition of nuclear weapons, an achievable goal that humankind longs to accomplish.

###

[As an alternative, this presentation can be interrupted before the paragraph first asking for one minute of silence. The speaker on "Nuclear Colonialism, Environmental Racism" would then make her presentation. After that the first speaker would return and call for the minute of silence. This would give delegates additional concerns for their minute of reflection.]

To: dave@paxchristiusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: NPT PrepCom Presentation
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Dave:

I'm sorry we never caught up with one another today. I was hoping for some written comments from you on the draft presentation for the NPT PrepCom. I did hear from Clayton, received a few oral comments from you, and had a message regarding the ICJ opinion. I used these and my own sense of redrafting to produce the attached second draft of our statement. I have sent it to the other conveners. I still want your comments by Wednesday so that I can produce the final draft and get copies made before I leave for Geneva on Friday.

Shalom,
Howard

P.S. Dwain Epps received your packet of invitations and thanks you for them.

###

A Spiritual, Ethical, and Humanitarian Perspective on Nuclear Weapons
A Presentation to the NPT Preparatory Committee

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition

Mr. Chairman and delegates to the 1998 session of the NPT Preparatory Committee, I greatly appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and to present some ideas developed by the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition.

You meet at a propitious time. With a new millenium rapidly approaching, the people of this planet would like to enter the new century free from the threat of nuclear holocaust. In the next two weeks you delegates here assembled have a great opportunity to take decisive action to set the course for the abolition of all nuclear weapons on Earth.

The moral grounds for nuclear abolition are expressed in a statement by Godfried Cardinal Danneels and Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, which you have received. Their words reflect a broad consensus within the world's religious community. They state:

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

I believe that most of you in your heart of hearts, in the deep recesses of your mind, agree with this conclusion. The challenge to you is to let your moral judgment guide your actions.

A statement developed by the Christian Peace Conference in the Czech Republic for this conference offers a pair of reasons for the total rejection of nuclear weapons: first, the threat to Creation and, second, the contribution to moral degradation.

"Nuclear weapons," say the Czechs, "fundamentally differ from all other weapons because of their potential to destroy all life on this planet. They are terminal in relation to Nature. They can destroy the divine Creation....They take from God the sole power to end the created order, and thus usurp the divine prerogative....Nuclear weapons stand

condemned because they can destroy 'the sacred gift of life' and are thus innately demonic and blasphemous."

Secondly, the Czech statement notes, "The terrible suffering caused by nuclear weapons, their potential for total destruction, and their perversion of the fundamental nature of matter have contributed immeasurably to the moral degradation of humanity in our time." This moral decline has escalated from the mass slaughter of World War I to the Nazi concentration camps to the mass bombing of cities in World War II to the development of nuclear weapons and their use on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the 1945. "The East-West nuclear confrontation," the Czechs conclude, "with the readiness of states to commit global genocide further hugely contributed to the moral de-sensitization of our age, now so evident in many aspects of contemporary life."

From an ethical perspective, Judge Mohammed Bedjaoui, when he was president of the International Court of Justice, indicted: "The nuclear weapon, the ultimate evil, destabilizes humanitarian law which is the law of lesser evil. The existence of nuclear weapons is therefore a challenge to the very existence of humanitarian law, not to mention their long-term effects of damage to the human environment, in respect to which the right to life must be exercised."

Judge Bedjaoui spoke in connection with an unanimous ruling of the International Court of Justice that under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all aspects under strict and effective international control."

Even if no other nuclear bomb is exploded, the Earth will remain scarred by the nuclear weapons era. Earth and its people have suffered grave harm in the mining of fissionable material, in production of nuclear warheads with the byproduct of radioactive waste, and through nuclear testing in the atmosphere and below the ground..

Beyond harm to people and environmental damage, nuclear weapons have taken an enormous economic toll. Since the 1940s the nuclear weapon states have spent more than \$8 trillion to develop, test, produce, transport, deploy, and safeguard their nuclear arsenal. This vast waste of resources brings to mind the words of U.S. President Dwight D. Eisenhower, himself a former general, words deemed so important that they are engraved beside his tomb in Abilene, Kansas. " Every gun made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed....This is not a way of life at all....Under the cloud of threatening war, it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron."

The great irony is that the nuclear weapon states through these vast expenditures have failed to produce the security they seek. Indeed, it is their own people who are at greatest risk due to their doctrine of mutually assured destruction. Citizens of the allies of nuclear weapon states are themselves vulnerable to nuclear attack because of the established doctrines of the nuclear powers. Any other nation gaining nuclear weapons would join the ranks of the insecure.

Tragically the nuclear weapon states and their allies are victims of a self-imposed and self-destructive addiction to nuclear weapons. Yes, an addiction. Like many other addictions cure can come in two ways.

First, the addicted can exercise self-will, can renounce the addictive substance or orientation, and can through great determination and inner strength free itself from the addiction that is sapping its vitality. In this case, the nuclear weapon states can say individually or join together in a covenant that says, "We renounce the use of nuclear weapons for war-fighting purposes. We renounce nuclear deterrence as an instrument of foreign and military policy." Renunciation would remove the fundamental blockage to carrying out a series of actions that lead to nuclear abolition. Other speakers on this program will describe the steps that can be taken along this road.

Second, friends of the addicted can apply "tough love". They can talk firmly and insist that the addicted take the necessary steps leading out of addiction. In the matter at hand, you delegates from non-nuclear weapon states can exercise tough love by insisting that the nuclear powers embark upon a course of action that moves toward nuclear abolition. You can even develop a plan in the form of a nuclear weapons convention to outlaw and abolish nuclear weapons. Even if you are part of a political bloc with one or more nuclear weapon states, true friendship requires you to apply tough love by acting independently and supporting measures leading to nuclear abolition. Beyond that each and everyone of you has a higher loyalty to all humankind, to the well-being of all peoples on Earth.

As you prepare to meet the challenges before you during this session of the NPT Preparatory Committee, I invite you to pause and observe one minute of silence. Use this minute to reflect upon the human suffering caused by nuclear weapons in their more than fifty years of existence: the victims at Hiroshima and Nagasaki; the indigenous people and other inhabitants living in the vicinity of test sites in the Western United States, Algeria, Russia, Kazakhstan, China, the South Pacific, and Australia; persons far from away from test sites but harmed by drifting radioactive fallout; the people who have suffered by the side effects of mining operations and weapon production facilities.

In silence we can remember all who have suffer. We can share together feelings of regret and contrition. You who are delegates can also use this moment to reflect on what you can accomplish in the next two weeks. You can re-dedicate yourself to working courageously and with imagination to find ways to end the nuclear arms race and rid Earth of this horrible plague on human existence.

May we pause now in silence.

[After one minute.]

In the spirit of renewal and re-dedication, the NGO community this afternoon would like to offer you a series of ideas on steps that can be undertaken to achieve the abolition of nuclear weapons, an achievable goal that humankind longs to accomplish.

###

[As an alternative, this presentation can be interrupted before the paragraph first asking for one minute of silence. The speaker on "Nuclear Colonialism, Environmental Racism" would then make her presentation. After that the first speaker would return and call for the minute of silence. This would give delegates additional concerns for their minute of reflection.]

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 20 Apr 1998 14:38:07 -0700 (PDT)
From: Greg Mello <lasg@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: U.S. to Pursue "New Nuclear Options"
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Sender: lasg@pop.igc.org

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id OAA25044

The following may be of general interest:

PRESS RELEASE

For Immediate Release 4/20/98

**DISARMAMENT GROUPS FORCE DOE TO RELEASE PORTIONS OF
SECRET "STEWARDSHIP" PLAN FOR NUKES; AGENCY NOW ADMITS
IT WILL "REPLACE" NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN STOCKPILE AND DEVELOP
"NEW NUCLEAR OPTIONS FOR EMERGENT THREATS"**

Contacts:

Greg Mello or Maya Sinha at the Los Alamos Study Group
(Santa Fe, NM), 505-982-7747

Christopher Paine at the Natural Resources Defense Council
(Washington, DC), 202-289-2370

Marylia Kelley at Tri-Valley CAREs (Livermore, CA), 510-443-7148

Jackie Cabasso at the Western States Legal Foundation (Oakland, CA),
510-839-5877

The Department of Energy (DOE), in an attempt to fend off a legal challenge to its nuclear "stewardship" program brought by the above groups and others, has released a declassified version of its October 1997 "Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan" to a federal court. This newly-released "Green Book," so called, provides new admissions regarding DOE's plans to indefinitely maintain a large nuclear arsenal, gradually replace existing weapons with modified or new ones, develop "new nuclear options for emergent threats," and create the capacity to build thousands of additional nuclear weapons if "needed." The provision of "new nuclear options" has been, up to now, strenuously denied by DOE.

The lawsuit that produced the document was brought by 39 disarmament and environmental organizations, represented by the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC). The stewardship plan was supplied last month in response to plaintiffs' arguments against production of plutonium pits at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) and construction of the National Ignition Facility (NIF) in Livermore. Both projects have capital costs in the \$1.2 billion range. New information on environmental and safety risks at both sites has led plaintiffs to request Judge Stanley Sporkin to order DOE to further analyze alternatives to the projects.

The clearest plain-language statement of DOE's plans to continue nuclear weapons development can be found in the following

passage:

The requirement to maintain the capability to design and engineer new weapon systems to military requirements [was] stated in the DoD Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). **NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN THE ENDURING STOCKPILE WILL EVENTUALLY BE REPLACED.** (New system development may be needed even to maintain today's military characteristics.) **THIS WORK IS ANTICIPATED TO BEGIN AROUND 2010.** [Compare: "I'd hate to say we'll be done [with subcritical tests] in 10 years, said LANL's Wolkerstorfer. "In 10 years, we're going to be building different pits, different weapons. And that means different issues coming up." Ian Hoffman, "Managing the Nuclear Arsenal," Albuquerque Journal, 6/1/97.] In the meantime, future national policies are supported for deterrence by retaining the ability to develop new nuclear options for emergent threats...Miniature, modular building blocks for nuclear weapon systems are being developed...**PROOF-OF-PRINCIPLE FLIGHT TESTS WILL DEMONSTRATE ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTS TO ADDRESS NEW THREATS AND WILL PROVIDE THE TECHNOLOGY FOR NEW APPROACHES TO DETERRENCE,** should the nation ever need them, as well as attract and train new nuclear weapon system engineers. (p. 7-34, emphasis added)

"These statements reveal a shocking disregard for U.S. commitments, especially those enshrined in the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), to end the nuclear arms race," said Study Group Director Greg Mello. "It's imperative that these plans be stopped. If we don't abide by the treaties we've signed, how can we get other countries to do so?"

Advocates of a conservative approach to maintaining U.S. nuclear weapons will be dismayed to learn that DOE believes it can gradually replace the fully-tested weapons in the U.S. stockpile with weapons whose "physics packages" have never been fully tested but rather have been designed or redesigned on computers, perhaps several times, by people who have never had real nuclear testing experience. Several prominent DOE advisors have advocated against such an approach.

Other features of DOE's plan, revealed for the first time in this document, include:

The supposed "need" for a 10 petaflop or faster supercomputer--a machine at least 10,000 times faster than the fastest experimental supercomputer operating today (p. 8-18);

The near-term "need" to certify modifications to the nuclear explosive portions of some U.S. weapons, including a new fire-resistant-pit-containing primary for B61 tactical gravity bombs (p. 4-15 and 1-11);

A program to provide a "continuum of warhead design options" (p. 5-9) to replace the warheads on the Navy's submarine fleet, giving new ground-burst (and hence hard target kill) capability for those

reentry vehicles which now carry W76 warheads--the most numerous weapon type now deployed (p. 10-20);

Provision for the actual manufacture of these new submarine-launched warheads, an admitted driver for DOE's manufacturing modernization plan (called "ADaPT," for "Advanced Design and Production Technologies") (p. 10-21);

A DOE plan that would allow the agency to double the "shot" rate at NIF after the facility is built, yet the "[c]ost for implementing the increased shot rate is not in the baseline project [i.e. not in the budget submitted to Congress for funding] (p. 9-28); and

"Hedge" production plans and "demonstrations" that, when implemented, would allow DOE to quickly increase U.S. nuclear weapon production to "cold war levels of building" (p. 6-18).

Much of the "Green Book" remains classified, including details of how DOE plans to use its multi-billion-dollar suite of "surrogate" testing facilities to design weapons and thus complete its "end run" around the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).

*****ENDS*****

Greg Mello
Los Alamos Study Group
212 E. Marcy Street #7
Santa Fe, NM 87501
505-982-7747 voice
505-982-8502 fax
lasg@igc.apc.org
www.lasg.org

To: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Invoice
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 10:29 PM 4/20/98 -0400, you wrote:

>Howard,

>

>I picked up an invoice from Back Home Printing for Peace Leaf in the amount
>of \$236. This could come out of either the general or the education fund
>but presumably not to be charged to Ploughshares. Pease advise.

>

>Phil

>

>

Dear Phil,

It doesn't matter a lot. You can use the Education Fund if the balance is sufficient since Peace Leaf is clearly educational.

I have an invoice for \$31.70 from the Institute for Global Communications for our internet service. You may charge it to Ploughshares.

And I request a payment of \$2,000 for 10 days of work on the CTBT during April. I'm leaving Friday evening for Geneva and would like to receive the check before then. This is a Ploughshares expenditure.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <d.atwood@mbox.unicc.org>
X-Sender: d.atwood@mbox.unicc.org
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
From: "David Atwood" <d.atwood@mbox.unicc.org>
Date: Tue, 21 Apr 1998 10:47:35 +0200

Dear Howard,

I assume that you have received Marie-Pierre's note saying that she is unable to deliver the presentation. Too bad. I hope that Clayton will be able to do it. How are your other arrangements taking shape?

I look forward to meeting you soon.

All good wishes,

David

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: d.atwood@mbox.unicc.org

Return-Path: <mailbox@ipb.org>
From: International Peace Bureau <mailbox@ipb.org>
To: "Hallman, Howard" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: NPT: reception
Date: Tue, 21 Apr 1998 11:26:54 +-200

Dear Howard

Thank you for the faxed menu! If fundraising is not a problem, then of course the agreed reception arrangement will be fine.

If for some reason the target sum should not be reached, we could tell them to drop the "fruit mirror".

See you in Geneva,

Adam Berry

* * * * *

SPECIAL NGO COMMITTEE FOR DISARMAMENT

Joint NGO Project

for the Second Session of the NPT PrepComm

* * * * *

c/o International Peace Bureau

ipb@gn.apc.org

tel: +41 22 731 64 29

fax: +41 22 738 94 19

41 rue de Zurich

CH - 1201 Geneva

Switzerland

NGO Committee Secretariat:

womensleague@gn.apc.org

To: bridget@fcnl.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Signers of religious leaders' statement
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Bridget:

I have followed up with several religious leaders as follows:

Bishop Cecil Bishop, AMEZ - faxed follow up; if he replies by Thursday, April 23, please let me know because I want to send the statement to all AMEZ bishops.

The Rev. Dr. Edward Jones, National Baptist Convention of America -- faxed follow up

The Rev. Dr. Henry Lyons -- will fax follow up when I get the fax number

The Rt. Rev. Frank T. Griswold, Episcopal Church -- faxed a reminder to Bryan Grieves, who replied that Bishop Griswold is signing.

Wrote to all Christian Methodist Episcopal bishops

Am asking Bishop McKinley Young, AME Church, for list of bishops to write to.

Am trying to reach Rev. Reginald M. McDonough Baptist General Association of Virginia.

Will try to reach somebody at North Carolina and Texas Southern Baptist Conventions.

In all cases I am providing them the reply reform directed to you.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <LCNP@aol.com>
From: LCNP <LCNP@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 21 Apr 1998 12:04:51 EDT
To: robwcpuk@gn.apc.org
Cc: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: ICJ and preamble at NPT

Dear Rob,

Well done on an excellent statement on the ICJ opinoin, morality and the bomb for the NPT opening statement.

I would suggest only one small change. Paragraph 1, second to last sentence, after "international humanitarian law", add "which prohibits the use of weapons which cause unnecessary suffering, indiscriminate harm, violate nuetral territory, or longterm and severe damage to the environment. It is inconceivable that Trident missiles could be used, even in retaliation, without violating these laws."

And I have a question. Don't some of the Trident submarines still have Mark 5/W-88 warheads which have a yield of 475 kilotons? If so, then your second sentance should be modified to "100 - 475 kilotons", "8 - 30 times greater than the Hiroshima bomb"

Peace
Alyn

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 21 Apr 1998 10:43:54 -0400
From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: NPT PrepCom documents on the Web
To: "Abolition Caucus (E-mail)" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>

forwarded

Non-member submission from [Stephen Young <syoun@basicint.org>]

Date: Mon, 20 Apr 1998 13:37:41 -0400
From: Stephen Young <syoun@basicint.org>
Organization: BASIC
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Subject: NPT PrepCom documents on the Web

To all folks interested in the NPT PrepCom

I will be attending the NPT Preparatory Committee (PrepCom) meeting in Geneva from 27 April - 8 May.

One of my primary tasks will be to ensure that as many key documents from the PrepCom as possible are available to all.

Toward that end, I will be placing speeches, official texts, draft language and anything else I think is useful on BASIC's website.

The address is: www.basicint.org

I will probably not be able to get every speech up, but will make sure all the key speeches are there.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Stephen Young
Senior Analyst
BASIC

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 21 Apr 1998 13:23:35 -0400
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: WRITE YOUR SENATOR
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

To : CTBT Organizers
From: disarmament
Date: April 21, 1998

Dear CTBT Organizers:

This week is an especially important time to focus on getting letters and calls into your Senator's office. The Senate is just back from the recess and will be taking up NATO expansion shortly with a final vote expected before the second week in May. We need to make sure that Senate puts the CTBT on the agenda immediately after NATO expansion. That means that Senators everywhere need to here from you to know that this is a high priority for constituents.

>From Bruce Hall at Peace Action, here's a sample letter to senators on the test ban that may be helpful in your efforts. Notice that Clinton has tentative plans to travel to India, China, and Russia later this year. Those are all key test ban countries.

Please take a moment to send a letter to your senator regardless of their political party. See below.

Short simple letters in your own words are easier to write and are more likely to get read. The key to any effective Senate letter is the first sentence. Be sure you clearly ask for action in that first sentence and then finish your letter by restating your request.

When you do get a response to your letter, Please let us know! Send your letter to your Washington DC Contact or the Disarmament Clearinghouse.

The Honorable _____
The United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator _____,

Please do everything in your power to ensure that the Senate ratifies the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty this year. I am distressed to learn that one Senator, Jesse Helms of North

Carolina, continues to block progress on important arms control and non-proliferation treaties such as this one.

U.S. leadership will be key to ensure that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty will become international law and quick Senate ratification will allow the United States to focus its efforts on bringing other key countries on board. I urge you to make sure that when President Clinton visits Russia, China, and India later this year, he has a freshly ratified Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty under his belt.

Over the past 50 years nuclear weapons tests have damaged our environment and driven a deadly nuclear arms race. It is time, finally, to end this menace. I look forward to learning about your leadership on this crucial issue.

Sincerely,

NAME

ADDRESS

For more information and assistance on your letters and calls, and for more on WHAT YOU CAN DO to achieve a NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY NOW!, go to the CTBT Action Site:

<http://www.psr.org/ctbtation.htm>

and contact

Disarmament Clearinghouse
Kathy Crandall, Coordinator
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

(The Disarmament Clearinghouse is a project of:
Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility, and
Women's Action for New Directions

Return-Path: <robwcpuk@gn.apc.org>

Date: Tue, 21 Apr 1998 21:46:04 +0100 (BST)

X-Authentication-Warning: mail.gn.apc.org: Host ao123.du.pipex.com [193.130.254.123] claimed to be [193.130.244.12]

X-Sender: robwcpuk@pop.gn.apc.org

To: mupj@igc.apc.org

From: robwcpuk@gn.apc.org (Rob Green)

Subject: NPT PrepCom/NGO Presentation: Preamble

Cc: lcnp@aol.com, geowcpuk@gn.apc.org, katie@chch.planet.org.nz

Dear Howard Hallman,

In case you didn't see my previous email to you, I'm taking the opportunity to slightly amend the following input on the ICJ/legitimacy issue for your Preamble statement for the NGO Presentations in Geneva on 28 April. I will be attending the whole PrepCom, so would be happy to help you make any last-minute changes. Please let me know if you'd like to discuss this before then. I arrive in Geneva PM Sunday 26 April, and will try to attend the NGO orientation session. I look forward to meeting you.

Best wishes,

Rob Green

Chair, World Court Project (UK)

* * *

NPT PREPCOM, GENEVA: 27 April-8 May 1998

NGO PRESENTATIONS 28 April 1998

PROPOSED DRAFT TEXT ON ICJ/LEGITIMACY FOR PREAMBLE STATEMENT

Most of the nuclear weapons deployed by the nuclear weapon states are far more powerful than those which brought indiscriminate death and suffering to the civilians of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. For example, both the USA and the UK deploy Trident missiles with up to 8 warheads in the 100 kiloton range, a yield 8 times greater than the Hiroshima bomb. The International Court of Justice, in its 8 July 1996 Advisory Opinion, decided that any threat, let alone use of nuclear weapons should comply with international humanitarian law*, which prohibits the use of weapons which cause unnecessary suffering or indiscriminate harm, violate neutral territory, or cause long-term and severe damage to the environment. It is inconceivable that Trident missiles could be used, even in retaliation, without violating these laws*.

The Court also referred to Article VI of the NPT, and went further by agreeing unanimously that all States are under a legal 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." In so doing, it omitted the clause from Article VI relating to a treaty on general and complete disarmament - which hitherto the nuclear States have hidden behind.

Speaking for the Holy See before the First Committee of the UN General Assembly on 15 October 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino stated: "With the valuable admonition offered in the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice, the international community can now see how the legal and moral arguments against nuclear weapons intertwine with the strategic; since nuclear weapons can destroy all life on the planet, they imperil all that humanity has ever stood for, and indeed humanity itself...The gravest consequences for mankind lie ahead if the world is to be ruled by the militarism represented by nuclear weapons rather than the humanitarian law espoused by the International Court of Justice."

Judge Mohammed Bedjaoui, then President of the Court, said: "The nuclear weapon, the ultimate evil, destabilises humanitarian law which is the law of the lesser evil. The existence of nuclear weapons is therefore a challenge to the very existence of humanitarian law, not to mention their long-term effects of damage to the human environment, in respect to which the right to life must be exercised."

ENDS

To: robwcpuk@gn.apc.org (Rob Green)
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: NPT PrepCom/NGO Presentation: Preamble
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 09:46 PM 4/21/98 +0100, you wrote:

>Dear Howard Hallman,

>

>In case you didn't see my previous email to you, I'm taking the opportunity
>to slightly amend the following input on the ICJ/legitimacy issue for your
>Preamble statement for the NGO Presentations in Geneva on 28 April. I will
>be attending the whole PrepCom, so would be happy to help you make any
>last-minute changes. Please let me know if you'd like to discuss this
>before then. I arrive in Geneva PM Sunday 26 April, and will try to attend
>the NGO orientation session. I look forward to meeting you.

>

>Best wishes,

>Rob Green

>Chair, World Court Project (UK)

>

>

Dear Rob Green:

Yes, I did receive your suggestions for the presentation. It came after I had written a first draft, but I was able to incorporate a couple of points from your material into the second draft, which is attached below. I was particularly glad to receive the quotation from Judge Bedjaoui.

We want to use one of our ten minutes for a minute of silence. We have a lot to cover in the remaining nine minutes and accordingly can only use portions of the material offered to us.

I look forward to meeting you in Geneva.

Shalom,
Howard

###

A Spiritual, Ethical, and Humanitarian Perspective on Nuclear Weapons
A Presentation to the NPT Preparatory Committee

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition

Mr. Chairman and delegates to the 1998 session of the NPT Preparatory Committee, I greatly appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and to present some ideas developed by the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition.

You meet at a propitious time. With a new millennium rapidly approaching, the people of this planet would like to enter the new century free from the threat of nuclear holocaust. In the next two weeks you delegates here assembled have a great opportunity to take decisive action to set the course for the abolition of all nuclear weapons on Earth.

The moral grounds for nuclear abolition are expressed in a statement by Godfried Cardinal Danneels and Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, which you have received. Their words reflect a broad consensus within the world's religious community. They state:

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

I believe that most of you in your heart of hearts, in the deep recesses of your mind, agree with this conclusion. The challenge to you is to let your moral judgment guide your actions.

A statement developed by the Christian Peace Conference in the Czech Republic for this conference offers a pair of reasons for the total rejection of nuclear weapons: first, the threat to Creation and, second, the contribution to moral degradation.

"Nuclear weapons," say the Czechs, "fundamentally differ from all other weapons because of their potential to destroy all life on this planet. They are terminal in relation to Nature. They can destroy the divine Creation....They take from God the sole power to end the created order, and thus usurp the divine prerogative....Nuclear weapons stand condemned because they can destroy 'the sacred gift of life' and are thus innately demonic and blasphemous."

Secondly, the Czech statement notes, "The terrible suffering caused by nuclear weapons, their potential for total destruction, and their perversion of the fundamental nature of matter have contributed immeasurably to the moral degradation of humanity in our time." This moral decline has escalated from the mass slaughter of World War I to the Nazi concentration camps to the mass bombing of cities in World War II to the development of nuclear weapons and their use on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the 1945. "The East-West nuclear confrontation," the Czechs conclude, "with the readiness of states to commit global genocide further hugely contributed to the moral de-sensitization of our age, now so evident in many aspects of contemporary life."

From an ethical perspective, Judge Mohammed Bedjaoui, when he was president of the International Court of Justice, indicted: "The nuclear weapon, the ultimate evil, destabilizes humanitarian law which is the law of lesser evil. The existence of nuclear weapons is therefore a challenge to the very existence of humanitarian law, not to mention their long-term effects of damage to the human environment, in respect to which the right to life must be exercised."

Judge Bedjaoui spoke in connection with an unanimous ruling of the International Court of Justice that under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all aspects under strict and effective international control."

Even if no other nuclear bomb is exploded, the Earth will remain scarred by the nuclear weapons era. Earth and its people have suffered grave harm in the mining of fissionable material, in production of nuclear warheads with the byproduct of radioactive waste, and through nuclear testing in the atmosphere and below the ground..

Beyond harm to people and environmental damage, nuclear weapons have taken an enormous economic toll. Since the 1940s the nuclear weapon states have spent more than \$8 trillion to develop, test, produce, transport, deploy, and safeguard their nuclear arsenal. This vast waste of resources brings to mind the words of U.S. President Dwight D. Eisenhower, himself a former general, words deemed so important that they are engraved beside his tomb in Abilene, Kansas. "Every gun made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed....This is not a way of life at all....Under the cloud of threatening war, it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron."

The great irony is that the nuclear weapon states through these vast expenditures have failed to produce the security they seek. Indeed, it is their own people who are at greatest risk due to their doctrine of mutually assured destruction. Citizens of the allies of nuclear weapon states are themselves vulnerable to nuclear attack because of the established doctrines of the nuclear powers. Any other nation gaining nuclear weapons would join the ranks of the insecure.

Tragically the nuclear weapon states and their allies are victims of a self-imposed and self-destructive addiction to nuclear weapons. Yes, an addiction. Like many other addictions cure can come in two ways.

First, the addicted can exercise self-will, can renounce the addictive substance or orientation, and can through great determination and inner strength free itself from the addiction that is sapping its vitality. In this case, the nuclear weapon states can say individually or join together in a covenant that says, "We renounce the use of nuclear weapons for war-fighting purposes. We renounce nuclear deterrence as an instrument of foreign and military policy." Renunciation would remove the fundamental blockage to carrying out a series of actions that lead to nuclear abolition. Other speakers on this program will describe the steps that can be taken along this road.

Second, friends of the addicted can apply "tough love". They can talk firmly and insist that the addicted take the necessary steps leading out of addiction. In the matter at hand, you delegates from non-nuclear weapon states can exercise tough love by insisting that the nuclear powers embark upon a course of action that moves toward nuclear abolition. You can even develop a plan in the form of a nuclear weapons convention to outlaw and abolish nuclear weapons. Even if you are part of a political bloc with one or more nuclear weapon states, true friendship requires you to apply tough love by acting independently and supporting measures leading to nuclear abolition. Beyond that each and everyone of you has a higher loyalty to all humankind, to the well-being of all peoples on Earth.

As you prepare to meet the challenges before you during this session of the NPT Preparatory Committee, I invite you to pause and observe one minute of silence. Use this minute to reflect upon the human suffering caused by nuclear weapons in their more than fifty years of existence: the victims at Hiroshima and Nagasaki; the indigenous people and other inhabitants living in the vicinity of test sites in the Western United States, Algeria, Russia, Kazakhstan, China, the South Pacific, and Australia; persons far from away from test sites but harmed by drifting radioactive fallout; the people who have suffered by the side effects of mining operations and weapon production facilities.

In silence we can remember all who have suffer. We can share together feelings of regret and contrition. You who are delegates can also use this moment to reflect on what you can accomplish in the next two weeks. You can re-dedicate yourself to working courageously and with imagination to find ways to end the nuclear arms race and rid Earth of this horrible plague on human existence.

May we pause now in silence.

[After one minute.]

In the spirit of renewal and re-dedication, the NGO community this afternoon would like to offer you a series of ideas on steps that can be undertaken to achieve the abolition of nuclear weapons, an achievable goal that humankind longs to accomplish.

Return-Path: <eivpet@online.no>

X-Authentication-Warning: pilt.online.no: ti01a09-0046.dialup.online.no [130.67.2.110] didn't use HELO protocol

Date: Tue, 21 Apr 1998 23:14:34 +0200

From: Eivind Vad Petersson <eivpet@online.no>

To: mupj@igc.org

Subject: Nuclear Abolition

Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition

Howard W. Hallmann

mupj@igc.org

Oslo, 21. april 1998

Dear Howard W.Hallmann

Thank you for your letter of April 4th about the campaign for the abolition of Nuclear Weapons.

Due to the time factor, we have not been able to circulate the letter to our members before the time limit of tomorrow, but we will distribute it to all member churches during the coming days and also send it with our recommendation to the foreign minister of Norway.

We are happy to sign this statement:

Sincerely

Christian Council of Norway

Rev. Billy

Taranger

Rev. Ingrid Vad Nilsen

President

General Secretary

Mailing address:

PB 5816 Majorstua

0308 Oslo

Norway

phone: 47 - 22 93 27 50

fax: 47 - 22 93 28 28

e-mail: eivpet@online.no

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Tue, 21 Apr 1998 17:43:17 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: NPT PrepCom documents on the Web

To: Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers members and friends
Fm: Stephen Young, BASIC c/o Daryl Kimball
Dt: 20 April 1998
Re: NPT PrepCom documents on the Web

I will be attending the NPT Preparatory Committee (PrepCom) meeting in Geneva from 27 April to 8 May.

One of my main tasks will be to place on BASIC's website official documents, speeches, and draft texts from the meeting.

I will be scanning, HTMLing and putting up documents on a daily basis, so the information should be extremely current.

The address of our website is <<http://www.basicint.org>>

If you need any further information, please feel free to contact me.

Yours,

Stephen Young
Senior Analyst
BASIC

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: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Tue, 21 Apr 1998 18:48:47 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: CTBT op-ed project - target states & topics

April 21, 1998

To: Coalition member groups and other CTBT supporters
From: Daryl Kimball (CRND) and Bill Eisenstein (NSNS)

Re: Reminder about CTBT op-ed project

Next month, the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers will be hiring a media consultant -- Elliott Negin - - to help stimulate the publication of op-eds on the Comprehensive Test Ban. Elliot will attend our next CTBT Working Grp. meeting (4/24 at 9:30 am at UCS) to briefly discuss the project.

We Need Your Help and Eloquent Words (generally 500-750):
What is needed are your finished op-eds no later than May 4. Coalition member groups and other CTBT supporters are asked to solicit, ghost-write, or otherwise assemble 1-2 draft op-eds by the most well-known or expert persons in your organizations that you would like to have the consultant assist in placing. Ideally you might solicit an op-ed by a prominent member of your organization who lives outside Wash. DC. Your level of interest and ability to follow through with some op-eds is vital to making this work.

Suggested Topics:

Ideally, we would like to have CTBT op-eds that address a range of reasons and topics that make the case for Senate consideration of the Treaty this year, including: 1) the value of the CTBT to non-proliferation efforts and the NPT; 2) the value of U.S. ratification for helping to address the S. Asian nuclear standoff; 3) the value of the CTBT verif. system; 4) the importance of the CTBT to capping the superpower nuclear arms race; 5) n-testing is not necessary to maintain the safety of the arsenal; 6) the CTBT is supported by a bi-partisan majority of the public and a large segment of your constituency (i.e. health professionals, weapons scientists, environmentalists, religious denominations, etc.); 7) the bipartisan legacy of the test ban effort (i.e. Eisenhower and Kennedy); and other topics.

Newspapers of Interest:

The project will focus on placing op-eds primarily in newspapers in the states listed below. Please think about whether your organization has a board member, activist, or contact who might be able to collaborate with you on an op-ed in one of these states:

North Carolina, Wyoming, Minnesota, Missouri, Tennessee, Indiana, Georgia, Kansas, Nebraska, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Maine, Iowa, Colorado, Utah, Washington, Alaska, New York, Mississippi.

Elliott Negin will be working out of the National Security News Service

offices beginning the 2 week of May. He will:

- * receive your finished op-eds
- * distribute the columns to selected newspapers
- * conduct follow-up calls to opinion page editors.

Please send your op-eds directly to Elliot Negin at National Security News Service via e-mail, c/o Bill Eisentstein <billeisen@rocketmail.com>

If you already have op-eds written and are trying to place them, please let Elliot, Bill or Daryl know about your effort to help improve overall coordination.

If you have any questions feel free to contact us. Thank you.

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: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <LCNP@aol.com>
From: LCNP <LCNP@AOL.COM>
Date: Tue, 21 Apr 1998 19:12:34 EDT
To: mailbox@ipb.org
Cc: syoung@basicint.org, ledwidge@psr.org, pbidwai@pb.unv.ernet.in,
agrieg@online.no, kirsten.osen@basalmed.uio.no,
morten.bremer.maerli@nrpa.no, r_salvador@mailcity.com, wslf@igc.org,
jburroughs@igc.org, amok@amok.antenna.nl, damjanov@math.uni-hamburg.de,
geowcpuk@gn.apc.org, magoo@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in,
greensfelder@igc.apc.org, wagingpeace@napf.org, robwcpuk@gn.apc.org,
A.Malten@net.HCC.nl, nde@igc.apc.org, dave@paxchristiusa.org,
mupj@igc.org, henrik.arnell@klingen.uu.se, ddurand@mail.asi.fr,
okamoto@shudo-u.ac.jp
Subject: NPT Paper on Article VI

Content-ID: <0_893200354@inet_out.mail.aol.com.1>
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Dear Friends,

Thank you for your interest in our paper

Peace
Alyn Ware
Content-ID: <0_893200354@inet_out.mail.aol.com.2>
Content-type: text/plain;
name="ART6.ASC"

Content-disposition: inline

1984 Revisited:
Rearmament is Disarmament?

Comments on Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty

Table of Contents

1. Summary	1
2. Recommendations	1
3. The Emperor has no Clothes: Conditionality and Article VI	1
4. Nuclear Weapons States: Rearmament is Disarmament	2
5. Idealism or Realism: The Tide Moves	4
6. 2000 Review: Fireworks or Fizzle	4
7. Making it happen	5

Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy
666 Broadway, Suite 625
New York, NY 10012
Tel: (1) 212 674 7790. Fax: (1) 212 674 6199
Email: lcnp@aol.com. Website: www.ddh.nl/org/ialana

1. Summary

Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) obliges States parties to negotiate in good faith on effective measures for nuclear disarmament. Currently most nuclear weapon States (NWS) say that they are ultimately in favor of nuclear disarmament but they currently refuse to enter into negotiations on nuclear disarmament in the Conference on Disarmament or any other multi-lateral forum. Instead certain NWS are continuing their research, testing, development, production and deployment of nuclear weapons systems.

A convergence of international developments indicates that the possibility of total nuclear disarmament has moved from a pipe dream to an achievable goal.

States parties of the NPT should use the opportunity of the strengthened review process to make greater progress towards the fulfillment of the Article VI obligation for nuclear disarmament.

2. Recommendations

I. States parties should:

- a. Call for negotiations to begin in 1998 leading to the conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention, which would provide for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons under international verification and control.
- b. Call for the immediate implementation by the nuclear weapon States of initial disarmament steps as recommended by the United Nations, Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, the Generals and Admirals' Statement, the Group of 21 and the Civil Leaders Statement (see box on page 5).
- c. Establish an intersessional working group on nuclear disarmament.

II. Non-nuclear States should remind the nuclear weapon States that if progress is not made towards complete nuclear disarmament, the non-proliferation regime is likely to unravel.

3. Conditionality and Article VI

The specific obligation of the NWS to pursue negotiations leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons was reaffirmed in the Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament which were adopted by consensus at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the NPT.

The International Court of Justice reaffirmed this obligation in July 1996, and noted that this required the conclusion of negotiations on nuclear disarmament in all its aspects.

a) Conditionality excuse

Some NWS seek to make the fulfillment of this obligation conditional upon other factors. The United States, for example, has linked this obligation with the obligation to achieve general and complete disarmament and implies that the former is not possible without the latter. In explaining its opposition to the U.N. draft resolution on the ICJ advisory opinion the U.S. referred to "the mischaracterization of NPT Article VI and the NPT Principles and Objectives decision document, which are selectively quoted ... by omitting crucial references to general and complete disarmament'."

The Chairman's Working Paper for the NPT Preparatory Committee contains language proposed by NWS that "The States parties... recognize that nuclear disarmament can only take place in a stable international security environment," i.e. an environment that is not likely to exist within the lifetime of anyone alive today.

The NWS are correct in asserting that nuclear disarmament, general and complete disarmament, and international security are related, but they have the relationship reversed. Nuclear disarmament is a part of general and complete disarmament, and its achievement will assist and precede the achievement of general and complete disarmament, not the other way around. The elimination of nuclear weapons will drastically reduce the need for conventional weapons which many States now rely upon to deter or counter nuclear weapons. In addition, the achievement of nuclear disarmament will allow greater attention to be focused on next steps towards general and complete disarmament.

Similarly the achievement of nuclear disarmament will contribute tremendously to global security, not only as a consequence of the reduced threat resulting from the elimination of nuclear weapons, but also from the adoption of confidence building and security measures which will inevitably be adopted as part of a nuclear disarmament regime.

Thus, even if, as some NWS assert, nuclear disarmament is conditional on progress towards general and complete disarmament and on an improvement in international security, this is no reason not to commence nuclear disarmament negotiations, but rather an additional reason to start such negotiations.

The conditionality advanced by some NWS becomes fallacious when one considers that the barrier to nuclear disarmament cited by them, i.e. the lack of progress on general and complete disarmament, is in fact caused largely by these very same States, which are the largest conventional arms producers and exporters in the world.

b) The Emperor has no clothes

The conditionality excuse evaporates completely under examination of the NPT, which makes no such conditions. This is evident from:

i) The formulation of Article VI which, while noting obligations for nuclear disarmament and general and complete disarmament, makes no mention of conditionality, but includes a clear division, in the form of a comma, between these two obligations.

ii) The ninth preambular paragraph of the NPT which declares the intention of States parties "to achieve the cessation of the nuclear arms race and to undertake effective measures in the direction of nuclear disarmament" without any mention of conditionality with respect to general and complete disarmament or international security.

iii) The fourth preambular paragraph of UN General Assembly Resolution 2373 (June 12, 1968), which welcomed the conclusion of the NPT and expressed the conviction that "an agreement to prevent the further proliferation of nuclear weapons must be followed as soon as possible by effective measures on the cessation of the nuclear arms race and on nuclear disarmament..." Again no mention is made of any link to general and complete disarmament or international security.

In addition, The International Court of Justice reaffirmed unanimously that "there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations on nuclear disarmament in all its aspects," without mentioning any such conditionality.

4. Nuclear Weapons States: Rearmament is Disarmament?

While not committing itself to nuclear abolition, the United States argues that they are implementing their Article VI obligations in a step-by-step manner, and cites the achievement of the START, INF and CTBT treaties, withdrawal of tactical nuclear weapons from surface ships, adherence to nuclear free zones and pursuance of negotiations on a fissile material cutoff treaty.

While States deserve recognition for the progress and hard work done to achieve such steps, even a cursory look will reveal that they are limited achievements towards the goal of nuclear disarmament. Indeed, very little progress on any of the above has been made since the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference.

The START and INF treaties, while reducing the total number of delivery systems, do not require destruction of nuclear warheads. Some reduction of nuclear warhead numbers has taken place. However the lowest number envisaged, even if START III were to be negotiated, remains in the thousands of mostly strategic weapons, still well above the number which could destroy not only entire countries but possibly all life on earth.

The CTBT, while prohibiting testing by nuclear explosions, does not prohibit other forms of testing. For that reason it is viewed by many as discriminatory, restraining only those countries that do not have the technology to do non-explosive testing. In addition, it is unlikely to enter into force in the foreseeable future because of the lack of fulfillment of entry-into-force requirements.

Adherence by the NWS to nuclear weapon free zones has been reluctant at best. The U.S. ended its military cooperation with New Zealand in 1984 in retaliation for New Zealand declaring itself a nuclear weapon free zone. The U.S. also opposed Palau's attempt to establish itself as a nuclear weapon free zone. In addition, three of the NWS opposed United Nations General Assembly Resolution 52/38 N (December 9, 1997) which called for the NWS to ratify the appropriate protocols of the regional nuclear weapon free zones.

The fissile material cutoff treaty, as proposed by the NWS, is more of a non-proliferation measure than a disarmament measure. An FMCT which only prohibits production would affect the ability of the "have-nots" to develop nuclear weapons, but would not affect the ability of the NWS to maintain or even enhance their nuclear weapons stockpiles as they all have more than adequate stockpiles of fissile material.

Thus the "disarmament measures" cited by the NWS hardly qualify for the term. At the same time, the NWS, particularly the U.S., are rearming through a continuation of research, testing, development, deployment and production of nuclear weapons systems, often under the guise of innocuous Orwellian sounding names such as Stockpile Stewardship and Management.

Current programs include:

- * Production of plutonium triggers for hydrogen bombs. These triggers are small nuclear weapons in themselves, used in hydrogen bombs to initiate the fusion reaction. Los Alamos National Laboratory is preparing to produce these for the first time in almost 40 years.

- * The U.S. has conducted three sub-critical tests in Nevada since the signing of the CTBT. These are explosive tests of nuclear weapons which do not reach criticality.

- * The U.S. has developed a new warhead, a modification of the B61, which has been designed as a low-yield counter-proliferation weapon. In addition the US has continued to build delivery systems, particularly Trident

submarines

and Trident II missiles. The U.K. is modernizing its nuclear force by replacing its existing nuclear armed submarine fleet with Trident systems.

* The U.S. is planning to resume production of tritium, a neutron provider in nuclear weapons, despite the fact that existing stocks of tritium would suffice for existing weapons stockpiles for 20 years and for a smaller stockpile until the end of the 21st century. These plans indicate that the U.S. has no intention of making deep reductions in nuclear weapons stockpiles anytime before the 22nd century.

* The National Ignition Facility, one of the new facilities being built in the U.S. as part of the Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program, will enable fusion experiments to enhance designs of thermonuclear weapons and possibly even to enable the design of a fusion weapon which would not require fissile material.

In addition the NWS maintain their nuclear weapons on alert status and, with the exception of China, maintain policies of first use of nuclear weapons. The U.S. recently reaffirmed its policy not only of first use of nuclear weapons, but also a policy of flexible use including use against non-nuclear threats.

Finally, the NWS, with the exception of China, refuse to commence negotiations which would lead to the elimination of nuclear weapons under a nuclear weapons convention, as called for in United Nations Resolution 52/38 O, and also refuse to allow the establishment of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament in the Conference on Disarmament.

5. Idealism or Realism:

The Tide Moves.

Recent developments betoken a groundswell of expert and grassroots opinion in favor of nuclear abolition.

International Court of Justice President Bedjaoui has noted that "the goal is no longer utopian and that it is the duty of all to seek to attain it more actively than ever. The destiny of man depends on the will to enter into this commitment..."

Other key developments indicating the desirability and practicality of complete nuclear disarmament include:

* In August 1996, the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons released its report which concluded that nuclear disarmament was necessary and achievable.

* On December 5, 1996, 60 retired Generals and Admirals, including General George Lee Butler, former Head of the U.S. Strategic Command which controls all nuclear weapons, released a statement calling for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

* On December 10, 1996 and again on December 9, 1997, the U.N. General Assembly called for the immediate commencement of negotiations leading to the conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention.

* On March 13, 1997, the European Parliament called on all members to support negotiations leading to the conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention.

* On November 17, 1997, the United Nations distributed a Model Nuclear Weapons Convention (A/C.1/52/7) submitted by Costa Rica. The model convention outlines a practical regime for the elimination of nuclear weapons and deals with the legal, technical and political issues that would need to be addressed.

* On February 2, 1998, 117 Civil Leaders including 47 past or present heads of State released a statement calling for the abolition of nuclear weapons and the implementation of steps towards that goal.

* Over 1000 citizens' organizations have joined Abolition 2000, an international network calling for the negotiation of a nuclear weapons convention.

* On February 2, The Nation published as a special issue a long article entitled "The Gift of Time: The Case for Abolishing Nuclear Weapons," containing pro-abolition interviews with such world leaders as Helmut Schmidt, Robert McNamara, Senator Alan Cranston, Mikhail Gorbachev and Gen. Charles Horner.

* Public opinion polls indicate support for a nuclear weapons convention in the U.S. and U.K. at over 80%, and Canada at over 90%.

The NWS continue to resist the call for the elimination of nuclear weapons, but this can be overcome by political

pressure and momentum generated by other governments and the public. The recent success of the landmines campaign, which also focussed on the complete ban on an inhumane and indiscriminate weapons system despite the resistance of many States, demonstrates this.

6. 2000 Review: Fireworks or Fizzle?

The 2000 Review of the Non-Proliferation treaty has the potential to produce significant measures to complete the process of the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons. On the other hand, it could produce "a tale full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

States parties should not accept tokenism or deception from the NWS. The first steps should be taken immediately so that the 2000 Review Conference can set the scene for the full implementation of the Article VI nuclear disarmament obligation through the rapid conclusion of negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention.

States parties should call now for the immediate implementation of steps which have been proposed by the United Nations, Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, the Group of 21 Program of Action for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, the Generals and Admirals Statement and the Civil Leaders Statement (see box).

Those steps that have not been implemented by the year 2000 should be listed in the final document of the NPT 2000 Review as the next steps to be concluded.

States should call for the immediate implementation of the following steps:

- * Commencing negotiations which would lead to the conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention* Taking all nuclear forces off alert
- * Ending deployment of all nuclear weapons
- * Removing warheads from delivery vehicles* Negotiating further reductions in nuclear stockpiles
- * Concluding agreements on no-first-use, no-use of nuclear weapons or non-use against non-nuclear weapons States
- * Closure or conversion of all nuclear test sites
- * Ending of all nuclear weapons modernization and research, except research necessary for the destruction of nuclear weapons and the verification of arms control agreements
- * Ending the production of nuclear warheads, their components and nuclear weapons delivery systems
- * Establishing a registry of nuclear weapons and fissile material
- * Placing all fissile material under international control

7. Making it happen

Over the past two years the Conference on Disarmament has been unable to make progress, having failed to establish an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament. The Review process of the NPT offers an alternative complementary path to stimulate progress and to lay some of the groundwork for negotiations.

The proposal in the Chairman's working paper to establish an intersessional working group to assist in the achievement of a nuclear weapons convention should be supported.

"Negotiations, as a matter of some urgency, on a nuclear-weapons convention should commence... This could be assisted through the establishment of an intersessional working group." (NPT Chairman's working paper, NPT/CONF.2000/PC/32/Corr.1)

While negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention itself would achieve little without the agreement of the NWS, an intersessional working group could pave the way for such negotiations through considering the legal, political and technical measures necessary for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

It should be made clear to the NWS that if they move rapidly towards the implementation of their NPT obligations, it

would assist in achieving the aim of universality while, at the same time, improving security globally. The NWS should also be told in no uncertain terms that if on the other hand they persist in non-implementation of their obligations, universality is impossible, and other States parties may start to reassess their participation in the treaty.

Return-Path: <LCNP@aol.com>
From: LCNP <LCNP@aol.com>
Date: Tue, 21 Apr 1998 19:12:45 EDT
To: mailbox@ipb.org
Cc: syoung@basicint.org, ledwidge@psr.org, pbidwai@pb.unv.ernet.in,
agrieg@online.no, kirsten.osen@basalmed.uio.no,
morten.bremer.maerli@nrpa.no, r_salvador@mailcity.com, wslf@igc.org,
jburroughs@igc.org, amok@amok.antenna.nl, damjanov@math.uni-hamburg.de,
geowcpuk@gn.apc.org, magoo@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in,
greensfelder@igc.apc.org, wagingpeace@napf.org, robwcpuk@gn.apc.org,
A.Malten@net.HCC.nl, nde@igc.apc.org, dave@paxchristiusa.org,
mupj@igc.org, henrik.arnell@klingen.uu.se, ddurand@mail.asi.fr,
okamoto@shudo-u.ac.jp
Subject: NPT Article IV paper

Content-ID: <0_893200365@inet_out.mail.aol.com.1>
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Dear Friends,

Attached is the email version of our paper on nuclear energy and the NPT. The hard copy includes photos and charts which we are unable to reproduce in electronic form.

Peace
Alyn
Content-ID: <0_893200365@inet_out.mail.aol.com.2>
Content-type: text/plain;
name="ENERGY.ASC"

Content-disposition: inline

Nuclear Energy and the
Non Proliferation Treaty:
An Authorized Albatross?

Comments on Article IV of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

About, about, in reel and rout
The death-fires danced at night;
The water, like a witch's oils,
Burnt green, and blue and white.

Ah! Well a-day! What evil looks
Had I from old and young!
Instead of a cross, the Albatross
About my neck was hung.

(The Rime of the Ancient Mariner)

Alyn Ware
Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy

Prepared for the second session of the
Preparatory Committee for the 2000 Review Conference on the Parties to the Treaty on the
Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

April 1998

Nuclear Energy and the Non Proliferation Treaty:
An Authorized Albatross?

Table of Contents

1. Summary	1
2. Recommendations	1
3. Energy Requirements	1
4. Risks of Nuclear Energy	
i) Human health and the environment	
a) Nuclear accidents	2
b) Nuclear waste	3
c) Nuclear transport	3
ii) Nuclear weapons proliferation	3
5. Economic Costs of Nuclear Energy	4
6. Energy Alternatives	
i) Energy efficiency	4
ii) Alternative Energy Sources	4
a) Biomass	5
b) Solar	5
c) Wind	5
d) Geothermal	6
7. Unsound Promotion of Nuclear Energy	6
8. NPT "Right" to Nuclear Energy	7
9. Nuclear Energy and the NPT 2000 Review	8
10. Conclusion	8

Appendix I: Nuclear Power Reactors in Operation, Dec. 1993

Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy
666 Broadway, #625
New York, NY 10012, USA
Tel: (1) 212 674 7790. Fax (1) 212 674 6199
Email. Lcnp@aol.com

Note: This is an updated version of a paper prepared for the 1995 NPT Review
and Extension Conference.1. Summary

Energy development is a primary concern for increasing the standard of living in developing countries. The Non-Proliferation Treaty establishes a "right" of all parties to develop nuclear energy,

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) is empowered to facilitate the transfer of nuclear technology to non-nuclear states. In addition, the IAEA actively promotes the development of nuclear energy.

It is however becoming increasingly obvious that while the benefits of nuclear technology in medicine, engineering and agriculture may outweigh the risks, this is not true in the case of nuclear energy. Nuclear energy creates a legacy of serious and longlasting environmental and health problems, and enables proliferation of nuclear weapons. This affects the security and the well being of people in all states, not just those in the states with nuclear energy. Nuclear energy has become an "authorized albatross" around the necks of humanity.

States do not have an "inalienable right" to damage human health or the environment nor to threaten the security of neighboring states or the lives of citizens.

Alternative energy sources which are environmentally safe and cost effective are becoming more available and could provide for the world's energy requirements.

While there is an international agency established to promote and assist the development of nuclear energy, there is no such agency to promote and assist the development of renewable, environmentally safe energy.

2. Recommendations

- a) That an international sustainable energy agency be established with the aim to promote and assist in the development of energy efficiency, and renewable, environmentally safe energy.
- b) That states make a commitment not to develop any new nuclear power facilities and to phase out nuclear energy by the year 2015.
- c) That Article IV of the NPT not be reaffirmed at the NPT Review in 2000, but left to lapse as Article V has done.
- d) That the Chairman's Working Paper for the NPT Preparatory Committee include language reflecting the above (for draft language see section 9: Nuclear Energy and the 2000 Review of the NPT, p 8)

3. Energy Requirements

Developing countries have a right to energy assistance in order to raise their standard of living to that of the developed world. It has been estimated that in order for the developing countries to reach such a standard, their energy production would need to double by the year 2025.

Energy assistance needs to conform to the economic, health and environmental needs of the recipient countries.

Energy companies, whose main aim is to make a profit, cannot be relied upon to conform to such requirements. With the support of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the nuclear energy industry will continue to promote an energy which is unsafe, uneconomic and unnecessary.

There needs to be an alternative international energy agency with the objective of promoting non-polluting, economic, renewable energy options.

4. Risks of nuclear energy

i) Human Health and the Environment

Nuclear energy poses serious risks to human health and the environment

a) Nuclear accidents

While there have been numerous nuclear accidents, those of Windscale (UK), Three Mile Island (US) and Chernobyl (Ukraine) have most forcibly demonstrated the serious risks associated with nuclear energy.

Chernobyl, for example, released over 300 times the radiation released by the Hiroshima bomb, and contaminated at least 20 countries. In Finland many reindeer had to be killed due to radioactive contamination. 99% of the land in Belarus is contaminated to some degree and will remain so for up to 250,000 years.

Over 800,000 children in Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova and surrounding states are at high risk of contracting leukemia or other cancers as a result of the accident. There is a 300% increase in congenital birth defects, blood and nervous system disorders and cancer in the area. Thyroid cancer increased 1000%. These health problems will continue to appear, particularly in children, for 1000-10,000 generations. Independent scientists have estimated that between 280,000 and 500,000 deaths will result worldwide from the accident.

It has been claimed that the RBMK reactor is fundamentally more dangerous than other reactors and that this is the reason for the Chernobyl accident occurring. This is not true. The Chernobyl accident occurred primarily through human error. In fact, in 1983 Mr Semenov, Head of the IAEA Department of Nuclear Energy and Safety praised the RBMK reactors for their safety features. IAEA reassurances that such an accident cannot happen in other reactors are misleading and fallacious.

If nuclear energy is not phased out, another accident of the magnitude of that at Chernobyl will likely occur sometime.

b) Nuclear waste

Nuclear energy produces waste which remains radioactive and a threat to health and the environment for up to 250,000 years.

There is no known way of storing this waste safely and securely for such a long period. In addition, even if a safe storage method is developed, there is no known way of communicating to subsequent civilizations what is stored, how dangerous it is and how to maintain it safely. No known human language has lasted more than 5000 years, let alone 250,000 years.

It is irresponsible for humanity to keep producing this waste before we have developed storage methods and trans-civilization communication tools which will overcome these problems.

c) Nuclear transport

Nuclear energy involves the transportation of highly radioactive materials from mines to processing plants to reactors to reprocessing plants to reactors again and finally to storage sites. Transporting radioactive materials poses additional risks of accidents resulting in uncontrollable leakage into the environment. These risks are particularly high in the shipments of waste across the world's oceans.

While the benefits of nuclear energy are confined to the states possessing such nuclear energy, the health and environmental costs are borne by many others.

ii) Nuclear Weapons Proliferation

Nuclear energy poses serious threats to nuclear weapons proliferation.

In 1946 a report to the US Secretary of State's Committee on Atomic Energy concluded that

"The development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes and the development of atomic energy for bombs are much of their course interchangeable and interdependent." The committee further concluded that "...there is no prospect of security against atomic warfare" in an international system where nations are "free to develop atomic energy but only pledged not to use it for bombs."

Subsequent events have given proof of this statement. The development of nuclear weapons by France emerged from a nuclear program which many scientists believed was only for civilian purposes. A number of states including parties to the NPT such as Iraq and North Korea, have received technical assistance in the development of nuclear energy, only to redirect this technology into a nuclear weapons program.

Frank von Hippel, adviser to the US government, has noted that "Civilian nuclear energy programs provide a convenient cover, as well as the training, technology and nuclear material necessary for the construction of nuclear weapons."

India's explosion of a nuclear device on May 18, 1974, developed from a civilian nuclear program, demonstrates dramatically that fissile material and technology diverted from civilian programs will indeed work in nuclear weapons.

The increase in production and reprocessing of plutonium from civilian nuclear reactors means that diversion into nuclear weapons becomes even harder to prevent. The manufacture of nuclear weapons is technically not difficult once fissile material is obtained. Civilian stocks of separated plutonium, currently at 122 tonnes, are projected to surpass military stocks by the year 2000 and will reach 550 tonnes by 2010. The recent diversion of Russian plutonium into private hands demonstrates the increasing likelihood that such diversion could enable nuclear weapons production by a growing number of states, including those without nuclear power, and also by non-state entities.

5. Economic Costs of Nuclear Energy

When the "Atoms for Peace" program was first launched it was claimed that nuclear energy would be too cheap to meter. This claim has proven to be blatantly incorrect, as costs for nuclear power plants are now on average above \$1 billion to build, and the costs of accidents, decommissioning and downtime have yet to be fully accounted for, let alone the unquantified economic costs of the damage to human health and the environment.

The Chernobyl accident alone could end up costing US\$358 Billion by the year 2000.

The development of environmentally safe, renewable energy systems has been hindered by low budgets for research and development, compared to nuclear energy which has had considerable government subsidization for research and development.

Despite this, the per unit cost for most sustainable energy sources is cheaper than for nuclear energy, competitive with fossil fuels and constantly reducing.

6. Energy Alternatives

No one energy source can provide all of humanity's energy needs. However, a sensible combination of energy efficiency systems and safe, renewable energy sources can meet this requirement.

i) Energy efficiency

Current consumption of energy by the developed world is inefficient. The developed countries could reduce their energy consumption without damage to their economies or standard of living by using energy efficiency techniques such as minimal processing, recycling, use of energy efficient machinery, and more efficient energy management. Utilizing energy efficiency would in fact improve the standard of living globally as it would reduce the impact of overconsumption of energy on the environment and human health.

Utilizing similar models of energy efficiency, the economies of developing countries could develop without having to consume the same per capita level of energy as the developed world currently consumes.

ii) Alternative energy sources

Alternative energy sources could provide the energy currently provided by nuclear energy and also the projected energy output of nuclear power plants planned for the future.

Coal, oil and hydroelectric stations will continue to play a role in the world's energy needs. While each of these is either non-renewable or damaging to the environment, they are not life threatening to the degree that nuclear energy is. However, even without nuclear energy, fossil fuel use could be considerably reduced with the development of solar, biomass, wind, geothermal and other renewable non-polluting energy sources. Such renewable energy sources could fill the bulk of the world's energy requirements by the mid 21st Century.

a) Biomass

Biomass involves the generation of energy from plant material through decomposition, burning or other means. Biomass currently provides one-third of the energy used in the developing world. When produced sustainably the burning of energy crops produces no net increase in global carbon dioxide levels.

Conversion of burning sugar cane to energy could generate another third of the developing world's energy needs.

Biomass energy has other advantages in that it can often be produced from byproducts of food crops, making the energy source a dual contribution to the economy.

b) Solar energy

A range of technologies have developed to harness solar energy, including passive water heaters, parabolic troughs, parabolic dishes and photovoltaic systems.

Some of these technologies can be used in decentralized systems, including energy production units on individual homes or

businesses. These provide attractive options for the developing world as they are inexpensive and do not require large and expensive energy grids for distribution of energy from a central source.

Other systems can be used to generate large amounts of power from a centralized location to feed energy consuming industries.

Marginally productive or non-productive desert land is ideal for medium to large scale solar energy projects. In a study of possible sites for large scale production of solar energy in the US, a desert area in Nevada was chosen as the most productive.

Solar energy is now becoming a comparatively cheap energy source. The proposed Nevada Solar Project could produce 10,000 MWs of energy at 6.22c/Kwh.

c) Wind

Windmills can be used for direct work such as water pumping and grain grinding. They can also be used to generate electricity.

In 1988 2% of California's energy was produced by windmills. Wind farms require large amounts of space, but can be established on land also used for agriculture or horticulture. The cost of electricity from wind in the US has reduced from 20c per kilowatt-hour in the 1980s to 5c per kilowatt-hour, and is expected to decline further.

d) Geothermal

Geothermal energy uses steam from underground volcanic areas to provide heat or to generate electricity. It is currently utilized in Japan, Aotearoa-New Zealand, Hawaii, California and Iceland. Japan, which currently has 270 megawatts of geothermal capacity, has a potential of 250 times that amount, or double the country's current nuclear energy capacity. At least 40 countries, including the USA, could produce a considerable percentage of their energy needs from geothermal reserves.

7. Unsound Promotion of Nuclear Energy

Many developed countries are turning away from nuclear energy, but are peddling it to the developing world.

Nuclear energy is now being recognized by many countries in the developed world as being uneconomic, unsafe and unnecessary. As a result developed countries are now turning away from nuclear energy. In the United States all reactor orders placed over the past 20 years have subsequently been cancelled. In Canada the nuclear industry has not placed an order for a reactor since 1974. Greece, Italy, Austria, Belgium, Switzerland, Spain, Sweden, Finland and Germany have all halted construction of further reactors.

Despite the turn away from nuclear power in the developed world, nuclear power companies from the developed world are peddling it instead to the developing world. In 1988, the Philippines government filed a bribery suit against Westinghouse, a US company, accusing it of paying \$17.2 million to former president Marcos to win the project.

The International Atomic Energy Agency actively promotes the development of nuclear energy.

The International Atomic Energy Agency was established by a United Nations General Assembly Resolution on 4 December 1954, with the aim to "accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world."

Article III of the IAEA's Statute authorizes the Agency "to meet the needs of research on, and development and practical application of, atomic energy for peaceful purposes, including the production of electric power, with due consideration for the needs of the under-developed areas of the world."

The IAEA acts on this aim through information dissemination and technical assistance. The IAEA has established a number of avenues for accomplishing this including operating research and service laboratories, maintaining the International Nuclear Information System, holding promotional conferences and meetings, provision of technical training, providing nuclear equipment, and publishing bulletins, newsbriefs and other promotional documents.

The IAEA is involved in a number of nuclear endeavors including food irradiation and the use of radio-isotopes in medicine, geothermal exploration and scientific research. However the IAEA has noted that "...promotion of nuclear power will be the Agency's most important contribution to the economy and general welfare."

The IAEA particularly targets those developing countries currently experiencing economic growth. This is often at the cost of cheaper alternatives. In Thailand, for example, despite a World Bank recommendation against building nuclear power plants because the cost would be much higher than alternatives, Hans Blix, at that time the Director-General of the IAEA, told government officials that

"In the longer term it is inevitable and indispensable to use nuclear power and therefore any developing country with fairly high levels of development like Thailand must begin to prepare for a nuclear period."

To this end, the IAEA downplays the environmental, economic and health risks associated with nuclear energy. In 1991, for example, the IAEA downplayed the effects of the Chernobyl accident arguing that the Soviets had over-reacted to the contamination and that "the relocation and foodstuff restrictions should have been less extensive." In addition the IAEA at times promotes a reduction in safety standards for nuclear energy. S. Elkund, Director General of the IAEA at the time, noted that "...there is a double standard in safety requirements by which nuclear undertakings are compelled to be safer than all others...and this imposes an economic penalty on nuclear power..."

8. NPT "Right" to Nuclear Energy

Article IV of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty asserts the "inalienable right of all Parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes." Article IV also establishes the obligations of nuclear states to assist non-nuclear states with the development of nuclear energy, and notes particularly the "needs for the developing areas of the world".

This "right" would however appear to be in conflict with more fundamental rights such as the rights to health and life.

These rights are confirmed by numerous instruments of international law including;

The Constitution of the World Health Organization;

"The enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health is one of the fundamental rights of every human being..." (Principles paragraph 2)

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

"Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person" (Article 3)

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;

"Every human being has the inherent right to life. This right shall be protected by law." (Article 6.1)

Convention on the Rights of the Child;

"States parties recognize that every child has the inherent right to life."

(Article 6.1)

"States parties shall ensure to the maximum extent possible the survival and development of the child."

(Article 6.2)

Nuclear power threatens the health and life of citizens currently living as well as those in subsequent generations. This right is not abrogated by the necessity of energy development as the "deprivation of life may be justified only in defence of life"

In addition, where there is clearly a choice between non-life-threatening energy options and life-threatening energy options, states have a responsibility to choose non-life-threatening options.

The NPT was adopted at a time when the full implications of nuclear energy for health and life were not known. In fact, these implications are only now coming to light as a result of, inter alia, the Chernobyl accident and nuclear waste problems.

Now that these implications are known, the Article IV "right" to nuclear energy should be allowed to languish just as the Article V "right" to nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes has been left to do.

9. Nuclear Energy and the 2000 Review of the NPT

The Chairman's Working Paper for the Preparatory Committee for the 2000 Review Conference of the Parties to the treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT/CONF.2000/PC.I/32. Annex I) calls on States parties to "reaffirm the importance they attach to ensuring the exercise of the inalienable rights of all the parties to the treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination..."

This draft text should be opposed and replaced with text along the lines of the following;

"The States parties reaffirm the inherent and inalienable rights to life and health and that such rights must be upheld in the pursuit of energy.

The States Parties reaffirm also the rights of all States to the development of energy necessary for economic and social advancement, and call on the fullest possible exchange of equipment, materials and scientific and technological

information
for the development of safe and sustainable energy sources.

To that end, the States parties call for the establishment of an International Sustainable Energy Agency with a mandate to promote and assist in the development of energy efficiency and renewable, environmentally safe energy sources.

The States parties recommend that priority for energy assistance be given to States which have forgone nuclear energy or have committed themselves to phasing out nuclear energy over a reasonable timeframe."

10. Conclusion

The 20th Century has seen the rise of many threats to the global environment, nuclear energy being one of the greatest. The legacy of nuclear contamination and environmental destruction which the 20th century has created will remain for generations to come.

We have the choice at the dawn of the 21st Century to continue down a road of nuclear dangers that threatens the health and lives of all people and all other living beings on this planet, or to abandon such a dangerous and destructive path in favor of one which can provide for the energy needs of the world in a safe and economically sound way.

The choice is yours. Please make it wisely.

"The self-same moment I could pray
And from my neck so free
The albatross fell off and sank
Like lead into the sea"

Samuel Taylor Coleridge
The Rime of the Ancient Mariner

Return-Path: <jancormack@clear.net.nz>
From: "jancormack" <jancormack@clear.net.nz>
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition"
Date: Wed, 22 Apr 1998 14:24:49 +1200
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

Dear Howard Hallman,

The following people wish to have their names added to the statement "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition". They are all involved in the work of the Conference of Churches in Aotearoa New Zealand at an Executive level.

1. William V. Robinson
President, CCANZ (Conference of Churches in Aotearoa New Zealand)
1 Valley View Road
Titirangi
Waitakere City
Auckland 1007
Fax: 64 9 828 2056
2. Rev Jennifer Dawson
President, CCANZ
162 Richardson Terrace
Christchurch 2
New Zealand
e mail: jenny.dawson@p3.terrier.chch.planet.org.nz
3. Rev Max Reid
President, CCANZ
80 Lonsdale Street
Dunedin
New Zealand
e mail: maxr@deepsouth.co.nz
4. Mrs Jan Cormack
General Secretary, CCANZ
Private Bag 11-903,
Ellerslie
Auckland
New Zealand
Fax: 64 9 525 4346
e mail: jancormack@clear.net.nz

I trust that this list of names arrives in time!

With all good wishes,

Jan Cormack
General Secretary
CCANZ

Return-Path: <dce@wcc-coe.org>
Date: Wed, 22 Apr 1998 12:10:26 +0200
From: Dwain EPPS <dce@wcc-coe.org>
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: The final text

With thanks for your suggestions!

Attachment Converted: C:\INTERACT\data\download\RAISER1.NPT

To: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Invoice
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 10:06 PM 4/21/98 -0400, you wrote:

>Howard,
>Due to other things on my schedule, I won't get to writing checks until
>Thursday. Then, however, I assure you "the checks are in the mail!"
>Phil
>
>Phil,

I respect your schedule. If you plan to mail my \$2,000 check late in the day on Thursday so that it won't arrive by the time I leave Friday afternoon, please call me, and I'll pick it up. I want to use part of it for some bills that are due while I'm away.

Howard

To: "Tamara Malinova" <malinova@un.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Remarks for reception
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Ms. Malinova:

We now have available the text of the remarks that Dr. Konrad Raiser will make at the reception in honor of Ambassador Wyzner and delegates to the NPT Preparatory Committee, to be held in Geneva on Monday evening, April 27. It is attached. I don't have a text for Cardinal Danneels remarks, but I believe that he will speak in a similar vein.

We look forward to Ambassador Wyzner's presence at the reception and his remarks in response.

Shalom,
Howard W. Hallman

###

Reception in Honor of the Chairman and Delegates attending
the NPT Preparatory Committee
27 April 1998
Palais des Nations, Geneva

WELCOMING REMARKS

Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser
General Secretary
World Council of Churches

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates, Friends,

Thank you all for accepting Cardinal Danneels's and my invitation to join us in this informal gathering at the beginning of your work here in Geneva. It gives us the welcome opportunity to greet you, and to assure you that we shall be accompanying you with our hopes and prayers during these days.

It would be unfair to burden you with long speeches on the eve of your meeting where you will certainly get your full! We shall not do this tonight. Nevertheless, Cardinal Daneels and I do wish to convey to you the importance we attach to what you are called to do here.

We all remember the decades of the 1970s and 1980s when world public opinion followed your debates with a sense of great urgency. Millions of people were in the streets of major capitals around the world pressing for an immediate reversal of the nuclear arms race. Now you meet without such immediate pressure from world public opinion. Indeed the world press has paid quite little attention to the fact that you are gathered here.

We should not, however, allow ourselves to be complaisant. What you are called to do here is of central importance to the peoples of the world. Your task remains as difficult as ever, and it must be undertaken with wisdom, courage, and a sense of great urgency.

By the grace of God, the nuclear arms race has been reversed, and for the first time since Hiroshima, nuclear weapons and delivery systems are being destroyed. But the nuclear threat remains. The rhythm of nuclear disarmament has

slowed to a snail's pace. While testing has also been halted, nuclear arms research and development continues. And although the major nuclear weapons powers have stepped back cautiously from their absolute reliance on doctrines of nuclear deterrence, nuclear weapons remain the pillar of global defense strategies.

As the Psalmist put it, we live still "in the valley of the shadow of death." We in the World Council of Churches firmly believe that this is not what God intended for humanity. God wills Peace with Justice, and the integrity of all Creation.

Since it was formed fifty years ago, the World Council of Churches has called repeatedly and insistently for the total elimination of atomic and nuclear weapons. The Protestant, Anglican and Orthodox from around the world who are joined in this Council and the Roman Catholic Church, with which we have close relations, are firmly united on this point. Together, we have always made this appeal in a spirit of humility, confessing to God our own complicity, and our own failure to trust more in our Creator than in arms. Yet we know that true security is never to be found in arms of any sort, and certainly not in these most terrible weapons ever devised by human beings. Nuclear weapons are sinful, and their production, possession and deployment, and the very threat of their use in an extreme case constitute crimes against God and humanity.

Friends,

Now is the time. The task before you is weighty indeed. And though you meet now without the glare of publicity which accompanied you in the past, you may be assured that people of faith around the world are following with care and great anticipation your work in these days.

The burden, as ever, is on the nuclear weapons states themselves. We are grateful for the steps they have taken to reduce the threat of nuclear war. We hope that they will join a consensus of commencing work on the total abolition of nuclear arms. But the responsibility is not theirs alone. If they do not move ahead, then other nations must take the lead, for now is the time.

For my part, I wish to assure you of our confidence in your ability to reach achieve significant agreements in this sense, to work in the spirit of compromise and mutual respect, and with bold resolve. Our prayers are with you. May God inspire your thoughts, your deliberations and your spirit of determination to do what will be pleasing in God's sight.

To: dave@paxchristiusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Dr. Raiser's remarks for reception
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Dave,

Here's the final text of Dr. Raiser's remarks for the reception.

Howard

###

Reception in Honor of the Chairman and Delegates attending
the NPT Preparatory Committee
27 April 1998
Palais des Nations, Geneva

WELCOMING REMARKS

Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser
General Secretary
World Council of Churches

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates, Friends,

Thank you all for accepting Cardinal Danneels's and my invitation to join us in this informal gathering at the beginning of your work here in Geneva. It gives us the welcome opportunity to greet you, and to assure you that we shall be accompanying you with our hopes and prayers during these days.

It would be unfair to burden you with long speeches on the eve of your meeting where you will certainly get your full! We shall not do this tonight. Nevertheless, Cardinal Daneels and I do wish to convey to you the importance we attach to what you are called to do here.

We all remember the decades of the 1970s and 1980s when world public opinion followed your debates with a sense of great urgency. Millions of people were in the streets of major capitals around the world pressing for an immediate reversal of the nuclear arms race. Now you meet without such immediate pressure from world public opinion. Indeed the world press has paid quite little attention to the fact that you are gathered here.

We should not, however, allow ourselves to be complaisant. What you are called to do here is of central importance to the peoples of the world. Your task remains as difficult as ever, and it must be undertaken with wisdom, courage, and a sense of great urgency.

By the grace of God, the nuclear arms race has been reversed, and for the first time since Hiroshima, nuclear weapons and delivery systems are being destroyed. But the nuclear threat remains. The rhythm of nuclear disarmament has slowed to a snail's pace. While testing has also been halted, nuclear arms research and development continues. And although the major nuclear weapons powers have stepped back cautiously from their absolute reliance on doctrines of nuclear deterrence, nuclear weapons remain the pillar of global defense strategies. As the Psalmist put it, we live still "in the valley of the shadow of death." We in the World Council of Churches firmly believe that this is not what God intended for humanity. God wills Peace with Justice, and the integrity of all Creation.

Since it was formed fifty years ago, the World Council of Churches has called repeatedly and insistently for the total elimination of atomic and nuclear weapons. The Protestant, Anglican and Orthodox from around the world who are joined in this Council and the Roman Catholic Church, with which we have close relations, are firmly united on this point. Together, we have always made this appeal in a spirit of humility, confessing to God our own complicity, and our own failure to trust more in our Creator than in arms. Yet we know that true security is never to be found in arms of any sort, and certainly not in these most terrible weapons ever devised by human beings. Nuclear weapons are sinful, and their production, possession and deployment, and the very threat of their use in an extreme case constitute crimes against God and humanity.

Friends,

Now is the time. The task before you is weighty indeed. And though you meet now without the glare of publicity which accompanied you in the past, you may be assured that people of faith around the world are following with care and great anticipation your work in these days.

The burden, as ever, is on the nuclear weapons states themselves. We are grateful for the steps they have taken to reduce the threat of nuclear war. We hope that they will join a consensus of commencing work on the total abolition of nuclear arms. But the responsibility is not theirs alone. If they do not move ahead, then other nations must take the lead, for now is the time.

For my part, I wish to assure you of our confidence in your ability to reach achieve significant agreements in this sense, to work in the spirit of compromise and mutual respect, and with bold resolve. Our prayers are with you. May God inspire your thoughts, your deliberations and your spirit of determination to do what will be pleasing in God's sight.

Return-Path: <dce@wcc-coe.org>
Date: Wed, 22 Apr 1998 15:54:10 +0200
From: Dwain EPPS <dce@wcc-coe.org>
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: 27 April reception -Forwarded

Date: Wed, 22 Apr 1998 11:02:02 +0200
From: Ursula ZIERL <uz@wcc-coe.org>
To: dce@wcc-coe.org
Cc: ch@wcc-coe.org
Subject: 27 April reception

I had a call from the Belgian Mission, saying that Ambassador Jean-Marie Noirfalisse will attend the reception. Please put his name instead of the one to whom the invitation was addressed (Willems?)

Regards. Ursula

Return-Path: <revweb@worldnet.att.net>
Date: Wed, 22 Apr 1998 14:07:47 -0500
From: Gloria Weber <revweb@worldnet.att.net>
Reply-To: revweb@worldnet.att.net
Organization: Interfaith Voices
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: Interfaith Voices Directory
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id MAA04121

DATE: April 22, 1998

TO: US & Canadian Faith & Interfaith Groups that work for peace and justice

FR: The Staff of Interfaith Voices for Peace & Justice
Bruce Schuman (UUA)-Webmaster; Anne Simpson (SBC)-Production; Gloria Weber (ELCA)-Editor

RE: Want to be included in the new Directory?

You're invited to complete and return the following forms if you are a faith or interfaith group working for peace and justice. Quite likely you've already received these forms by mail and mislaid them or put them aside. We hope you'll respond to this E-mail. We believe that peace and justice groups will profit from knowing one another. News, views, plans, and ideas of thousands of activists across the country can be shared.

Your entry form is enclosed. If you want to be included...act now. Please complete your entry and return it ASAP. Use E-mail, fax or postage mail. We'll include your entry as you return it, unless we must condense your mission statement. So, please make your mission statement as complete and concise as possible - 3 to 5 sentences.

You'll be sent a hard copy of the directory and we'll also post it at www.origin.org/ifv.htm. No commitment is involved-just improved communication and cooperation. The Directory (hard copy and Internet) has countless possibilities-identifying allies, immediate news, planning cooperative actions, conducting surveys, signing petitions, and just plain making new friends. Members, staff and friends may then participate on the Web.

The directory and web pages are free, at least in '98. We're volunteering our time now as we apply for grant funds...because future possibilities are unlimited and exciting. We hope you agree and return your form ASAP. About 300 groups have already answered.

Call or E-mail us with questions, concerns or suggestions at 1-888-454-8296 (toll free). E-mail revweb@worldnet.att.net.

Here's your entry form----

INTERFAITH VOICES for Peace and Justice
P. O. Box 270214, St. Louis, MO 63127
Toll Free (888) 454-8296, Fax (314) 892-1244
revweb@worldnet.att.net, www.origin.org/ifv.htm

Please complete the following information and return by fax to (314)
892-1255. Call (888)454-8296 if you have any questions.

ORGANIZATION: _____

CONTACT: _____

ADDRESS: _____

CITY/STATE/ZIP: _____

PHONE: _____

FAX: _____

E-MAIL: _____

WEB PAGE: _____

MEMBERSHIP: Are you a membership organization? __Yes __No
of Members _____ Membership Cost _____

NEWSLETTER: Do you have a newsletter? __Yes __No
Newsletter Name _____

PUBLICATION: Do you publish a magazine? __Yes __No
Publication Name _____
of Subscribers _____ Subscription Cost _____

MISSION: _____

Does your Organization have local offices or chapters in the U.S. or
Canada? __Yes __No

If yes, please indicate how many and the locations:

MINISTRY: CHOOSE YOUR ORGANIZATION'S FOCUS (Mark all that apply):

CHILDREN/YOUTH/FAMILY: Aging, child and spousal abuse, family planning, sexuality training, quality education (including special needs)

COMMUNICATION: Publications - Examples: National Catholic Reporter, The Lutheran, Christian Ethics Today, Tikkun, etc.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM: Prevention, system reform, community violence, illegal drugs

DISCRIMINATION: On basis of: race, religion, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation

ECOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENT: Clear air and water, nuclear energy, global warming, endangered species.

ECONOMIC CONCERNS: Multi-national corporations, world bank, treaties, adequate pay for workers, salary inequities, right of workers to organize, military defense spending

ECUMENISM/INTERFAITH COOPERATION: Examples: World Council of Churches, United Nations Assn. Of U.N., etc.

FOREIGN POLICY CONFLICT/NEEDS: Countries other than the United States and Canada

GLOBAL PEACE/SECURITY: Nuclear arms and testing, chemical and biological weapons, arms control, arms sales, landmines, overpopulation

HEALTH ISSUES: Universal health care, managed care, HIV/AIDS, organ donation, bio-ethics, legal drugs

HUNGER/HUMAN NEEDS: Welfare reform, simple living, earned income tax credit, needs of disabled, immigration, alcohol and drug treatment, etc.

LEADERSHIP TRAINING: Educating, training or organizing leaders for peace and justice ministry; research and reporting leadership information

LIFE AND DEATH ISSUES: Abortion, contraception, euthanasia, assisted suicide, death penalty

PEACE AND NON-VIOLENCE: Gun control, peacetime military, military budget, non-violence as way of life

__ RELIGION IN SOCIETY: Observing and reporting

__ RELIGIOUS AND CIVIL LIBERTY: Place of religion in public education, separation of church and state, 501(c)3 taxation, First Amendment studies

__ URBAN MINISTRY CONCERNS: Quality public education, affordable housing, minimum wage, job training, day care, employment

INTERFAITH VOICES includes a directory, news alerts, a newspaper, and web communication. We would like your thoughts and comments:

Submitted by: _____

Fax information to (314) 892-1255

Return-Path: <cccgsec@web.net>
Date: Wed, 22 Apr 1998 15:58:08 -0400 (EDT)
X-BlackMail: ts34-11.tor.istar.ca, cccadmin.kaja, cccgsec@web.net, 204.191.149.154
X-Authenticated-Timestamp: 15:58:08(EDT) on April 22, 1998
X-Sender: cccgsec@pop.web.net
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
From: General Secretary <cccgsec@web.net>
Subject: Statement on Nuclear Abolition

Dear Mr. Hallman:

Further to my e-mail of April 17th., the following is a list of heads of our member churches who have agreed to sign the Statement on Nuclear Abolition to be presented to the NPT Preparatory Committee in Geneva, April 27th.

The Most Rev. J. Barry Curtis
President
Canadian Council of Churches.
3015 Glencoe Road, S.W.
Calgary, Alberta, T2S 2L9
Tel. (403) 243-3673, Fax: (403) 243-2182; e-mail: diocese@telusplanet.net

The Very Rev. Bill Phipps
Moderator
United Church of Canada
3250 Bloor St. W.
Etobicoke, Ont. M8X 2Y4
Tel. (416) 231-7680, Fax # (416) 232-6005

The Rev. John D. Congram
Moderator
The Presbyterian Church in Canada
50 Wynford Drive
Don Mills, Ont. M3C 1J7
Tel. (416) 441-1111, Fax # (416) 441-2825

Archbishop Michael G. Peers
Primate of the Anglican Church of Canada
600 Jarvis St.
Toronto, Ont. M4Y 2J6
Tel. (416) 924-9199, ext. 276. Fax # (416) 924-0211 or 968-7983

Commissioner Donald V. Kerr
Territorial Commander
The Salvation Army
2 Overlea Blvd
Toronto, Ont. M4H 1Pr
Tel. (416) 425-2111. Fax # (416) 422-6201

The Rev. Arie G. Van Eek
Council of Christian Reformed Churches in Canada
P.O.Box 5070
Burlington, Ont. L7R 3Y8

Tel. (905) 336-2920, ext. 241 or (905) 689-5266. Fax # (905) 336-8344;
e-mail vaneeka@crcnet.mhs.compuserve.com

Marvin Frey
Executive Director
Mennonite Central Committee Canada
134 Plaza Drive
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 5K9
Tel. (204) 261-6381, Fax # (204) 269-9875.

Gale Wills
Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) in Canada
91A Fourth Avenue
Ottawa, Ont. K1S 2L1
Tel. (613) 235-8553, Fax # (613) 232-9923.

Several of the aforementioned signatories have expressed a desire to have a hard copy of the signed statement as it will be presented to the NTP Preparatory Committee, so I would greatly appreciate receiving a copy at your earliest possible convenience.
Kindly acknowledge receipt of this e-mail.
With best regards, I am,
Sincerely.

Anne Marie Rodrigue
Administrative Assitant
Canadian Council of Churches
Tel: 416-232-6070 ext. 2023
Fax: 416-236-4532
E-mail: cccgsec@web.net

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: Christian CND <ccnd@gn.apc.org>
Date: Wed, 22 Apr 1998 11:30:49 -0700
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: to David Kreiger, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, INESnet@fy.chalmers.se
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

I am forwarding a very positive message recently received from Christian CND.

David Krieger

>Return-Path: <ccnd@gn.apc.org>
>From: Christian CND <ccnd@gn.apc.org>
>To: "wagingpeace@napf.org" <wagingpeace@napf.org>
>Subject: to David Kreiger, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
>Date: Tue, 21 Apr 1998 16:38:21 +0100
>
>Greetings from the Christian Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament in London, UK.
>
>Could you please publicise the following information? If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Caroline Gilbert, 42 Marksbury Ave, Richmond, Surrey, TW9 4JF, UK. Tel/fax +44 181 876 6025 Email ccnd@gn.apc.org
>
>
>
>
>
>The Christian Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament is working to get the Abolition 2000 Statement
>
>"to achieve by the year 2000 a signed agreement committing the world to a permanent elimination of nuclear weapons according to a fixed timetable"
>
>endorsed by churches and church related groups, societies, and conferences world wide so as to exert pressure on the governments of the nuclear weapons states to take steps towards nuclear disarmament.
>
>We took the Abolition 2000 Statement to the Second Ecumenical Assembly at Graz in 1997, this year we will take it to the Lambeth Conference in July and to the 50th anniversary meeting of the World Council of Churches at Harare in November. We are writing to all the Bishops in the Anglican Communion for the Lambeth Conference.
>
>We are asking all kinds of church groups, from mother and baby groups to religious orders to conferences, to endorse the Abolition 2000 Statement. We are particularly asking church groups in non nuclear weapon states to do so. Their endorsements will help those of us who live in nuclear weapon states to persuade our churches to support us. Then the Christian churches can stand together to put pressure on the nuclear powers to start the process of universal nuclear disarmament.
>
>For the Lambeth Conference Christian CND will support the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship in their Pilgrimage from Southwark Cathedral on 19th July to Canterbury on 25th July 1998. We will highlight the importance of Abolition 2000 as a step on the way towards the abandonment of war as a means of settling international disputes.
>
>We are working on bringing Abolition 2000 to church groups together with Pax Christi UK.
>
>If you can help us in any way we would be very pleased to hear from you.

>
>Please send your group's endorsement to us and we will forward them to Abolition 2000.
>
>
>
>Group Name:
>Contact Name:
>Address:
>Please return to Christian CND, 162 Holloway Rd, London, N7 8DQ.

>
>
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>

\$\$\$\$\$\$\$ 1 LINE REFORMATTED BY POPPER AT igc.apc.org \$\$\$\$\$\$\$

To: General Secretary <cccgsec@web.net>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Statement on Nuclear Abolition
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 03:58 PM 4/22/98 -0400, you wrote:

>Dear Mr. Hallman:

>

>Further to my e-mail of April 17th., the following is a list of heads of our
>member churches who have agreed to sign the Statement on Nuclear Abolition
>to be presented to the NPT Preparatory Committee in Geneva, April 27th.....

Dear Ms. Rodrique:

Thanks for this list. I'll fax you a copy of statement.

Howard Hallman

Return-Path: <flick@igc.apc.org>
X-Sender: flick@pop.igc.apc.org (Unverified)
Date: Thu, 23 Apr 1998 08:26:59 +0100
To: disarmtimes@apc.org
From: wilpfun@igc.apc.org (wilpf)
Subject: Convenors Meeting, Sunday 26th, 6pm
Cc: ipb@gn.apc.org, mupj@igc.apc.org, basecln@gaia.psdn.org.ph,
oliver.meier@bits.de, kalinowski@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de,
arjun@ieer.org, Simon.Carroll@ams.greenpeace.org, dkimball@clw.org,
wslf@igc.apc.org, datan@igc.org, edibal@iprolink.ch

Dear Convenors,

- * A reminder that the convenors of the NGO presentations plan to meet at 6pm Sunday 28th of April at the WILPF office, which is across the road from the UN, 1 rue de Varembe, 1211 Geneva, Ph 41 22 733 6175
- * I think I have emailed all convenors about this separately in our communications about the drafts. Some of you have not completed a first draft yet and thus I might not have clarified the time and date, but please do make sure you come.
- * Some people are not arriving until after Sunday, in which case they have been asked to send a replacement to this meeting with the most current draft of their speeches.
- * The space at the WILPF office is not huge, and thus I would like to encourage people to bring as few extras as possible, although of course no one will be kicked out. Unless you as convenors want there to be a closed door.
- * Please bring the latest draft of the text of your speech on a disc - and please save it as TEXT if you are on an IMB computer. The speeches will be layed out and made into a booklet format on a MACINTOSH computer on MONDAY NIGHT - to be ready for handing out on Tuesday. If you are using an IBM this means you will need to save your material on a PC EXCHANGE disc, which is the kind of disc that can be read by both types of computers. It will also be handy if you have your disc at the meeting for any changes that you want to make on the spot using the computers at the WILPF office.
- * It is my desire that we get a chance to hear the speeches read out loud at that meeting. This will be a chance to hear the flow of the speeches, to listen for repetition etc. I also hope that as a group we can finalise the speakers and make sure that there are all the kinds of balances we need, gender, race, non/nuclear weapons states, languages etc. Organising for people to help distribute the speeches on Tuesday Afternoon will be another agenda item.

I realise we will be tired people, I don't think the meeting will go for many hours, but I promise to have some wine and cheese there to make it easier!

love from felicity

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 23 Apr 1998 11:26:33 +0200
From: Pms8a001 <damjanov@math.uni-hamburg.de>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: INES proposals for the A2000 Annual Meeting in Geneva
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id CAB07245

Dear abolitionists,
Reiner Braun, Executive Secretary, and me (Tobias Damjanov), member of the Project Staff of the INTERNATIONAL NETWORK OF ENGINEERS AND SCIENTISTS FOR GLOBAL RESPONSIBILITY (INES) have elaborated some proposals for the upcoming Annual Meeting of the International Abolition 2000 Network in Geneva. These proposals we like to present to you here (my apologies that the text has not been proofread by a native English speaker)

1998 Annual Meeting of the International Abolition 2000 Network:
Proposals for Intensifying and Strengthening the Network's Future Work

Preliminary remark:
Noting that in recent months, the Network has grown considerably in numbers, we are somewhat missing an equally successful qualitative development. This is why we would like to table some proposals as to how to intensify and strengthen most effectively the political quality of the Network. The Network's Annual Meeting is certainly the best place to discuss and decide upon this issue.

While making our particular points, we are fully aware that there are quite a few other issues equally important to ours, to say the least. Concentrating on and giving priority to certain selected subjects does not mean from our point of view that other issues are less relevant. To cut this story short: we believe it would be helpful to a certain extent if the Abolition 2000 Network would have some sort of „think-tank" of its own. As Janet Bloomfield once wrote (in: „Thoughts on the future of A2000", email to the <abolition-caucus>, 17 Oct 1997):
„...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?"

Additionally, we'd like to draw your attention to the
- 1999 Hague Peace Conference

- proposals for the UN to declare the Year 2000 as International Year for Abolition of Nuclear Weapons

These are two issues which certainly deserve to be tackled by this year's

Meeting of the Network. Although we are very much interested in either subject, we won't focus on that here. We do mention that here, though, because we feel it is another „evidence" to give thought to a Network's „think-tank". No other peace-related organisation or network has more supporters/members than Abolition 2000 - a challenge we haven't met yet properly.

However, we ask the 1998 Annual Meeting of the International Abolition 2000 Network to discuss and vote on the following motions:

MOTION 1: Working Groups

Considering the political and practical importance of the Network's Working Groups with regard to the specific details of how to accomplish the abolition of nuclear weapons,

The 1998 Annual Meeting of Abolition 2000 suggests to strengthen this working group structure by taking into account the following:

==== > a) each Working Group should try to identify at least one member or contact address, be it individually or by organisation, in every country in which the Network is represented

==== > b) wherever possible, each Working Group should support the establishment of regional and/or national branches dealing with the particular regional and national specialities of the subject on which either Working Group is concentrating its activities

MOTION 2: Internal Information and Communication

By April 1998, more than 1,000 organisations and groupings the world over had signed the Network's Abolition Declaration. To meet this very promising development in terms of information and communication,

The 1998 Annual Meeting of Abolition 2000 strongly recommends that
==== > a) all Working Groups to release feed-back information on their activities, their problems, etc. to the abolition community (see, for example,

the Minutes of the NPT Working Group regularly disseminated via the abolition-caucus, or the listserver of the Religious Working Group)

==== > b) also, the Transition Group to make public to the Network members

summaries of its discussions, its proposals, decision-making etc.

==== > c) the „Bulletin for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons" (BAN!) to be

relaunched on a regular basis (available in a printed version as well as in an

email version). The contents of it should be mainly action-oriented and it should

be taken into account that such a publication could also be used to address

non-members of the Network. One possibility of disseminating the printed

version would be to add it as an insert to the „INESAP Bulletin"

MOTION 3: National and regional Abolition branches

In order to further strengthen the Network regionally and countrywise by

decentralising work and intensifying activities on all specific sub-items of

the overall approach to abolish nuclear weapons once and forever,

The 1998 Annual Meeting of Abolition 2000 suggests that

=== > a) Network members of a given country should consider to form national Abolition 2000 Coalitions which would enhance the grassroots power of abolitionists (as it was successfully done already in some countries).

One goal should be to establish contact addresses of activists being responsible

for one (or more) countries which would help decentralizing and thus, intensifying the Network's practical policy-making

=== > b) efforts should be made to form regional Network branches like the

European Abolition 2000 Network launched in mid-1997

=== > c) Network activists, including members of the Transition Group and

all Working Groups, should assist those who intend to form national or regional Abolition 2000 Coalitions, particularly by providing addresses of the

Network members in the respective country/region

=== > d) countries and regions, in which the Network is underrepresented,

should be identified in order to establish a priority list of (geographical) areas

where the Network ought to become more active

(for example, Africa, Eastern Europe, etc.)

=== > e) efforts should be made to identify all major international NGOs dealing

somehow with nuclear issues who are still not Network members. This could

include, among others, trade unions, religious NGOs, and human rights organisations. In addition, it could be considered to approach in

particular

selected profession-based international organisations, including, for example,

special initiatives addressing parliamentarians and international governmental

organisations. (If agreed upon this proposal in general, it could be further

considered to establish a corresponding Abolition 2000 Working Group dealing

with this matter as a coordinating body on behalf of the Network.)

MOTION 4: Nuclear Weapon-Free Zones

The process towards creating nuclear weapon-free zones (NWFZ) and agreements to declare regions and even continents nuclear weapon-free are

very important and convincing steps on the way to a nuclear weapon-free world.

Therefore, the 1998 Annual Meeting of Abolition 2000 will intensify the

campaign for nuclear weapon-free zones by

=== > a) initiating local communities' NWFZ resolutions, including the demand for immediate negotiations on the Nuclear Weapons Convention, in as many countries as possible (so far, this has been successful only in a

very few countries, eg. the US, the UK, Japan, Australia and Aotearoa)

=== > b) lobbying for NWFZ treaties in world regions particularly endangered

through nuclear weaponry, i.e. Europe, Middle East, Far East Asia, India/Pakistan.

To help accomplishing these goals the Network Meeting suggests

=== > c) to consider the establishment of an Abolition 2000 Working Group on

Nuclear Weapon-Free Zones which would, among other things, coordinate campaigning and lobbying, follow the international discussion on NWFZ, and

provide useful information

=== > d) to liaise more closely with groups and organisations dealing with NWFZ

issues, such as the UK-based Nuclear Free Zone Local Authorities

International

Secretariat and NFZ offices in other countries, or the Cities

Partnership Programme of

Hiroshima and Nagasaki to Ban Nuclear Weapons

Take also into account what the founding conference of the European branch of

Abolition 2000 („Visions for a Non-nuclear Europe", Schlaining/Austria, 13-15 June 1997) discussed with regard to NWFZ activities:

<><> To intensify the dialogue with governments and government officials,

organize a letter jointly signed by major national NGOs from European countries

to

- urge governments to start negotiating nuclear weapon-free zones in Europe

- ask for official consultations between NGO representatives and governments'

representatives

This activity could be combined with or accompanied by related actions parallelly conducted in European countries

<><> To create a political atmosphere favourable for both the establishment of

nuclear weapon-free zones and negotiations for a Nuclear Weapons Convention,

local authorities in all European countries should be urged to vote for an

Abolition Declaration

<><> Parliamentary initiatives:

- motions in favour of nuclear weapon-free zones

- motions to establish legal provisions/laws

<><> Approaching the OSCE:

Nuclear weapon-free zones are on the OSCE agenda - NGOs could elaborate proposals of how to lobby OSCE representatives to make them supportive

for

nuclear weapon-free zones

[If you replace „Europe" by other regions, these suggestions are certainly of general relevance.]

Reiner Braun, Executive Secretary, INES < r.braun@lilly.ping.de >

Tobias Damjanov, Project Staff, INES I'tl Office <

damjanov@math.uni-hamburg.de >

[INES is a co-founder of both the International Abolition 2000 Network and its European branch]

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 23 Apr 1998 10:10:37 -0400
From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: FW: Final draft - nuclear power paper
To: "Abolition Caucus (E-mail)" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>

The final version of Simon Carroll's (Greenpeace International) NPT paper on "Nuclear Power - problems and alternatives" is now available in MSWord 6.0/95 format at <http://www.pgs.ca/pages/nl/npt-pc.doc>

Ross Wilcock
rwilcock@web.net
<http://www.pgs.ca/>

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

From: Simon Carroll [SMTP:Simon.Carroll@ams.greenpeace.org]
Sent: Thursday, April 23, 1998 4:05 AM
To: rwilcock@web.net
Subject: Final draft - nuclear power paper

Thanks again !!!!!

Return-Path: <cccgsec@web.net>
Date: Thu, 23 Apr 1998 11:04:24 -0400 (EDT)
X-BlackMail: ts67-10.tor.istar.ca, cccadmin.kaja, cccgsec@web.net, 204.191.147.73
X-Authenticated-Timestamp: 11:04:24(EDT) on April 23, 1998
X-Sender: cccgsec@pop.web.net
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
From: General Secretary <cccgsec@web.net>
Subject: Statement on Nuclear Abolition

Dr. Mr. Hallman:

Bishop Sartison has today authorized us to include his signature in the
aforementioned statement. I hope it is not too late. His name should appear
as follows:

The Rev. Telmor Sartison, Bishop
Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada
1512 St. James St.
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3H 0L2
Tel. (204) 786-6707, ext. 304. fax # (204) 783-7548. email: sartison@elcic.ca.

Thank you for faxing me a copy the statement. However, what I need, when
available - perhaps upon your return from Geneva, is a copy of the complete
list of signers as presented to the delegates of the NTP Preparatory Committee.

Wishing you a good trip, I am,

Sincerely yours,
We have MOVED!!!

Canadian Council of Churches
3250 Bloor St. W., 2nd Floor
Toronto ON M8X 2Y4
Tel: 416-232-6070
Fax: 416-236 4532
E-mail: cccgsec@web.net
<http://www.web.net/~ccchurch>

Return-Path: <dh3m@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de>
From: Martin Kalinowski <dh3m@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de>
Subject: Re: Convenors Meeting, Sunday 26th, 6pm
To: wilpfun@igc.apc.org (wilpf)
Date: Thu, 23 Apr 1998 19:19:03 +0200 (CET)
Cc: disarmtimes@apc.org, ipb@gn.apc.org, mupj@igc.apc.org,
basecln@gaia.psdn.org.ph, oliver.meier@bits.de,
kalinowski@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de, arjun@ieer.org,
Simon.Carroll@ams.greenpeace.org, dkimball@clw.org, wslf@igc.apc.org,
datan@igc.org, edibal@iprolink.ch

Dear Felicity,
dear convenors,

I am sorry that I cannot arrive before Tuesday morning in Geneva. The reason is that I take part at an international expert hearing on nuclear disarmament before the Committee for Foreign Affairs of the German Bundestag. It takes place Monday, April 27 from morning to evening. This coincidence is very unfortunate. I will take the night train to Geneva.

Martin Mueller will be at the convenors meeting. He will carry copies of the prepared NGO statement on fissile materials and the file on disk.

The prepared text is too long for 10 minutes. I make a proposal on which experts will be read (about half of the written version). This will accomodate the request by Alice Slater and David Krieger to make the statement more stringent and clear. Perhaps you have a better choice for selecting the paragraphs that will be read. I would like to see the full version printed because the details given are helpful to the delegates and in reading one has more time to think about the message.

As suggested by Felicity, I dropped all references to names at the end of the text. Instead I left a general disclaimer that need not be read out.

I am convinced that the text is (as it stands) in the interest of Abolition 2000. However, I understood my working task as preparing an NGO statement rather than an Abolition 2000 statement. This means especially that it reflects more on realistic approaches without leaving the ground of the overall goal of Abolition 2000.

If I understood my working task in a wrong way or if the persons present at the convenors meeting are not happy with the text I prepared, please go ahead and drop it. I tried to prepare the best possible text.

Joseph Rotblat will not read the text. Therefore, I am still looking for a person who can do that. In principal I am ready to read it, but I am happy, if someone else does it.

I am looking forward to seeing you in Geneva.

With best regards,
Martin

=====
Dr. Martin B. Kalinowski, IANUS
Hochschulstr. 10, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany
Tel.: +49-6151-163016 FAX: +49-6151-166039
Internet, private: KALINOWSKI@HRZPUB.TU-DARMSTADT.DE
Internet, group: IANUS@HRZPUB.TU-DARMSTADT.DE
<http://www.tu-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/welcome.htm> and [.../inesap.htm](http://www.tu-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/inesap.htm)
=====

Please mind the change in our postal address!

Please mind the slight change in the internet address: tu instead of th !

>From flick Thu Apr 23 10:56:22 1998

Return-Path: <flick@igc.apc.org>

X-Sender: flick@pop.igc.apc.org

Date: Fri, 24 Apr 1998 01:06:38 +0100

To: edibal@iprolink.ch

From: flick@igc.apc.org (flick)

Subject: very close to the final draft of the final statement

Cc: jbloomfield@gn.apc.org, mupj@igc.apc.org, basecln@gaia.psdn.org.ph,
oliver.meier@bits.de, kalinowski@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de,
arjun@ieer.org, Simon.Carroll@ams.greenpeace.org, dkimball@clw.org,
wslf@igc.apc.org, datan@igc.org, aslater@igc.apc.org, cesd@agoranet.be

DEAR CONVENORS - PLEASE NOTE I AM IN GENEVA FROM FRIDAY - PLEASE EMAIL ME
THERE wilpf@iprolink.ch (work) or to edibal@iprolink.ch (home)

After much input, and using Alice's draft as a basis, this is the final
statement. Have not got statements from Jackie, Janet and Myrla - ASAP
PLEASE

see you in Geneva!

love flick

DRAFT NGO CLOSING PRESENTATION _ A CALL TO ACTION

It is our most fervent desire that the NGO presentations you have heard
today will empower you in your work to realize the promise of the NPT for
the elimination of nuclear weapons. You have heard a multiplicity of
views, representing the diversity of opinion and expertise within our
community. Because we are committed to this treaty and its principles, we
are here working to ensure the fulfillment of the promises made over a
quarter of a century ago when the treaty was agreed. We ask you to take
substantive measures over the next two weeks in order to sustain the
world's hope and belief in those promises.

We are pleased that you have agreed, once again, to hear our views at this
year's PrepCom, and that we are able to address you so early in the
proceedings. We would urge that you consider expanding the process of
broader NGO participation by creating, at next year's PrepCom, an
NGO delegation with observer status, similar to the NGO delegation from the
International Campaign to Ban Landmines which contributed so substantively
at the CCW Review Conference and subsequently in the Ottawa process. Just
as NGOs fully participate in UN meetings on Social, Economic, and Human
Rights issues, so too should we be welcomed at disarmament talks. It is
time to move on from Cold War practices that kept NGOs outside closed
doors.

The NPT regime is clearly capable of accelerating the process of
disarmament . At the NPT Extension conference, Nuclear Weapons States were
called to conclude negotiations on the CTBT in 1996, and a CTBT was indeed
negotiated and signed in 1996. Under the enhanced review process agreed in
1995, Prepcoms have the power to hold substantive as well as procedural

discussions and can begin this forward looking work. The International Court of Justice ruled unanimously that international law requires the conclusion of nuclear disarmament negotiations not linked to any other procedures or matters. This NPT PrepCom has an obligation, under Article VI and its re-affirmation by the ICJ, to call for negotiations on a convention to begin immediately. We see merit in the proposal made at last years Prepcom to convene an inter-sessional working group to advance these discussions.

With two years remaining before the new millennium, it is simply unconscionable to think that negotiations can not be concluded in time to enter the 21st Century with a signed treaty banning nuclear weapons.

You now have in your hands a Model Treaty, drafted by a network of civil society organisations with the help of leading legal scholars, scientific experts and diplomats which proposes steps and methods for dismantling the nuclear scourge and monitoring and verifying compliance. For those who say it cannot be done, we urge you to use this document as a starting point towards the commencement of negotiations. Test its premises and assumptions and start bringing your own expertise to bear on what it would take to ban nuclear weapons. We have banned chemical weapons. We have banned biological weapons. We have banned landmines. We must do no less with nuclear weapons. The work must begin this year.

While the Nuclear Weapons Convention is clearly on our horizon, taking nuclear weapons off of hair trigger alert is an important step towards that goal. As many of you know, in January 1995 a rocket was launched off the coast of Norway on an exploratory mission to study the Aurora Borealis. This launch caused the Russian President to open, for the first time, the dreaded nuclear suitcase and brought the world for a few minutes closer to a nuclear exchange than at any time since the Cuban Missile Crisis. Lengthening the time between threat and use to allow for diplomacy and rational decision making as well as verification, will truly make this a Cold War era. We urge you not to leave this NPT PrepCom without assurances from the Nuclear Weapon States that immediately, this year in 1998, they will take their nuclear weapons off alert.

A plethora of similar steps towards nuclear safety and non-proliferation is available such as the removal of warheads from their delivery systems so perilously poised to wreak destruction and havoc on the planet; declaring a production halt on fissile materials including tritium production which is planned to ensure the endurance of lethal arsenals; and the common sense step of making an inventory of all weapons usable radioactive materials, military and civilian.

We have argued that computer simulated nuclear tests and so called "sub-critical" nuclear tests are not consistent with the obligations and spirit of the CTBT. The non-governmental community is convinced that blowing up plutonium 1000 feet below the desert floor in Nevada, and beneath the fragile Arctic permafrost in Novaya Zemlya; designing weapons and testing their earth penetrating capacity in Alaska for certification as new weapons in the nuclear arsenal --the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and the capability to design new ones --makes a mockery of the long sought CTBT and is violative of the Article VI mandate for "good faith efforts" towards nuclear disarmament. The European Parliament shares our

concerns.

Proliferation of nuclear technology and nuclear materials is a direct consequence of the so-called "peaceful uses" of nuclear energy. This is immediately apparent when we examine the unique requirement for entry into force of the CTBT which requires the signatures of the 44 nations in possession of nuclear reactors. The drafters well knew that every nuclear reactor is a bomb factory. There are other readily available and sustainable means of power to enable all of us to enjoy life equitably on our planet. To stop nuclear proliferation, to stop further production of nuclear waste, to stop further havoc to health, to stop environmental racism and colonialism, we are going to have to rely on the only safe nuclear reactor we have -- our own radiant sun. Better sooner than later, before we have added perilously to the existing lethal pollution on our planet.

Overwhelmingly majorities have indicated in public opinion polls, by petitions, and by joining the burgeoning networks to abolish nuclear weapons, that we want a swift end to the nuclear age. It is neither alarmist or "emotional" to state that humanity has created the circumstances by which intentionally or accidentally, life can be obliterated. This proximity to annihilation for some is a form of power and euphoria - emotions we believe history will deem psychotic. Many in this room, on the other hand, are galvanised into action by these existing threats. The NPT is the forum for change. The enormity of this task dawns on us all. It is difficult, transfigurative, without any blue print or model. it requires a deeper patience and stubbornness and a higher risk than any endeavour yet known. We realise that the nuclear problem will outlive us all. The elimination of nuclear weapons is however, possible and attainable within our lifetimes. Its achievement will demonstrate the capacity of the human species to act collectively for its own preservation. It's time to put away these deadly instruments of war, cleanup the toxic legacy of the nuclear age, and use our precious resources to provide for the genuine needs of our human family on planet earth. The Cold War's over. It is our fervent plea that you lay it to rest at this NPT PrepCom and substantively address the task at hand.

Thank you.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: datan@igc.org
Date: Thu, 23 Apr 1998 13:13:30 EDT
From: LCNP <LCNP@aol.com>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Draft NPT Statement: NWC
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Below is a draft NGO statement on the Nuclear Weapons Convention, open for comments. Responses received by the end of the day on Friday can be included.
Thank you,
Merav Datan

Nuclear Weapons Convention: Why and How

Mr President, delegates and non-governmental observers,

Thank you for the opportunity to address the second session of the preparatory committee for the 2000 Review of the Non Proliferation Treaty.

I will present non-governmental perspectives on the need for a nuclear weapons convention -- a treaty for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons. There is a range of opinions regarding negotiations leading to the conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention, the role of NPT Review in this process, and how to pursue the goals of a nuclear weapons convention.

Why Pursue a Nuclear Weapons Convention?

Article VI of the Non Proliferation Treaty obliges all State parties to negotiate in good faith on effective measures for nuclear disarmament. In reaffirming and clarifying this obligation, the International Court of Justice, in its advisory opinion of July, 1996, found unanimously that there exists an obligation to conclude negotiations on nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control.

The United Nations General Assembly called for the implementation of the ICJ opinion specifically through the immediate commencement of negotiations leading to the conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention. This call was supported by the European Parliament in March, 1997.

[I wish to echo the statements made by previous speakers regarding the universal call for the abolition of nuclear weapons, including the calls made by the Canberra Commission, the Generals and Admirals, the Civil Leaders and the 1000 plus organizations which are affiliated to Abolition 2000. The sentiment of these appeals, that nuclear abolition should be achieved in the shortest possible time, should be seriously listened to. The continued existence of nuclear weapons poses the greatest threat to humanity and all life on Earth.]

If progress is not made towards the goal of elimination we face the following threats:

- Use of existing nuclear weapons, whether by accident, mistake or design
- Proliferation of weapons to other States, regions or non-State entities
- Greater dependence on policies and means [methods] of military might, including [pure fusion or] fourth generation nuclear weapons and military uses of space, and
- constant threat of mass destruction

Incremental steps are the only way to address many of the details on which effective nuclear disarmament depends. To date, progress in disarmament has been incremental, following long-sought negotiations and hard-earned compromises. Recently concluded treaties and IAEA improvements are key steps towards nuclear disarmament. Other efforts, though currently deadlocked, also point in the right direction.

But these incremental steps are interlinked. A comprehensive approach is necessary to coordinate these steps. Large scale verifiable reductions in nuclear arsenals will require an unprecedented degree of collaboration, across political bodies and various industries.

Thus, the call by the United Nations, European Union and others is for the commencement of negotiations leading to a nuclear weapons convention.

How to Achieve a Nuclear Weapons Convention?

The most important ingredient to achieving a nuclear weapons convention is political will of the nuclear weapon States. This will is currently lacking, but could be garnered through the urgent call by States parties to the NPT for the immediate commencement of such negotiations. If such negotiations have not begun by the year 2000, this should be the principal call of the year 2000 Review Conference.

But States parties can do more. You need not wait for the nuclear weapon States to agree to negotiations. You could establish, through a decision at this preparatory committee meeting, an intersessional working group on implementation of Article VI to consider how to bring about negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention. This proposal has been made in the Chairman's working paper, Annex II of the Report of the Preparatory Committee on its first session, and should be supported by all delegations. Such an intersessional working group could, if it decided, consider technical questions regarding the elimination of nuclear weapons, such as verification, that could be developed even before nuclear weapon states have agreed to negotiate a nuclear weapons convention.

[Negotiations aimed towards the final conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention could focus initially on the implementation of steps towards that goal. Such steps could include the establishment of a registry of nuclear weapons and fissile material, the placing of all fissile material under international control, the taking of all nuclear forces off alert and removal of warheads from delivery vehicles, the ending of production of nuclear warheads and their components including fissile material, and reductions in stockpiles.]

How Would a Nuclear Weapons Convention Work?

Recently, at the request of Costa Rica, the United Nations circulated a Model Nuclear Weapons Convention (MNWC or model NWC, UN doc A/C.1/52/7) as a discussion draft. The model, drafted by an international team of lawyers, scientists and disarmament experts, offers a plan for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons in a series of graduated verifiable steps.

The purposes of the model NWC include demonstrating the feasibility of the elimination of nuclear weapons and encouraging governments to enter into nuclear disarmament negotiations.

The MNWC assumes a political climate ready for the elimination of nuclear weapons, an assumption which requires some suspension of disbelief. Security policies based on the threat of mass destruction are deemed necessary for the foreseeable future by Nuclear Weapons States (NWS) and some allies. However, engaging in the process of designing a Nuclear Weapons Convention is useful in a number of ways: (1) It can help identify policies that are inconsistent with the goal of nuclear disarmament; (2) It can help overcome some of the barriers that make nuclear abolition appear utopian; and (3) It can help prepare us for the day when the political will to begin negotiations materializes.

[History often moves surprisingly quickly, as exemplified by the crumbling of the Berlin wall or the conclusion of a landmines convention. Already one nuclear weapon State has expressed its readiness to enter into negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention. We may be able to bring the others on board sooner than we currently think is possible.]

We encourage all delegations to study and discuss the MNWC, whether informally or in the context of an intersessional working group of the NPT. The drafters welcome responses. In the past year there has been considerable feedback on the political and technical questions that must be resolved for verifiable and coordinated large-scale nuclear disarmament to begin. Areas that present the greatest uncertainty about developing a regime for elimination of nuclear weapons, the open questions and critical issues, include the following:

* Will the elimination of nuclear weapons mean a different international security system? Yes. Some governments still consider the threat of nuclear weapons to be a vital component of their security. This posture will have to change before they agree to eliminate these weapons, and this change will help create a different security system, with greater reliance on non-violent conflict resolution, demilitarization and international law. Existing international security mechanisms may be strengthened and new ones created in the process, but these are not necessary prerequisites to implementation of a plan for the elimination of nuclear weapons. The NWC should not try to prescribe the elements of an alternative security system. Rather, as it evolves, the NWC should seek to incorporate and reinforce developments towards demilitarization and less reliance on force as a method of transnational conflict resolution. Enforcement is a particularly difficult issue in this context, as the NWS are also the permanent members of the Security Council. An alternative security system must address the meaning and extent of the right of self-defense.

* How can the NWC prevent breakout? The key to breakout is irreversibility of the disarmament process. A concerted effort to eliminate not only nuclear weapons but the infrastructure behind them will require sequenced reversible measures leading to a world in which developing nuclear weapons will mean starting from scratch. Such a program will become increasingly difficult to conceal as the infrastructure is converted or allowed to erode. But the potential for a state to break out of the NWC and pursue a nuclear weapons program will exist as long as there is the nuclear material, including that produced by use of nuclear energy.

* Do Nuclear Weapons States (NWS) and Non-Nuclear Weapons States (NNWS) have different roles in nuclear arms control and disarmament? Yes. The asymmetry between NWS and NNWS in the current non-proliferation regime will mean different functions and obligations on their respective parts in the move toward elimination of nuclear weapons. Although the NWC seeks to overcome existing inequities, disarmament and verification will of necessity involve greater NWS responsibility and access to certain information as long as nuclear weapons exist. NNWS will likely require concrete reassurance that material and key information is being handled as agreed.

* The knowledge of nuclear weapons cannot be dis-invented. The genie is out of the bottle. True, nuclear physics cannot be unlearned. In fact, it would be foolish to base any non-proliferation regime on the assumption that knowledge is lacking. But current proliferation risks are not merely a result of the splitting of the atom. They are also the end product of long-standing policies to exploit this discovery for military purposes. Making nuclear disarmament irreversible will therefore involve a gradual dismantlement of the entire nuclear weapons infrastructure, beginning with greater, not lesser, awareness of the potential risks posed by scientific discoveries.

Conclusion

A recurrent response to the demand for a NWC is that it is premature, that in today's political environment it is premature to consider and discuss a framework for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons. It is indeed premature to expect agreement on the objectives of the NWC or the details of its verification regime. But it is not premature to begin devising a plan for complete nuclear disarmament, to be ready when the political climate is favorable. Nor is it premature for States to begin developing the verification mechanisms for nuclear disarmament.

In light of the ongoing threat posed by nuclear weapons, and the damage, both direct and indirect, that they cause, discussions of a Nuclear Weapons Convention should be seen as an urgent need rather than a premature wish. [The model NWC is offered to States and NGO's in the hopes that it can inspire and enrich this discussion.]

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: datan@igc.org
Date: Thu, 23 Apr 1998 15:59:33 -0700 (PDT)
From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: Draft NPT Statement: NWC
To: LCNP <LCNP@aol.com>, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org

Dear Merav,

Thanks for doing this. I have added my comments in {brackets} to distinguish them from other [brackets]. Do you have the info on what body worked on preparations for the CTBT before it was actually negotiated? I left a question mark there. Regards, Alice

At 01:13 PM 4/23/98 EDT, LCNP wrote:

>Below is a draft NGO statement on the Nuclear Weapons Convention, open for
>comments. Responses received by the end of the day on Friday can be included.

>Thank you,

>Merav Datan

>

>

>

>Nuclear Weapons Convention: Why and How

>

>Mr President, delegates and non-governmental observers,

>

>Thank you for the opportunity to address the second session of the preparatory
>committee for the 2000 Review of the Non Proliferation Treaty.

>

>I will present non-governmental perspectives on the need for a nuclear weapons
>convention -- a treaty for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons.

>There is a range of opinions regarding negotiations leading to the conclusion
>of a nuclear weapons convention, the role of NPT Review in this process, and
>how to pursue the goals of a nuclear weapons convention.

>

>Why Pursue a Nuclear Weapons Convention?

>

>Article VI of the Non Proliferation Treaty obliges all State parties to
>negotiate in good faith on effective measures for nuclear disarmament. In
>reaffirming and clarifying this obligation, the International Court of
>Justice, in its advisory opinion of July, 1996, found unanimously that there
>exists an obligation to conclude negotiations on nuclear disarmament in all
>its aspects under strict and effective international control.

>

>The United Nations General Assembly called for the implementation of the ICJ
>opinion specifically through the immediate commencement of negotiations
>leading to the conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention. This call was
>supported by the European Parliament in March, 1997.

>

>[I wish to echo the statements made by previous speakers regarding the
>universal call for the abolition of nuclear weapons, including the calls made
>by the Canberra Commission, the Generals and Admirals, the Civil Leaders and

>the 1000 plus organizations which are affiliated to Abolition 2000. The
>sentiment of these appeals, that nuclear abolition should be achieved in the
>shortest possible time, should be seriously listened to. The continued
>existence of nuclear weapons poses the greatest threat to humanity and all
>life on Earth.]

>
>If progress is not made towards the goal of elimination we face the following
>threats:

>
> -Use of existing nuclear weapons, whether by accident, mistake or design
> -Proliferation of weapons to other States, regions or non-State entities
> -Greater dependence on policies and means [methods] of military might,
>including [pure fusion or] fourth generation nuclear weapons and military uses
>of space,

{- Continued inattention to the problems caused by nuclear
materials, which over the last 50 years have lead to severe environmental
damage from secret and negligent practices and transportation mishaps thus
causing spiraling incidences of cancer and genetic damage simply from the
production and handling of UNUSED nuclear weapons;}and

> -constant threat of mass destruction

>
>{I would leave this first sentence out.Incremental steps are the only way
to address many of the details on whicheffective nuclear disarmament depends.}

To date, progress in disarmament has been incremental, following long-sought
negotiations and hard-earned compromises. Recently concluded treaties and
IAEA improvements are key steps towards nuclear disarmament. Other efforts,
though currently deadlocked, also point in the right direction.

>
>But these incremental steps are interlinked. A comprehensive approach is
>necessary to coordinate these steps. Large scale verifiable reductions in
>nuclear arsenals will require an unprecedented degree of collaboration, across
>political bodies and various industries.

>
>Thus, the call by the United Nations, European Union and others is for the
>commencement of negotiations leading to a nuclear weapons convention.

>
>
>How to Achieve a Nuclear Weapons Convention?

>
>The most important ingredient to achieving a nuclear weapons convention is
>political will of the nuclear weapon States. This will is currently lacking,
>but could be garnered through the urgent call by States parties to the NPT for
>the immediate commencement of such negotiations. {I would leave the next
sentence out. I don't think we're ready to concede what the call should be
in the year 2000. We want immediate negotiations -- so why talk about what
we want if it doesn't happen? If such negotiations have not begun by the
year 2000, this should be the principal call of the year 2000 Review
Conference.}

>
>But States parties can do more. You need not wait for the nuclear weapon
>States to agree to {your call for} negotiations. You could establish,
through a decision at this preparatory committee meeting, an intersessional
working group on

>implementation of Article VI to consider how to bring about negotiations on a
>nuclear weapons convention. This proposal has been made in the Chairman's
>working paper, Annex II of the Report of the Preparatory Committee on its
>first session, and should be supported by all delegations. Such an
>intersessional working group could, if it decided, consider technical
>questions regarding the elimination of nuclear weapons, such as verification,
>that could be developed even before nuclear weapon states have agreed to
>negotiate a nuclear weapons convention.

>
>[Negotiations aimed towards the final conclusion of a nuclear weapons
>convention could focus initially on the implementation of steps towards that
>goal. Such steps could include the establishment of a registry of nuclear
>weapons and {weapons usable radioactive} material, the placing of all
>{such} material under international control, the taking of all nuclear
>forces off alert and removal
>of warheads from delivery vehicles, the ending of production of nuclear
>warheads and their components including {the nuclear} material, and
>reductions in
>stockpiles.]{Merav, scientists tell us that fissile material doesn't
include tritium, so we need to describe it differently to make it inclusive}.

>
>
>How Would a Nuclear Weapons Convention Work?

>
>Recently, at the request of Costa Rica, the United Nations circulated a Model
>Nuclear Weapons Convention (MNWC or model NWC, UN doc A/C.1/52/7) as a
>discussion draft. The model, drafted by an international team of lawyers,
>scientists and disarmament experts, offers a plan for the prohibition and
>elimination of nuclear weapons in a series of graduated verifiable steps.

>
>The purposes of the model NWC include demonstrating the feasibility of the
>elimination of nuclear weapons and encouraging governments to enter into
>nuclear disarmament negotiations.

>
>The MNWC assumes a political climate ready for the elimination of nuclear
>weapons, an assumption which requires some suspension of disbelief. Security
>policies based on the threat of mass destruction are deemed necessary for the
>foreseeable future by Nuclear Weapons States (NWS) and some allies. However,
>engaging in the process of designing a Nuclear Weapons Convention is useful in
>a number of ways: (1) It can help identify policies that are inconsistent with
>the goal of nuclear disarmament; (2) It can help overcome some of the barriers
>that make nuclear abolition appear utopian; and (3) It can help prepare us for
>the day when the political will to begin negotiations materializes.

>
>[History often moves surprisingly quickly, as exemplified by the crumbling of
>the Berlin wall or the conclusion of a landmines convention. Already one
>nuclear weapon State has expressed its readiness to enter into negotiations on
>a nuclear weapons convention. We may be able to bring the others on board
>sooner than we currently think is possible.]

>
>We encourage all delegations to study and discuss the MNWC, whether informally
>or in the context of an intersessional working group of the NPT. The drafters
>welcome responses. In the past year there has been considerable feedback
>{on the model convention, addressing} the political and technical questions

that must be resolved for verifiable and coordinated large-scale nuclear disarmament to begin. Areas that present the greatest uncertainty about developing a regime for elimination of nuclear weapons, the open questions and critical issues, include the following:

>
>* Will the elimination of nuclear weapons mean a different international security system? Yes. Some governments still consider the threat of nuclear weapons to be a vital component of their security. This posture will have to change before they agree to eliminate these weapons, and this change will help create a different security system, with greater reliance on non-violent conflict resolution, demilitarization and international law. Existing international security mechanisms may be strengthened and new ones created in the process, but these are not necessary prerequisites to implementation of a plan for the elimination of nuclear weapons. The NWC should not try to prescribe the elements of an alternative security system. Rather, as it evolves, the NWC should seek to incorporate and reinforce developments towards demilitarization and less reliance on force as a method of transnational conflict resolution. Enforcement is a particularly difficult issue in this context, as the NWS are also the permanent members of the Security Council. An alternative security system must address the meaning and extent of the right of self-defense.

>
>* How can the NWC prevent breakout? The key to breakout is irreversibility of the disarmament process. A concerted effort to eliminate not only nuclear weapons but the infrastructure behind them will require sequenced reversible measures leading to a world in which developing nuclear weapons will mean starting from scratch. Such a program will become increasingly difficult to conceal as the infrastructure is converted or allowed to erode. But the potential for a state to break out of the NWC and pursue a nuclear weapons program will exist as long as there is {nuclear material which has not been inventoried and placed under international guard}, including that produced by use of nuclear energy.

>
>* Do Nuclear Weapons States (NWS) and Non-Nuclear Weapons States (NNWS) have different roles in nuclear arms control and disarmament? Yes. The asymmetry between NWS and NNWS in the current non-proliferation regime will mean different functions and obligations on their respective parts in the move toward elimination of nuclear weapons. Although the NWC seeks to overcome existing inequities, disarmament and verification will of necessity involve greater NWS responsibility and access to certain information as long as nuclear weapons exist. NNWS will likely require concrete reassurance that material and key information is being handled as agreed.

>
>* The knowledge of nuclear weapons cannot be dis-invented. The genie is out of the bottle. True, nuclear physics cannot be unlearned. In fact, it would be foolish to base any non-proliferation regime on the assumption that knowledge is lacking. {Indeed, the knowledge of making chemical and biological weapons also cannot be disinvented. Yet that did not prevent the world from making a commitment to ban them despite the fact that verification of compliance is much more difficult for those weapons of mass destruction than it would be for nuclear weapons.} {C}urrent proliferation risks are not merely a result of the splitting of the atom. They are also the end product of long-standing policies to exploit this discovery for military purposes. Making nuclear disarmament

>irreversible will therefore involve a gradual dismantlement of the entire
>nuclear weapons infrastructure, beginning with greater, not lesser, awareness
>of the potential risks posed by scientific discoveries.

>

>

>Conclusion

>

>A recurrent response to the demand for a NWC is that it is premature, that in
>today's political environment it is premature to consider and discuss a
>framework for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons. It is indeed
>premature to expect agreement on the objectives of the NWC or the details of
>its verification regime. But it is not premature to begin devising a plan for
>complete nuclear disarmament, to be ready when the political climate is
>favorable. Nor is it premature for States to begin developing the verification
>mechanisms for nuclear disarmament. {For many years, a CTBT seemed beyond
reach; yet verification mechanisms were prepared in advance by ?? and when
its time had come, it took only one short year to negotiate and sign a CTBT
because of the advanced thinking and planning which preceded it. }

>

>In light of the ongoing threat posed by nuclear weapons, and the damage, both
>direct and indirect, that they cause, discussions of a Nuclear Weapons
>Convention should be seen as an urgent need rather than a premature wish. [The
>model NWC is offered to States and NGO's in the hopes that it can inspire and
>enrich this discussion.] { We urge you to set up an intersessional working
group and begin the process this year. }

>

>

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: Fri, 24 Apr 1998 12:36:27 +0100 (BST)
From: robwcpuk@gn.apc.org (Rob Green)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Abolition Breakthrough Latest
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Authentication-Warning: mail.gn.apc.org: Host an013.du.pipex.com [193.130.253.13] claimed to be [193.130.249.211]
X-Sender: robwcpuk@pop.gn.apc.org

Dear Abolitionists,

As many of us prepare to gather in Geneva for the NPT PrepCom, I thought you'd like to know how much progress the International Institute of Strategic Studies reckons we've made.

In its annual Strategic Survey just published, this leading London-based security policy think-tank states: "For the first time in years, the case for abolishing nuclear weapons has entered the mainstream of arms control debate."

That is praise indeed from them: and beautifully timed for us. WE'RE GETTING THERE!

Onwards & Upwards,

Rob Green
Chair, World Court Project(UK)

Return-Path: <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>
Date: Fri, 24 Apr 1998 08:59:42 -0400
From: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>
Subject: Peace Leaf Mailing
Sender: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>
To: James Hipkins <70761.2655@compuserve.com>,
Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Content-Disposition: inline

Jim,

The rain situation has been the same in the DC area.

I wanted to let you know that Howard leaves today for two weeks in Geneva. Since he must countersign our checks, there will be that delay in getting a check off to your church for postage.

Please let the church people know of this situation and assure them that we are not deadbeats.

Best wishes to you and Char.
Phil

To: Christian CND <ccnd@gn.apc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: attn: Howard Hallman, re: statement for NPT PrepCom
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 03:07 PM 4/24/98 +0100, you wrote:

>
>This message is in regards to the statement prepared by Pax Christi and the WCC for the NPT PrepCom in Geneva. We understand that you are seeking endorsements from councils of churches and heads of communions, however, the Christian Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament in London would also like to endorse this statement if you feel it is appropriate.
>
>Please contact us if you would like more information about Christian CND.
>
>Sincerely,
>
>Nancy A. Zook
>Christian CND

Dear Nancy:

Thanks for your message. It took us so long to get final approval from Cardinal Danneels and Dr. Raiser that we had only enough time to seek sign-ons from councils of churches and heads of communion. Otherwise we would have welcomed your endorsement. I'm leaving for Geneva in a few hours and don't have time to add other names to the list of signers.

In case you haven't seen the statement, a copy is attached.

I've heard of Christian CND but don't know much about you. So I would like more information.

I'm going to be in Geneva for the two weeks of the NPT Preparatory Committee meeting. This includes a reception for delegates Monday evening, April 27, hosted by Cardinal Danneels and Dr. Raiser. If you or a representative of Christian DND will be in Geneva, you are welcome to attend. It's in the 8th Floor restaurant of Palais des Nations from 18:30 to 20:30. I'd like to meet you then or at some other time during the PrepCom.

Shalom,
Howard

###

ACT NOW FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION

A Statement Addressed to the
Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee

The time has come to rid planet Earth of nuclear weapons -- all of them, everywhere. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee has a remarkable opportunity at its upcoming meeting to set the course resolutely for the achievement of this goal.

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass

destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. This was quite apparent in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The same result would probably occur in any further use, and indeed would be worse because of the increased destructive power of modern nuclear weapons.

When used as an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt. It loses sight of the inviolable connection between means and end by failing to recognize that just ends cannot be achieved through wrongful means.

During the past 50 years the production and testing of nuclear weapons has proven grievously harmful to individuals and the environment in the vicinity of mining operations, processing plants, production facilities, and test sites. Numerous locales are burdened with lingering radioactivity and deadly waste products that will take decades to clean up. Some sites may never be restored to safe occupancy.

Psalm 24 teaches, "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and those who dwell therein." The First Book of Moses, also known as Genesis, indicates that God made Earth available to humankind to till and keep, that is, to use for mutual benefit and to preserve. Because production and use of nuclear weapons causes grave harm to Earth and its inhabitants, we as good stewards of God's Earth have an obligation to rid the world of this perilous threat.

Numerous religious bodies have condemned nuclear weapons and have called for their abolition. Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemn as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See before the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 15, 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino stated: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....This is a moral challenge, a legal challenge and a political challenge. That multiple-based challenge must be met by the application of our humanity."

In principle the nations of Earth agree on the need to eliminate nuclear weapons. Indeed, they have made a strong commitment in Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) "to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." After reviewing this article at the request of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice unanimously agreed 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."

Now is the time to take this obligation seriously. We call upon the members of the NPT Preparatory Committee to make the 1998 session a notable landmark in the journey toward the abolition of all nuclear weapons.

First, we ask the delegates to call resolutely upon the nuclear weapon states to embark upon a series of steps along the road leading to nuclear abolition. There is broad consensus among study commissions, retired generals and admirals, scientists, and other civilian experts on what these steps should be. They include:

- Declare a policy of no first use amongst themselves and non-use in relation to non-nuclear weapon states.
- Cease all research, development, production, and deployment of new nuclear weapons.
- Refrain from modernizing the existing nuclear arsenal and increasing the number of deployed nuclear weapons.
- Take all nuclear forces off alert and remove warheads from delivery vehicles.
- Achieve faster and deeper bilateral reduction of nuclear weapons by the United States and Russia.

It would be appropriate for the NPT Preparatory Committee to require the nuclear weapon states to provide annual progress reports on how they are carrying out such measures.

Second, we ask the delegates to take the lead in commencing the process of developing a nuclear weapons convention to outlaw and abolish all nuclear weapons. One appropriate method would be to establish a working group of the NPT Preparatory Committee for this purpose. Although the nuclear weapons states should be part of this process, other nations need not wait until they are willing to become engaged. Rather as stewards of God's Earth, non-nuclear weapon states can begin the task of developing a nuclear weapons convention that specifies a fair and effective program to abolish all nuclear weapons.

We appeal to delegates to the NPT Preparatory Committee to consider what is best for the whole Earth and its inhabitants when they vote on issues of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. Loyalty to all humankind exceeds that of loyalty within political blocs of nations. We urge delegates to act now decisively and courageously for the benefit of all the peoples of Earth.

Godfried Cardinal Danneels, President Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, General Secretary
Pax Christi International World Council of Churches

March 1998

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

Date: Fri, 24 Apr 1998 18:33:49 +0100 (BST)

From: acronym@gn.apc.org (Rebecca Johnson)

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: NPT updates on web

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

X-Authentication-Warning: mail.gn.apc.org: Host ag186.du.pipex.com [193.130.246.186] claimed to be Acronym

X-Sender: acronym@pop.gn.apc.org

The Second PrepCom of the 2000 NPT Review Conference will take place in Geneva 27 April to 8 May.

This is to inform you that over the next two weeks regular updates on the NPT PrepCom being held in Geneva will be posted up onto our website at <http://www.gn.apc.org/acronym>

The latest ACRONYM Report, Number 11 is now published and up on our website, entitled 'Reviewing the Non-Proliferation Treaty: Preparing for the Future'. ACRONYM 11 contains information, ideas and documents on the strengthened review process, and was primarily intended as a resource for governmental and non-governmental participants at the PrepCom.

The executive summary of ACRONYM 11 forms the basis for our NPT PrepCom No 1, which should also now be available on the website.

To avoid clogging the netwaves, I will not be posting you individual messages each time a new NPT Briefing is published, but I expect them to be approximately every 2 days, depending on how much is happening.

Stephen Young has said that he will also be posting key statements and documents on the BASIC website at www.basicint.org

Hope this is useful.

Rebecca Johnson

The Acronym Institute
24, Colvestone Crescent, London E8 2LH, England.
telephone (UK +44) (0) 171 503 8857
fax (0) 171 503 9153
website <http://www.gn.apc.org/acronym>

Return-Path: <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Date: Fri, 08 May 1998 12:07:06 -0400
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
To: tcollina@ucsusa.org, armsintern@ucsusa.org,
Maureen Eldredge <meldredge@igc.org>,
Marie Rietman <ctbt@2020vision.org>, Lisa Ledwidge <ledwidge@psr.org>,
Kimberly Robson <wandwill@clark.net>, kathy@fcnl.org,
Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>, Jenny Smith <jsmith@clw.org>,
Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>, Gordon Clark <paexec@igc.org>,
Fran Teplitz <paprog@igc.org>, David Culp <dculp@nrdc.org>,
Daryl Kimball <dtkimball@clw.org>, Bruce Hall <panukes@igc.org>,
Bridget Moix <bridget@fcnl.org>, Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>,
Bill Eisenstein <billeisen@rocketmail.com>, vision@igc.org,
bmusil@psr.org, ledwidge@psr.org, paexec@igc.org, paprog@igc.org,
panukes@igc.org
Subject: Schedule Alert

To: CTBT Organizers in DC
From: Fran Teplitz, Peace Action
(& Kathy Crandall Disarmament Clearinghouse)
Subject: Schedule Alert

Dear CTBT activists,

The next meeting of grassroots and religious groups working on the CTBT is currently scheduled for Wednesday, May 13 at 1pm. Unfortunately this conflicts with the memorial service for Dr. Benjamin Spock, scheduled from noon to 2pm on that day at the Friends Meeting House on Florida Ave., NW.

It was suggested that executive directors and program staff should attend the CTBT meeting since we may be addressing the allocation of resources from the Ploughshares donor.

Since we have two important events, I would like to suggest that the CTBT meeting date be changed, perhaps to Thursday, May 14th at 2:00pm. (The memorial service date is quite fixed at this point.)

Thank you for your flexibility in helping assure full participation in these two gatherings.

Since Bob Tiller and Howard Hallman are both out of town, I would be happy to receive your response to meeting on the 14th at 2pm (paprog@igc.apc.org)

Thanks,

Return-Path: <dh3m@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de>
From: Martin Kalinowski <dh3m@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de>
Subject: to Howard Hallman
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Date: Fri, 8 May 1998 18:41:53 +0200 (CET)

Dear Howard,

It was a pleasure for me to meet you in Geneva.
I promised you to give some addresses to you.
Constanze Eisenbart is the Convenor of a Nuclear Non-proliferation Expert Group in Geneva which meets two times per year and often has international experts invited as speakers. Her address is

FEST - Protestant Institute for Interdisciplinary Research,
Schmeilweg 5, 69118 Heidelberg, Germany; Tel.: +49-6221-91220, Fax -167257

Christian Democrats against nuclear energy,
Postbox 421713, 55072 Mainz, Germany

Evangelische Studentengemeinde in Deutschland (Protestantic students)
Tunisstr. 8, 50667 Koeln, Germany

Pax Christi, Feststr. 9, 70178 Stuttgart, Germany

All of them signed the abolition 2000 statement.

Best regards,
Martin

=====
Martin B. Kalinowski, IANUS
Hochschulstr. 10, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany
Tel.: +49-6151-163016 FAX: +49-6151-166039
Internet, private: KALINOWSKI@HRZPUB.TU-DARMSTADT.DE
Internet, group: IANUS@HRZPUB.TU-DARMSTADT.DE
<http://www.tu-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/welcome.htm> and [.../inesap.htm](http://www.tu-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/inesap.htm)
=====

Please mind the change in our postal address!
Please mind the slight change in the internet address: tu instead of th !

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>

Date: Wed, 06 May 1998 10:41:55 -0400

From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>

Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility

To: bmusil@psr.org, ledwidge@psr.org, paexec@igc.org, paprog@igc.org,
panukes@igc.org, wandwill@clark.net, vision@igc.org, joe@fcnl.org,
bridget@fcnl.org, kathy@fcnl.org, meldredge@igc.org, dkimball@clw.org,
jsmith@clw.org, dculp@nrdc.org, disarmament@igc.org, mupj@igc.org,
tcollina@ucsusa.org, tperry@ucsusa.org, steveraikin@delphi.com,
billnrns@aol.com

Subject: Next grassroots CTBT meeting

Check your calendars! Do you have the date and time for the next CTBT grassroots meeting blocked out? You should. Here are the details:

Date: Wednesday, May 13

Time: 1:00 p.m.

Place: FCNL, 245 Second St. N.E.

Please note that this is a departure from our usual pattern. Some people thought that we ought to meet in conjunction with the religious grassroots group, so we are doing that. Howard Hallman and I will work out a flow to the agenda (as soon as he returns from Geneva), so that both groups get their work done.

Your suggestions for the agenda are welcome. And your initiatives for grassroots efforts are needed. See you on Wednesday.

Shalom,
Bob Tiller

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 04 May 1998 11:55:54 -0400
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: CTBT FAN
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

To: CTBT-Organizers
From: disarmament
Subject:CTBT FAN

Dear CTBT-Organizers:

Please join the CTBT Fax Alert Network (described below) and help us to recruit activists nationwide - especially in these key states:

AK, AZ, CO, DE, IA, ID, IN, KS, KY, ME, MI, MO, MS, NC, NE, NM, NY, OH,
OR, PA, TN, VA

Are You a CTBT FAN?

Are you ready to turn the heat up on Jesse Helms and FAN the Flames?

JOIN CTBT FAX ALERT NETWORK (CTBT FAN)

Every two weeks receive a brief (1-2 pages) update on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and priority actions for **WHAT YOU CAN DO** to achieve a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW!

Stay up to date on the latest developments.

What other countries have ratified the CTBT?

What new organizations have endorsed the CTBT?

Which Senators publicly support the CTBT?

When will CTBT hearings be?

These and other questions answered to keep you informed.

Stay active : Help build the momentum to achieve a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW! with action ideas and suggestions:

Sample letters to the editor

Tips on meeting with your Senator

Outreach and event suggestions

Working Radio talk shows

And even more ideas to keep the heat on for a CTBT this year!

FAX ALERT JOIN The CTBT FAN CLUB NOW! FAX ALERT

Yes, I want to be kept informed, and motivated by receiving a free 1-2 page CTBT FAN every 2 weeks.

Name: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____ FAX: _____

is this a dedicated fax line? _____

Email: _____

(If you cannot receive a fax, but have e-mail, we'll add you to this special e-mail list)

RETURN TO: Disarmament Clearinghouse:

1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005

Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232

e-mail: disarmament@igc.org

(A free service for all CTBT Activists,
provided by the Disarmament Clearinghouse, a project of :
Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility and
Women's Action for New Directions)

FOR WHAT YOU CAN DO for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW!
<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 04 May 1998 11:55:54 -0400
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: CTBT FAN
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

To: CTBT-Organizers
From: disarmament
Subject:CTBT FAN

Dear CTBT-Organizers:

Please join the CTBT Fax Alert Network (described below) and help us to recruit activists nationwide - especially in these key states:

AK, AZ, CO, DE, IA, ID, IN, KS, KY, ME, MI, MO, MS, NC, NE, NM, NY, OH, OR, PA, TN, VA

Are You a CTBT FAN?

Are you ready to turn the heat up on Jesse Helms and FAN the Flames?

JOIN CTBT FAX ALERT NETWORK (CTBT FAN)

Every two weeks receive a brief (1-2 pages) update on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and priority actions for WHAT YOU CAN DO to achieve a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW!

Stay up to date on the latest developments.

What other countries have ratified the CTBT?

What new organizations have endorsed the CTBT?

Which Senators publicly support the CTBT?

When will CTBT hearings be?

These and other questions answered to keep you informed.

Stay active : Help build the momentum to achieve a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW! with action ideas and suggestions:

Sample letters to the editor

Tips on meeting with your Senator

Outreach and event suggestions

Working Radio talk shows

And even more ideas to keep the heat on for a CTBT this year!

FAX ALERT JOIN The CTBT FAN CLUB NOW! FAX ALERT

Yes, I want to be kept informed, and motivated by receiving a free 1-2 page CTBT FAN every 2 weeks.

Name: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____ FAX: _____

is this a dedicated fax line? _____

Email: _____

(If you cannot receive a fax, but have e-mail, we'll add you to this special e-mail list)

RETURN TO: Disarmament Clearinghouse:

1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005

Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232

e-mail: disarmament@igc.org

(A free service for all CTBT Activists,
provided by the Disarmament Clearinghouse, a project of :
Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility and
Women's Action for New Directions)

FOR WHAT YOU CAN DO for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW!

<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 04 May 1998 16:29:43 -0400
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: [Fwd: CTBT FAN]
To: CTBT-Organize@igc.org

Please note that the list of key states should include WA, WY
-very important states for the CTBT even if they are at the end of the
alphabet

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Received: (from majordomo@localhost)
by igcb.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) id JAA29227;
Mon, 4 May 1998 09:25:13 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from kds5.kivex.com (kds5.kivex.com [204.177.32.2])
by igcb.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id IAA21598
for <ctbt-organize@igc.org>; Mon, 4 May 1998 08:55:15 -0700 (PDT)
Received: from psrcomm1.psr.org (pc38.psrus.org [204.177.54.38])
by kds5.kivex.com (8.8.8/8.8.7-KIVEX) with SMTP id LAA02979
for <ctbt-organize@igc.org>; Mon, 4 May 1998 11:53:21 -0400 (EDT)

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Date: Mon, 04 May 1998 11:55:54 -0400
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Message-ID: <354DE50A.3880@igc.apc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Precedence: bulk
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: CTBT FAN
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win95; I)

To: CTBT-Organizers
From: disarmament
Subject:CTBT FAN

Dear CTBT-Organizers:
Please join the CTBT Fax Alert Network (described below) and help us to
recruit activists nationwide - especially in these key states:

AK, AZ, CO, DE, IA, ID, IN, KS, KY, ME, MI, MO, MS, NC, NE, NM, NY, OH,
OR, PA, TN, VA

Are You a CTBT FAN?
Are you ready to turn the heat up on Jesse Helms and FAN the Flames?

JOIN CTBT FAX ALERT NETWORK (CTBT FAN)
Every two weeks receive a brief (1-2 pages) update on the Comprehensive
Test Ban Treaty and priority actions for WHAT YOU CAN DO to achieve a
Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW!

Stay up to date on the latest developments.

What other countries have ratified the CTBT?

What new organizations have endorsed the CTBT?

Which Senators publicly support the CTBT?

When will CTBT hearings be?

These and other questions answered to keep you informed.

Stay active : Help build the momentum to achieve a
Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW! with action ideas and
suggestions: Sample letters to the editor

 Tips on meeting with your Senator

 Outreach and event suggestions

 Working Radio talk shows

And even more ideas to keep the heat on for a CTBT this year!

FAX ALERT JOIN The CTBT FAN CLUB NOW! FAX ALERT

Yes, I want to be kept informed, and motivated by receiving a free 1-2
page CTBT FAN every 2 weeks.

Name: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____ FAX: _____

is this a dedicated fax line? _____

Email: _____

(If you cannot receive a fax, but have e-mail, we'll add you to this
special e-mail list)

RETURN TO: Disarmament Clearinghouse:

1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005

Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232

e-mail: disarmament@igc.org

(A free service for all CTBT Activists,
provided by the Disarmament Clearinghouse, a project of :
Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility and
Women's Action for New Directions)

FOR WHAT YOU CAN DO for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW!

<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 5 May 1998 08:53:31 -0700 (PDT)
From: Veterans for Peace <vfp@igc.org>
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: Re: CTBT FAN
To: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>, ctbt-organize@igc.org
X-Sender: vfp@pop.igc.org

Dear Kathy,

Thanks for organizing this update - it sounds great.

Here are some some VFP e-mail addresses for it.

Hope all goes well.

Yours - Antonia

ipis
pbutler@redshift.com
Charlieatk@aol.com
Sandkel@aol.com
eeckart
WJWittman@aol.com
sally-aliceanddon@juno.com
bobvan@erols.com
jcreaven@worldnet.att.net
dannjohnson
dunkpaig@ptialaska.net
yolandamarajsh@top.to.com
wpowell4@ix.netcom.com
lincgrahlf@aol.com
wil.howie@pcusa.org
donwcole@aol.com
pbs@psu.edu
john.w.grant@widener.edu
dosissyg@coffey.com

Return-Path: <armsintern@ucsusa.org>

From: armsintern@ucsusa.org

Date: Fri, 01 May 98 13:24:02 -0500

To: <73744.3675@compuserve.com>, <anitas@ieer.org>, <billeisen@rocketmail.com>, <bmorse@igc.org>, <bridget@fcnl.org>, <btiller@psr.org>, <cdavis@clw.org>, <cpaine@nrdc.org>, <ctbt@2020vision.org>, <dculp@nrdc.org>, <disarmament@igc.org>, <dkimball@clw.org>, <ieer@ieer.org>, <jsmith@clw.org>, <kathy@fcnl.org>, <ledwidge@psr.org>, <meldredge@igc.apc.org>, <mupj@igc.org>, <paexec@igc.org>, <panukes@igc.org>, <paprog@igc.org>, <syoun@basicint.org>, <tom.clements@wdc.greenpeace.org>, <vision@2020vision.org>, <wandwill@clark.net>, <armsintern@ucsusa.org>, <tperry@ucsusa.org>, <tcollina@ucsusa.org>

Subject: NWWG Co-Chairs

Content-Description: "cc:Mail Note Part"

Marie Rietmann (20/20 Vision) and I are the co-chairs of Nuclear Weapons Working Group for May and June. If you have any items that you want on the agenda please send them to me @ armsintern@ucsusa.org, or if you have problems with that address, Maire @ ctbt@2020vision.org

Michael Pancook

Union of Concerned Scientists

Return-Path: <martha@clai.ecuanex.net.ec>
From: martha@clai.ecuanex.net.ec
To: mupj@igc.org
Date: Mon, 20 Apr 1998 18:17:45
Subject: REFERENCE YUOR LETTER APRIL 6, 1998
X-pmrqc: 1
Priority: normal
Organization: Consejo Latinoamericano de Iglesias

Quito, abril 20 de 1998
SG-082

Dr. Howard W. Hallman
RELIGIUS WORKING GROUP FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION
Washington, D.C.

Apreciado Dr. Howard,

Reciba Usted saludos muy afectuosos del Consejo Latinoamericano de Iglesias.

En nombre del Rev. Felipe Adolf, quien se encuentra en Brasil asistiendo la Reuni'on de la Junta Directiva del CLAI; c'umpleme agradecer y contestar su atenta carta de 6 de abril/98, sobre el tema "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition e indicarle que en cuanto El Rev. Adolf vuelva al pais, le estara contestando sus inquietudes. Muchas gracias por su comprensi'on.

God bless you,

Martha V. Benavides
Secretaria CLAI-Quito

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 24 Apr 1998 12:03:15 -0700
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: New A2000 Petition
To: abolition-2000@mail.agoranet.be, ABOLITION-EUROPE@vlberlin.comlink.de,
abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

Enclosed please find the NEW Abolition 2000 International Petitions. This version contains slightly modified language.

To all non-English speaking network participants:
Would you please take care of appropriate translations into your native language. Please send us surface as well as e-mail petitions in languages other than English.

The NEW English version Petition can also be found at:
<http://www.wagingpeace.org/hardcopypetition.html> and
<http://www.wagingpeace.org/intlpetition.html>

**ABOLISH NUCLEAR WEAPONS!
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 commitments:

1. **END THE NUCLEAR THREAT.** End the nuclear threat by dealerting all nuclear weapons, withdrawing all nuclear weapons from foreign soil and international waters, separating warheads from delivery vehicles and disabling them, 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 the elimination of 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 indigenou peoples.

Name: _____ Email*: _____
Address: _____

*By providing your e-mail address, you will receive periodic updates on Abolition 2000.

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.

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, URL <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>
<http://www.wagingpeace.org>

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

Date: Fri, 24 Apr 1998 23:10:22 +0100 (BST)

From: robwcpuk@gn.apc.org (Rob Green)

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Deterring War Responsibly

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

X-Authentication-Warning: mail.gn.apc.org: Host an216.du.pipex.com [193.130.253.216] claimed to be [193.130.244.13]

X-Sender: robwcpuk@pop.gn.apc.org

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id PAB16870

Dear Abolitionists,

I offer the following piece - written for British readers - for adaptation as required, which I hope might be useful. (Please note that the UK Trident system has less missiles and warheads, and their yield is smaller, than the US system.)

Best wishes,

Rob Green
Chair, World Court Project(UK)

* * *

DETERRING WAR RESPONSIBLY: BETTER, LAWFUL ALTERNATIVES TO TRIDENT

By Commander Robert Green, Royal Navy (Retired)

The Problem of Trident and Nuremberg

On 1 October 1997, I sent an Open Letter on "Trident and Nuremberg" to the Prime Minister, First Sea Lord, and other key players involved in planning and executing deployment of Britain's Trident submarine force, including each Trident Commanding Officer. In it I warned that they are flouting the Nuremberg Principles in light of the 8 July 1996 Advisory Opinion by the International Court of Justice on the legal status of the threat or use of nuclear weapons.

The Court confirmed that any threat, let alone use, of nuclear weapons should comply with international humanitarian law. The very nature of the Trident weapon system, comprising 16 ballistic missiles each equipped with up to six 100 kiloton thermonuclear warheads (100 kilotons is 8 times the yield of the Hiroshima bomb), means that there is no scenario where the use of even one missile could be lawful. If that is so, then any threat to use it is illegal too, because the Court added that threat and use are indivisible. This places the lawfulness of deterrence doctrine in grave doubt - hence my warning that the Court implicitly outlawed Trident patrols.

It is not surprising that the Government's legal advisers recommend "business as usual", given the gigantic resources - financial, material, human and psychological - invested in Britain's Bomb. The same happened with slavery - until public opinion was mobilised in support of the self-evident legal case against it. Indeed, there are close parallels between the campaigns to abolish slavery and nuclear weapons.

Nuclear Deterrence: A Dangerous Illusion

At present all strategic nuclear forces are "de-targeted" to locations in the Atlantic or Pacific Oceans. Despite the physical ability to re-target within a minute, this would be a major decision with huge implications in terms of posture. De-targeting shows that all five nuclear weapon states accept that maintaining nuclear forces on hair-trigger alert involves a high risk of inadvertent implementation of nuclear deterrence doctrine in terms of Mutual Assured Destruction.

When President Clinton was first considering de-targeting, he misunderstood it to mean de-alerting, yet accepted the latter. More recently, at the signing of the NATO/Russia Founding Act, Yeltsin made a similar error. What this indicates is that there may be widespread support now for standing down Cold War-style deterrence doctrine in favour of "existential" deterrence, which relies simply on possession of a nuclear arsenal and the capability to deliver it.

There are growing doubts about the utility of nuclear deterrence against a "rogue" regime or terrorist group armed with nuclear, biological or chemical weapons. In a speech on 16 November 1993 entitled "UK Defence Strategy: A Continuing Role for Nuclear Weapons?", the then British Secretary of State for Defence, Malcolm Rifkind, said: "...(I)t is difficult to see deterrence operating securely against proliferators."

One has only to think of a scenario where the 1991 IRA mortar bomb attack from a van in London against the British Cabinet had involved instead a threat to use even a crude nuclear device, to realise that a threat of nuclear retaliation is utterly incredible. Yet a greater threat to the government of a nuclear weapon state could barely be imagined.

It is widely acknowledged that the USA's dominance in modern conventional weaponry means that it has no need of nuclear weapons in order to deter any adversary. Conversely, NATO expansion and the recent collapse in Russian conventional capability is driving Russia back to reliance upon first use of nuclear weapons.

Some say that, without nuclear deterrence, disastrous wars between the major powers are likely to occur again. Others argue that modern industrial states, increasingly dependent on multinational conglomerates and the globalisation of trade and sensitive to public opinion, are increasingly constrained from going to war with each other.

Even if the second argument is not accepted, there is a fundamental logical and moral objection to relying on nuclear deterrence. If deterrence with conventional weapons failed, the damage would be confined to the belligerent states - and the environmental damage would usually be

reparable. What is at stake from deterrence failing between nuclear weapon states is the devastation and poisoning of not just the belligerent powers, but potentially of all forms of life on the planet.

On 4 December 1996 in Washington, General Lee Butler USAF (Ret), Commander in Chief Strategic Command 1992-94 in charge of all US strategic nuclear forces, explained why he had "made the long and arduous journey from staunch advocate of nuclear deterrence to public proponent of nuclear abolition." He warned: "Options are being lost as urgent questions are unasked, or unanswered; as outmoded routines perpetuate Cold War patterns and thinking; and as a new generation of nuclear actors and aspirants lurch backward toward a chilling world where the principal antagonists could find no better solution to their entangled security fears than Mutual Assured Destruction."

Better, Lawful Alternatives to Nuclear Deterrence

The way for the Government to comply with the law is to stand down Trident patrols, remove the warheads from the missiles and place them in verifiable storage pending their negotiated elimination. This would effectively replace Cold War-style nuclear deterrence doctrine with the concept of "existential" deterrence. However, reliance on nuclear weapons must be replaced by a new approach to thinking about security.

Nuclear weapons undermine security - both of those who possess them and those they are meant to deter. Indeed, they are a security problem, not a solution. This is because they provoke the very threat they are deployed against: namely, the spread of nuclear weapons to megalomaniac leaders or terrorists - who are least likely to be deterred. In a Gallup opinion poll in September 1997, a large majority (59% against 36%) of the British people showed that they understood this, agreeing that it would be best for Britain's security if it did not have nuclear weapons. Moreover, a clear majority (54% against 42%) would support immediate steps to place Trident nuclear warheads in storage.

The only practical solution to the nuclear weapons nightmare is to treat them like chemical and biological weapons, only worse in many respects - which effectively they are. Far from despairing that they "cannot be disinvented", the international community has agreed an enforceable treaty banning every aspect of chemical weapons; while efforts are in hand to strengthen a similar one against biological weapons. An immediate result is that military professionals refuse to operate them. This is because of a crucial difference between a military professional and a hired killer or terrorist: a military professional must be seen to be acting within the law - military, international and domestic law.

In the event of nuclear blackmail, the only way to deal with it is by negotiation while trying to neutralise the blackmailers using exhaustion, disorientation etc, and if needbe Special Forces with sophisticated precision weapons. By far the best and most responsible solution, however, is to shift the image of nuclear weapons from political virility symbol to the stigmatised status of chemical or biological weapons. Thereby, the risk of terrorists even wanting to get one is minimised, because this would destroy any support for their cause.

Associated with this is the need for a new understanding of security: as a safety-net for all, not a "win/lose" military game. It is about fostering a just, sustainable world order which meets human needs and tackles the root causes of insecurity.

We will not be secure while the global environment is at risk; nor while the risk of regional nuclear war is growing. Military strength is useless to starving people. No nation can feel secure if its neighbour feels threatened. Unprincipled arms sales cause or fan regional conflicts. People in the developing world will eventually tire of living on the edge of survival while the West preserves its comfortable way of life. Co-operative global action is the only way the biosphere will escape destruction. Cold War alliances have had their day: we must all be allies now if we are to avoid disaster.

Underlying all this, enabling humankind to coexist, is respect for, and compliance with, the law. On 24 September 1996 in a speech to the UN General Assembly, the then Foreign Secretary Malcolm Rifkind said: "The more we accept that international law must be the foundation of international relations, the safer we shall all be."

A New World Role for Great Britain

In the Gallup poll in September 1997, no less than 87% of the British people wanted the Government to help negotiate a global treaty to prohibit and eliminate nuclear weapons - as has been done for chemical and biological weapons. However, there is more than just votes and getting on the right side of the law in this. While making Britain and the world more secure, a decision by the Government to renounce its nuclear arsenal and place it in storage would:

- 1) Save money. It was admitted recently that the annual cost of Trident is about £1,000,000 million.
- 2) Secure Tony Blair's place in history. He would receive the world's acclamation and gratitude; and Britain's prestige would soar.
- 3) Dramatically transform the whole nuclear weapon debate. Exploiting the special US/UK relationship, Blair could enable Clinton to take the initiative in racing to secure START III with Yeltsin, and make massive budget savings. The NPT would be safe, pending the negotiation of an enforceable global treaty with a plan to eliminate all nuclear weapons. India and Pakistan would almost certainly agree to sign the CTBT; and they would be powerfully influenced to drop their dangerous nuclear ambitions. France would be outflanked and isolated in Europe, and would have to reconsider its nuclear policy - as would Israel.
- 4) Give Britain a key world role, just when its permanent seat in the UN Security Council would be under growing scrutiny. It would also decouple possession of nuclear weapons from P5 membership.
- 5) Cause much relief in the Royal Navy - even among Trident crews, concerned by potential morale problems of patrolling with no enemy and

unlawful weapons. The RN is deeply split over having to operate the immensely costly yet useless Trident force, which is widely seen as "Thatcher's macho mistake - a nuclear cuckoo in the Naval nest", threatening its future as a balanced, useful force. If needbe, the submarines' missiles could be re-equipped with conventional warheads, which would provide far more effective deterrence against potential proliferators of weapons of mass destruction.

6) Enable Aldermaston and Burghfield to switch to full-time, secure, prestigious work helping to dismantle the US and Russian nuclear arsenals.

ENDS

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Sat, 25 Apr 1998 12:26:16 -0700 (PDT)
From: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org (George Farebrother)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: press info to put out on ADays and Abolition 2000 networks.
To: a-days@motherearth.org, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: geowcpuk@pop.gn.apc.org

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id MAB21625

>Return-Path: <reforest@gn.apc.org>
>X-Authentication-Warning: mail.gn.apc.org: Host al211.du.pipex.com
[193.130.251.211] claimed to be reforest
>X-Sender: reforest@pop.gn.apc.org (Unverified)
>Date: Sat, 25 Apr 1998 12:20:16 +0100
>To: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org
>From: Reforest The Earth <reforest@gn.apc.org>
>Subject: press info to put out on ADays and Abolition 2000 networks.
>X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by mail.gn.apc.org id
MAA04262

>

>PRESS CONFERENCE

>

>Blair Challenged as International Activists
>Pledge to Dismantle the British Nuclear Weapon System.
>Issued: 27/4/98.

>

>This forthcoming Saturday (May 2nd) sees the launch in London of a group
>who have vowed to use nonviolent direct action to enable Britain to disarm
>its nuclear weapons by the year 2000.

>

>PLOUGHSHARES 2000 aims to push the British Government into abiding by the
>Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice of 8th July 1996
>that decided that the use or threatened use of nuclear weapons is generally
>illegal under international law because of the unique, indiscriminate and
>long-lasting damage their use would inflict on civilians and the global
>environment.

>

>PLOUGHSHARES 2000 is simultaneously being launched in Hiroshima, London,
>Edinburgh, Gent and Gothenburg.

>

>The group is being co-ordinated by Angie Zelter, one of the four 'Hawk
>Women' who in 1996 caused £1.5 million worth of damage to a Hawk jet bound
>for Indonesia. They won their case in court - arguing that their
>disarmament action was a justified 'upholding of international law to
>prevent British complicity in the Genocide in East Timor'.

>

>In Britain a rapidly growing nucleus of 49 'global citizens' aged between
>20 and 90 have already signed up as Ploughshares activists. Individuals
>join 'affinity groups' who are provided with handbooks, videos and
>nonviolence and safety training in preparation for their disarmament work.
>Transparency is a key element of the campaign and all the activists
>involved sign a Pledge to Prevent Nuclear Crime and their names are sent to

>the Government before they take action.

>

>The group has already written to Tony Blair inviting him to negotiate a
>phased scaling down of Britain's nuclear threat before they attempt to
>physically damage the weapon systems' functional ability. They have issued
>a list of 9 disarmament steps that the British Government could take - such
>as removing Trident submarines from 24-hour patrol and removal of warheads
>to shore. If these steps are taken the group will hold off taking action.
>If no concessions are made they will start their disarmament actions on
>August 11th at Faslane, the Naval Base for Britain's Trident submarines.

>

>PLOUGHSHARES 2000 actions are backed by a recent Gallup poll, which found
>that:

> 59% of people felt that Britain would be more secure without nuclear
>weapons,
> 87% wanted the government to start international disarmament negotiations.

>

>Speakers at the Press Conference will include:

> Rupert Ticehurst, Barrister and Lecturer in International Law at Kings
>College.

> Angie Zelter, from the Ploughshares Core Group.

> Matthew Pelling from the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, which is
>backing the campaign along with 42 other non-governmental organisations.

>

>ENDS

>EDITOR'S NOTES:-

>

>The Press Conference is being held on the large hall at Conway Hall, Red
>Lion Square, London at 1pm on Saturday May 2nd 1998.

>

>A Photo Opportunity, involving a spectacular banner drop, will take place
>in central London in the morning of the same day. The location details are
>being withheld but interested journalists should gather at 10.45 am on 2nd
>May outside Aquarium which is diagonally opposite the Thames from The
>Houses of Parliament, opposite the river from the Ministry of Defence
>buildings and Westminster Tube Station. They will then be taken to the
>venue - only 5 mins away.

>

>For more information contact Angie Zelter on 01603 611 953 or 01263 512
>049; Alan Wilkie on 0131 449 3695 or Brian Quail on 0141 339 1482

>

>

>

> Backgrounder on Trident Ploughshares 2000. 21/4/98.

>

>What is Ploughshares?

>

>Ploughshares actions are made by people committed to peace and disarmament
>and who nonviolently, safely, openly and accountably disable a war machine
>or system so that it can no longer harm people. Ploughshares activists are
>given training in safety and nonviolence and form groups for long-term
>support. Ploughshares is an enactment of the Biblical prophecies to 'beat
>swords into ploughshares' but is now no longer a Christian movement but one
>which embraces people from many different faiths or from none at all. The

>underlying appeal is the universal call to peace, to abolish all war and to
>find peaceful ways to resolve our conflicts. It recognises the abuse of
>power that war always is and the deep immorality of threats to kill.

>
>Ploughshares actions started in 1980 in the USA and have taken place in
>many different countries with weapons as diverse as rifles, warships,
>missiles, submarines and aircraft being dismantled or damaged. The most
>successful recent Ploughshares action was one carried out by 4 women who
>did £1.5 million worth of damage to a British Aerospace Hawk jet which
>prevented that plane from being exported to Indonesia where it may have
>been used to continue the genocide being committed in East Timor. The women
>were acquitted in a landmark case at Liverpool Crown Court in July 1996
>having argued that their act was justified in law as they were preventing
>British complicity in genocide.

>
>Trident Ploughshares 2000 is being launched in Hiroshima, Gothenburg, Gent,
>Edinburgh and London on May 2nd 1998. The foreign activists will join with
>their British colleagues as 'Global Citizens' in August to start
>dismantling the British Trident system that they see as a threat to global
>peace.

>
>Justification of Trident Ploughshares 2000.

>
>Trident Ploughshares 2000 is a 20-month project being publicly launched on
>May 2nd 1998 that aims to train and enable hundreds of international global
>citizens to dismantle the British Trident nuclear weapon system by the year
>2000. Our justification and mandates for our disarmament actions are:-
>· the long-term opposition of the vast majority of the world's Peoples and
>States who have called for global nuclear disarmament ever since the
>bombing of Hiroshima in 1945;
>· the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) of 8th
>July 1996 that confirmed the general illegality of nuclear weapons and
>concluded that States are under an obligation to bring to a conclusion
>negotiations on nuclear disarmament in all its aspects;
>· the very clear mandate the British population have given in recent polls
>showing a majority of people in favour of nuclear disarmament;
>· the British Labour Party's own election promises to achieve global
>nuclear disarmament;
>· the failure of the British Government to implement Article VI of the
>Non-Proliferation Treaty which promised nuclear disarmament by the nuclear
>powers.

>Words are not enough. With the ending of the Cold War and the approaching
>millennium, the time has come for a concerted attempt to disarm these
>terrible weapons of mass destruction.

>
>People's Disarmament.

>
>Trident Ploughshares 2000 are engaging in direct communication with the
>British Government and asking for dialogue. They have produced nine
>requests for the controlled disarmament of British nuclear forces. These
>requests are:-
>· i) The British Trident submarine system must immediately be taken off
>24-hour patrols.
>· ii) No new Trident missiles are to be purchased from the United States.

> iii) All British nuclear warheads must be removed from their delivery systems and stored separately by 1 January 2000.

> iv) No further deployment of US nuclear weapons in Britain. Britain should work with its NATO allies for withdrawal of all tactical nuclear weapons from Europe and for establishment of a policy not to use nuclear weapons first or against non-nuclear-armed adversaries in any circumstances.

> v) Trident missiles are to be returned to the United States and the warheads to be returned to AWE Aldermaston/Burghfield by an agreed date.

> vi) Commitment to a timetable for the decommissioning of British nuclear weapons as fast as is feasible and safe, with a target date for completion of 2010 at the latest.

> vii) Pledge not to replace Trident or seek to acquire nuclear weapons again.

> viii) Conversion of Britain's nuclear weapon facilities from research and development for the maintenance and production of the nuclear arsenal towards the decommissioning of nuclear weapons and facilities, safe management and disposal of nuclear materials under strict and effective national and international safeguards and controls, and the enhanced verification of international agreements on weapons of mass destruction.

> ix) Active and constructive British involvement in the determined pursuit by the nuclear-weapon states of systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the goal of negotiating interim agreements leading to a nuclear weapons convention as early as possible. The genuineness and constructiveness of this commitment will be gauged from the positions taken by Britain in United Nations General Assembly resolutions, the Non-Proliferation Treaty review process, the Conference on Disarmament, five-power talks, NATO, and other related fora'.

>

>If these requests are implemented then Trident Ploughshares 2000 will stop its proposed disarmament actions. If no progress is made by the Government towards actual practical disarmament by August 11th 1998 then the first of a series of disarmament actions will begin at Faslane and Coulport in Scotland, where the Trident nuclear submarines are based. Thereafter the activists will target other Trident related sites around the country, including command, control, communications and intelligence networks which are much more difficult for the authorities to defend and which are crucial to the deployment of Trident.

>

>Track-record of Ploughshares.

>

>Ploughshares point out that their capacity to carry out what they threaten to undertake is a proven one. As well as the Hawk jet incident, previous protesters have entered, undetected, into nuclear submarines on at least three occasions. Just last month, security at the Trident bases, near Glasgow, was tightened after protesters 'borrowed a police boat' from inside the high security area by the Explosives Handling Jetty at Coulport and drove it 40 minutes round the Lochs into another High Security Area in Faslane, where they landed a woman only yards away from two Trident submarines. 'We were putting it to its right and proper use - taxpayers expect police equipment to be used to uphold the law,' said Zelter, 'That is what we did, we used the boat to investigate the ongoing British conspiracy to commit war crimes with weapons of mass destruction.'

>

>Wide-spread support for Ploughshares Disarmament Actions.

>

>There are a growing number of organisations who are signing a Petition of
>Support for Trident Ploughshares 2000 and which include:- Action for The
>Earth (NUSU), Advisory Service for Squatters, Baranja International Meeting
>House, Campaign Against Sea Dumping, Campaign Against State Terrorism in
>Sri Lanka, Campaign for Law and Peace, Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament,
>Doncaster Green Party, Earth First! Action Update, For Mother Earth
>International, Frente Palante, Friends of The Earth Northern Ireland,
>Friendship Across Frontiers, Guatemala Solidarity Network, Hyndburn &
>Rossendale Trade Union Council, International Peace Bureau, Iona Community,
>Labour Action for Peace, London Greenpeace, McLibel Support Campaign,
>Mediation UK, Network of Engaged Buddhists (UK), Nottingham Veggies, Notts
>Earth First! , Partizans, Peace Care, Peace Prisoner Support, Reforest The
>Earth, Reform & Liberal Jewish Social Action, Road Alert!, Sikh Human
>Rights Group, Stirling CND, TAPOL Indonesia Human Rights Campaign, The
>Gandhi Foundation, The Green Party of England and Wales, The Land is Ours,
>The Rainbow Centre, Tower Hamlets CND, Womens Direct Action Group, World
>Peace 2000, Yorkshire CND. One M.P. Cynog Dafu and one MEP Michael Hindley
>have also signed a Petition of Support.

>
>Current list of names of Ploughshares Pledgers.

>
>49 people from Belgium, England, Finland, Japan, Scotland, Sweden and Wales
>have already been trained, signed the Pledge to Prevent Nuclear Crime and
>the Nonviolence and Safety Pledge and are named:- Kathryn AMOS; Morag
>BALFOUR; Klaus BOGNIEL; Rachel BOYD; Sylvia BOYES, Margaret BREMNER; Kay
>CARMICHAEL; Maggie CHARNLEY; Maxwell CRAIG; Stuart DENNIS; Pol D'HUYVETTER;
>Hugh DRUMMOND; Iona FISHER; Clive FUDGE; Hannah GRIFFIN; Dirk GRUTZMACHER;
>Tracy HART; Davida HIGGIN; Fredrik IVARSSON; Hanna JARVINEN; Petter
>JOELSON; Paul Andrew KELLY. Peter LANYON; Hans LAMMERANT; Richard LEWIS;
>Anja LIGHT; Anne LIVINGSTONE; Sheila MACKAY; David MACKENZIE; Ellen MOXLEY;
>Igge OLSSON; Brian QUAIL; Ian RICHARDSON; Koen ROGGEN; Norman SHANKS, Katri
>SILVONEN; Annika SPALDE; Helen STEVEN; Pelle STRINDLUND; Barbara Mary
>SUNDERLAND. Ian THOMSON; Anna TUOMINEN; Krista van VELZEN; Stellan
>VINTHAGEN; Agnes WALTON; Maire-Colette WILKIE.; Alan WILKIE; Bernard De
>WITTE; Angie ZELTER.

>
>
>
>Reforest The Earth
>42-46 Bethel Street
>Norwich
>Norfolk
>NR2 1NR
>UK
>
>tel +44 1603 611953
>fax +44 1603 666879
>e-mail reforest@gn.apc.org

>
>

George Farebrother (geowcpuk@gn.apc.org)

67, Summerheath Rd,
Hailsham
Sussex, BN27 3DR, England
Phone & Fax +44 (0)1323 844 269

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 which could find no lawful circumstance for the threat or use of nuclear weapons.

The World Court Project is part of Abolition 2000, A Global Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Mon, 11 May 1998 08:18:56 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: CWC implementation troubles

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Amy Smithson, Stimson Center (via D. Kimball, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers)

RE: CWC Revisited

Greetings to the veterans of the Poison Gas Task Force,

It has been just over a year since we all celebrated the Senate's vote to ratify the Chemical Weapons Convention. I know that everyone is now gearing up to work on ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, but I feel that I must bring circumstances related to the implementation of the CWC to your attention.

THE GOOD NEWS is that the CWC is working rather well--6 new countries have relinquished their weapons programs already. Not bad for one year's work, eh?

THE BAD NEWS is that Washington is causing all kinds of trouble for the treaty. For one, the U.S. is violating the CWC because it hasn't passed the legislation to implement it. The Senate is scheduled to vote between May 20th and 22nd, which on the surface sounds like good news. The problem is that this legislation has several provisions that will gut the CWC's verification regime--say goodbye to challenge inspections and sampling, two of the strongest tools that the CWC's inspectors have. Other measures in the legislation would curtail the scope and frequency of routine inspections.

The Clinton Administration does not think that the provisions in the implementing legislation are so problematic as to demand immediate attention. They are being pressed very hard to get the implementing legislation passed, and they in turn, have pressed the Congress to do the same. These provisions, they say, can be addressed at a later date, probably after the CTBT is ratified.

Unfortunately, by that time the precedents that the U.S. will set with these provisions will have done their damage. In Tehran, Beijing, and Moscow, those who would like to cheat on the CWC must be rubbing their hands in glee at this turn of events. In conservative circles, arms control critics must be similarly delighted because if these provisions aren't changed the CWC will really be unverifiable. Needless to say, this type of outcome is hardly in U.S. interests.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, I encourage all of those who worked in the trenches to get the CWC ratified to take a look at two items on the CBW Nonproliferation Project segment of the Stimson Center's web page (www.stimson.org), both of which are also linked to the "Poison Gas Task Force" section of the Coalition's

main web site.

First, look at the latest press release on the anniversary of the CWC's entry into force, which describes the progress that has been made in the treaty's first year. Second, and perhaps more importantly, look at the Issue Brief entitled "Congress, Administration poised to Weaken Poison Gas Ban." A great deal of detail can be found there about the problems in the implementing legislation.

WHAT TO DO: I suggest that you start bringing this up in your contacts with the Senate and the Clinton Administration. If enough of us insist that we not gut this treaty, then maybe Congress and the Clinton Administration will wake up! The United States must not rip apart a treaty it worked so hard to get.

Call if you have any questions...

Amy

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: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Mon, 11 May 1998 09:36:31 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: India conducts 3 n-test explosions

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: India conducts nuclear blasts

This just in ... bad news.

More details to follow.

DK

May 11, 1998

India Conducts 3 Nuclear Tests

Filed at 9:01 a.m. EDT

By The Associated Press

NEW DELHI, India (AP) -- India conducted three underground nuclear explosions today, its first nuclear tests since 1974, the prime minister said.

Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee told reporters the explosions in the desert 330 miles southwest of New Delhi did not release radiation into the atmosphere.

The development was sure to alarm Pakistan, India's rival. The two neighbors have fought three wars in the last 50 years.

``These were contained explosions like the experiment conducted in May 1974," Vajpayee said today in a brief statement. He refused to take questions.

He said the devices tested were a fission device, a low-yield device and a thermonuclear device.

``I warmly congratulate the scientists and engineers who have carried out these successful tests," Vajpayee added.

Vajpayee's government, which came to power in March, says India needs nuclear weapons to prevent what it calls military adventurism by neighboring Pakistan.

India first demonstrated its nuclear capability with the 1974 test explosion.

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: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <geowcpuk@gn.apc.org>
Date: Thu, 7 May 1998 12:14:52 -0700 (PDT)
X-Sender: geowcpuk@pop.gn.apc.org
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
From: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org (George Farebrother)
Subject: Scottish Church Contacts

GF/7089

Dear Howard

As promised, Scottish Church contacts follow.

+44 but without the first 0 for calling from USA to UK.

The first three are important Church leaders in their own right:

Rev Maxwell Craig
01786 823 588
01786 825 844
Action of Churches Together in Scotland Scottish
Churches House, Dunblane FK15 OAJ

Rev A R C McLellan
General Assembly of The Church of Scotland
121 George St Edinburgh EH 2 4YN

The Rev Norman Shanks
0141 445 4561
Fax 0141 445 4295
The Iona Community
Community House Peace Institute
Govan, Glasgow G51 3UU

The next two will be able to give you more useful contacts:

Alan Wilkie
0131 449 3695
Fax 0131 449 3695
Fellowship Of Reconciliation
10 Thomson Rd, Currie, Midlothian EH14 5HP

The Rev John Ainslie,
0141 423 1222. Home 0141 334 1175) Mobile 0836 334 1175
Fax Fax 0141 423 1231
cndscot@dial.pipex.com
Scottish CND
15 Barrland St, Glasgow G41 1QH

For England, try these three, who will be able to give you more contacts.

Pat Gaffney
0181 800 4612

Fax 0181 802 3223
paxchristi@gn.apc.org
Pax Christi
9 Henry Rd, London N4 2LH

Nancy Zook
CND@gn.apc.org
Christian CND
162 Holloway Rd, London N7 8DQ

Luisa Squatriti
0171 387 3601
Fax 0171 388 1977
luisas@quaker.org.uk
Quaker Peace & Servicet
Friends' House
Euston Rd London NW1 2BJ

Good Luck

George

George Farebrother (geowcpuk@gn.apc.org)

67, Summerheath Rd,
Hailsham
Sussex, BN27 3DR, England
Phone & Fax +44 (0)1323 844 269

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 which could find no lawful circumstance for the threat or use of nuclear weapons.

The World Court Project is part of Abolition 2000, A Global Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons

Return-Path: <ccnd@gn.apc.org>
From: Christian CND <ccnd@gn.apc.org>
To: "'Howard W. Hallman'" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: RE: information on Christian CND
Date: Fri, 8 May 1998 11:14:07 +0100

Dear Howard:

I hope that the NPT PrepCom in Geneva went well. Christian CND did not send a representative to attend the conference, but thank you for the invitation to the reception on 27 April. If you could email your mailing address to the office, I can send you information and also a copy of the newsletter we put out.

Peace and Happiness,

Nancy
Christian CND

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [SMTP:mupj@igc.apc.org]
Sent: Friday, April 24, 1998 4:08 PM
To: Christian CND
Subject: Re: attn: Howard Hallman, re: statement for NPT PrepCom

At 03:07 PM 4/24/98 +0100, you wrote:

>
>This message is in regards to the statement prepared by Pax Christi and the WCC for the NPT PrepCom in Geneva. We understand that you are seeking endorsements from councils of churches and heads of communions, however, the Christian Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament in London would also like to endorse this statement if you feel it is appropriate.
>
>Please contact us if you would like more information about Christian CND.
>
>Sincerely,
>
>Nancy A. Zook
>Christian CND

Dear Nancy:

Thanks for your message. It took us so long to get final approval from Cardinal Danneels and Dr. Raiser that we had only enough time to seek sign-ons from councils of churches and heads of communion. Otherwise we would have welcomed your endorsement. I'm leaving for Geneva in a few hours and don't have time to add other names to the list of signers.

In case you haven't seen the statement, a copy is attached.

I've heard of Christian CND but don't know much about you. So I would like more information.

I'm going to be in Geneva for the two weeks of the NPT Preparatory Committee

meeting. This includes a reception for delegates Monday evening, April 27, hosted by Cardinal Danneels and Dr. Raiser. If you or a representative of Christian DND will be in Geneva, you are welcome to attend. It's in the 8th Floor restaurant of Palais des Nations from 18:30 to 20:30. I'd like to meet you then or at some other time during the PrepCom.

Shalom,
Howard

###

ACT NOW FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION

A Statement Addressed to the
Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee

The time has come to rid planet Earth of nuclear weapons -- all of them, everywhere. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee has a remarkable opportunity at its upcoming meeting to set the course resolutely for the achievement of this goal.

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. This was quite apparent in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The same result would probably occur in any further use, and indeed would be worse because of the increased destructive power of modern nuclear weapons.

When used as an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt. It loses sight of the inviolable connection between means and end by failing to recognize that just ends cannot be achieved through wrongful means.

During the past 50 years the production and testing of nuclear weapons has proven grievously harmful to individuals and the environment in the vicinity of mining operations, processing plants, production facilities, and test sites. Numerous locales are burdened with lingering radioactivity and deadly waste products that will take decades to clean up. Some sites may never be restored to safe occupancy.

Psalm 24 teaches, "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and those who dwell therein." The First Book of Moses, also known as Genesis, indicates that God made Earth available to humankind to till and keep, that is, to use for mutual benefit and to preserve. Because production and use of nuclear weapons causes grave harm to Earth and its inhabitants, we as good stewards of God's Earth have an obligation to rid the world of this perilous threat.

Numerous religious bodies have condemned nuclear weapons and have called for their abolition. Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that

such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemn as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See before the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 15, 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino stated: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....This is a moral challenge, a legal challenge and a political challenge. That multiple-based challenge must be met by the application of our humanity."

In principle the nations of Earth agree on the need to eliminate nuclear weapons. Indeed, they have made a strong commitment in Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) "to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." After reviewing this article at the request of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice unanimously agreed 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."

Now is the time to take this obligation seriously. We call upon the members of the NPT Preparatory Committee to make the 1998 session a notable landmark in the journey toward the abolition of all nuclear weapons.

First, we ask the delegates to call resolutely upon the nuclear weapon states to embark upon a series of steps along the road leading to nuclear abolition. There is broad consensus among study commissions, retired generals and admirals, scientists, and other civilian experts on what these steps should be. They include:

- Declare a policy of no first use amongst themselves and non-use in relation to non-nuclear weapon states.
- Cease all research, development, production, and deployment of new nuclear weapons.
- Refrain from modernizing the existing nuclear arsenal and increasing the number of deployed nuclear weapons.
- Take all nuclear forces off alert and remove warheads from delivery vehicles.
- Achieve faster and deeper bilateral reduction of nuclear weapons by the United States and Russia.

It would be appropriate for the NPT Preparatory Committee to require the nuclear weapon states to provide annual progress reports on how they are carrying out such measures.

Second, we ask the delegates to take the lead in commencing the process of developing a nuclear weapons convention to outlaw and abolish all nuclear weapons. One appropriate method would be to establish a working group of the NPT Preparatory Committee for this purpose. Although the nuclear weapons states should be part of this process, other nations need not wait until they are

willing to become engaged. Rather as stewards of God's Earth, non-nuclear weapon states can begin the task of developing a nuclear weapons convention that specifies a fair and effective program to abolish all nuclear weapons.

We appeal to delegates to the NPT Preparatory Committee to consider what is best for the whole Earth and its inhabitants when they vote on issues of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. Loyalty to all humankind exceeds that of loyalty within political blocs of nations. We urge delegates to act now decisively and courageously for the benefit of all the peoples of Earth.

Godfried Cardinal Danneels, President Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, General Secretary
Pax Christi International World Council of Churches

March 1998

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 27 Apr 1998 11:08:27 -0400
From: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: CTBT bans the bang, not the bomb
To: "Abolition Caucus (E-mail)" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>

Non-member submission from [Eric Fawcett <fawcett@physics.utoronto.ca>]
Date: Sat, 25 Apr 1998 12:01:28 -0400
From: Eric Fawcett <fawcett@physics.utoronto.ca>
To: nAbolition Intl LISTMAILER <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>
Subject: CTBT bans the bang, not the bomb

Guardian Weekly, 12 April 1998, p. 12
Comment / Big bang and a whimper

By becoming the first nuclear weapons states to carry out ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), Britain and France have given the process a small nudge that may encourage the other three overt nuclear powers. A united front of all five is the minimum requirement for moving forward. Alas, the minimum is not enough. One reason is that the CTBT needs 44 named states to ratify it. These include India and Pakistan, who have no intention of signing. But there is also widespread scepticism that the treaty merely legitimises the dominance of the nuclear five. As Robert Bell, arms control director at the United States National Security Council put it, "the point of the treaty is to ban the bang, not to ban the bomb".

Only last week the Los Alamos National Laboratory was said to be producing plutonium triggers in order to "prepare a reserve supply if additional weapons are built in the future".

It is true that the very existence of the treaty may make it harder for a would-be nuclear power to develop weapons. The International Monitoring System now being set up will make it virtually impossible to avoid detection. It is true too that failure to conclude the treaty would have set back the cause of nuclear restraint significantly. It may also be argued that the South Asian problem has its own dynamic that was never going to respond to appeals for self-denial. Yet in the end the blatant character of the nuclear monopoly must reduce the credibility of the treaty and encourage "rogue" nuclear states to ignore it.

Cynicism will only be dispelled by visibly serious efforts to scale down arsenals to a real minimum-in the spirit of the pledge given by the five when negotiating the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. The British Foreign Secretary, Robin Cook, said this week that Britain's CTBT ratification signalled a commitment to a nuclear weapons-free world. With the non-nuclear option excluded even from the current defence review, who is going to believe him?

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>
Date: Mon, 27 Apr 1998 12:39:00 -0400
From: disarmament@igc.org
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org
Subject: Abolition Call at NPT Review
To: ctb-followers@igc.org

Rtw 04/27 1121 Campaigners urge n-weapon abolition pact by 2000

GENEVA, April 27 (Reuters) - Disarmament campaigners on Monday urged governments to work towards a pact for signature by 2000 that would eliminate all nuclear weapons within a fixed time-frame.

An umbrella coalition, Abolition 2000, issued its appeal as diplomats gathered for two weeks of discussions on preparations for a full-scale conference in two years time reviewing the 28- year-old Nuclear non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

"It is time for the nuclear powers to live up to their commitments and really work for nuclear disarmament," David Krieger of the United States-based Nuclear Age Peace Foundation told a news conference.

Leaders of the coalition presented an international petition on the issue to the chairman of the review meeting, Eugeniusz Wyzner of Poland, which they said was signed by 13 million people in Japan since November last year.

"These signatures represent voices of the common people, people in Japan who know the devastation caused by nuclear weapons. They are tired of waiting," said Krieger, whose organisation is part of the coalition.

Apart from the appeal for a treaty on eliminating weaponry, the petition also calls for the separation of warheads from delivery vehicles and for them to be disabled.

"It is basically absurd that, eight years after the end of the Cold War, nuclear weapons are on trigger alert," Krieger said.

The petition calls on the five declared nuclear powers -- the United States, Russia, China, Britain and France -- to pledge they would not be the first to use nuclear weapons in any conflict.

The NPT, aimed at barring the spread of nuclear weaponry, was signed in 1970 and 186 countries have since lined up behind it. In 1995, signatories agreed at a conference in New York to extend it indefinitely.

To win that extension, the nuclear five had to promise to take concrete steps towards overall nuclear disarmament in order to overcome fears among many developing countries that they wanted to maintain their own nuclear arsenals forever.

But anti-nuclear campaigners say they have been stalling, and argue that their tactics have blocked approval of other measures in the United Nations-sponsored Disarmament Conference.

The Conference, which holds two-month sessions three times a year in Geneva, has been stalled since 1996 over the nuclear issue.

Key developing countries, lead by India, decline to move ahead on other topics until the five agree to formal discussions on total nuclear disarmament by a specific date.

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Kathy Crandall, Coordinator
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 FAX: 202 898 0172
E-Mail: disarmament@igc.org

For WHAT YOU CAN DO for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW!:
<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

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

Date: Tue, 28 Apr 1998 07:10:52 -0400

From: Lachlan Forrow <lforrow@igc.apc.org>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Boston Press Release for NEJM article

To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, ihelfand@igc.apc.org,

hlabrams@leland.stanford.edu, lforrow@igc.apc.org, jgeiger@igc.apc.org,

rgould@igc.apc.org, dchall@u.washington.edu, harrisa@open.org,

dkerlins@medusa.unm.edu, amilholl@umaryland.edu, rush@hnrc.tufts.edu,

jpwilk@pivot.net, danfine@igc.apc.org, ledwidge@psr.org,

bmusil@psr.org, btiller@psr.org, blevy@igc.apc.org, bblair@brook.edu,

c_cassel@smtplink.mssm.edu, postol@mit.edu, gnlewis@mit.edu,

vsidel@igc.apc.org

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igcb.igc.org id EAA23345

X-Sender: lforrow@pop.igc.org

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id EAB23572

To: Abolition 2000 Colleagues

Enclosed is a press release issued today by Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center in Boston. Please feel free to use, excerpt, revise in any way might be helpful in your own local advocacy work.

--LF

EMBARGOED FOR RELEASE For more information: Patti Jacobs,
Wednesday, April 29, 6 PM EST (617) 667-4431

NEJM Study Warns of Increasing Risk of Accidental Nuclear Attack Over 6.8 Million Immediate U.S. Deaths Possible

BOSTON Despite the end of the Cold War, American and Russian nuclear arsenals remain on highalert. That, when combined with significant deterioration in Russian control systems, produces a growing likelihood of an "accidental" nuclear attack, in which more than six million American men, women, and children could die, according to a study published in the April 30 New England Journal of Medicine. The authors, physicians, public health professionals, and nuclear experts, will hold press conferences on April 29 in seven U.S. Cities, including Boston, beseeching the U.S. Government to seek a bilateral agreement with the Russians that would take all nuclear missiles off highalert as an "urgent interim measure" toward the only permanent solution: the abolition of nuclear weapons worldwide.

"It is politically and morally indefensible that American children are growing up with the threat of an accidental nuclear attack," says Lachlan Forrow, MD, principal author of the NEJM article, "'Accidental' Nuclear War: A Post-Cold War Assessment" and internist at Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center. His

study
cites
numerous instances of 'broken arrows' major nuclear accidents that could have killed millions and exposed millions of others to potentially lethal radiation from fallout if disaster had not been averted. "Nuclear weapons do not make us safer, their existence jeopardizes everything we cherish." Forrow adds, "We are calling upon the mayors and citizens of all U.S. and Russian cities to join us in appealing to Presidents Bill Clinton and Boris Yeltsin to end this threat by taking all weapons off highalert status immediately."

A strike on Boston would likely target Logan Airport, Commonwealth Pier, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Harvard University, resulting in 609,000 immediate fatalities, according to the researchers. Depending on wind patterns, says Dr. Forrow, hundreds of thousands of other Boston-area residents could be exposed to potentially lethal fallout.

Launching nuclear missiles on false warning is the most plausible contemporary 'accident' scenario, according to the authors. More than mere conjecture, this scenario almost played out to horrifying results in 1995 when a U.S. scientific rocket launched from Norway led to activation of the nuclear suitcases carried by the top Russian command the first time ever in Soviet/Russian history. It took eight minutes for the Russian leadership to determine the rocket launch was not part of a surprise nuclear strike by Western nuclear submarines just four minutes before they might have ordered a nuclear response based on standard launchonwarning protocols.

An 'accidental' nuclear attack would create a public health disaster of an unprecedented scale, according to more than 70 articles and speeches on the subject, cited by the authors and written by leading nuclear war experts, public health officials, international peace organizations, and legislators. Furthermore, retired General Lee Butler, Commander from 1991-1994 of all U.S. Strategic Forces under former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Colin Powell, has warned that from his experience in many "war games" it is plausible that such an attack could provoke a nuclear counterattack that could trigger full scale nuclear war with billions of casualties worldwide.

The authors describe the immediate effects of an "accidental" launch from a single Russian submarine that would kill at least six to eight million people in firestorms in eight major U.S. cities. With hospitals destroyed and medical personnel killed, and with major communications and transportation networks disrupted, the delivery of emergency care would be all but impossible,

according
to Forrow and his colleagues.

Warning that the risk of an "accidental," nuclear attack has increased in recent years, Forrow and his medical colleagues call for immediate dealerting steps to be rapidly followed by a signed global agreement by the Year 2000 committing the world to the elimination of all nuclear weapons within a specified timeframe.

Known as Abolition 2000, the initiative has been endorsed by leading U.S. medical organizations, including the American College of Physicians, the American Public Health Association and Physicians for Social Responsibility, as well as International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW), the 1985 Nobel Peace Prize Laureate, and over 1000 other nongovernmental agencies in 75 countries.

"As healthcare guardians, doctors and their medical centers have an obligation to safeguard the public welfare, including both the prevention of disease and the prevention of nuclear holocaust," says Mitchell T. Rabkin MD, CEO, CareGroup, the parent organization of Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center.

Adds Forrow, "It is painful for people to imagine the unimaginable, but it is necessary if we are to avoid disaster. In even a limited nuclear attack on Boston, institutions like Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center would be destroyed, and along with it our capacity to help those victims who did survive." He says, "Prevention is our only protection."

Copies of the article will be delivered by Abolition 2000 representatives to participants in the April 28 - May 8 United Nations Nuclear Nonproliferation Conference in Geneva and on Monday, May 4, copies of the article will be delivered to every member of the United States Congress.

The study was sponsored by the Albert Schweitzer Fellowship and conducted under the auspices of the Physicians for Social Responsibility, the U.S. affiliate of IPPNW.

Among others, the NEJM study was based on articles and speeches by retired General Butler; Herbert Abrams, MD, former chairman of Harvard Medical School's department of radiology; Bernard Lown, MD, who accepted the 1985 Nobel Peace Prize on behalf of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, and retired U.S. Senator Sam Nunn (D), Georgia.

In addition to Forrow, authors of the NEJM study include Christine Cassel, immediate past president of the American College of Physicians, Victor Sidel, copresident of IPPNW and former president of the American Public Health Association (APHA), Dr. Ira Helfand, past presidents of Physicians for Social Responsibility, Barry Levy, immediate past president of APHA; Bruce Blair, MD, of Brookings, one of the world's leading authorities on the command and

control of nuclear weapons, and Drs. Theodore Postol and George Lewis, leading experts on nuclear weapons systems at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center is a major clinical, research, and teaching affiliate of Harvard Medical School.

Lachlan Forrow, MD

The Albert Schweitzer Fellowship
A co-sponsor of ABOLITION 2000

"Nuclear weapons are against international law and they have to be abolished...All negotiations regarding the abolition of atomic weapons remain without success because no international public opinion exists which demands this abolition."

--Dr. Albert Schweitzer

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 28 Apr 1998 21:58:31 -0400
From: Lisa Ledwidge <ledwidge@psr.org>
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: Salt Lake Tribune Editorial - April 27, 1998
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

<http://www.sltrib.com/04271998/opinion/30258.htm>

Editorial
The Salt Lake Tribune
Monday, April 27, 1998
End Treaty Standoff

That old obstructionist, Sen. Jesse Helms, refuses to convene hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee on ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. His strategy is to hold the treaty hostage in a bid to force President Clinton to submit amendments to the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty of 1972 to the Senate.

Sen. Helms, R-N.C., has a point: Clinton is engaging in obstruction of his own where the ABM Treaty modifications are concerned. But that is not reason enough to delay action on the test-ban treaty.

Clinton signed the test ban in 1996. In order for the treaty to go into force, the 44 nations identified in it as having nuclear abilities must ratify it. So far, 13 have.

The theory of the treaty is simple. Without test explosions, it is difficult to develop reliable nuclear weapons, especially for newcomers to the nuclear club. That is less true for the five acknowledged nuclear weapons states -- the United States, Britain, France, Russia and China -- which have conducted extensive tests and can improve their weapons using computer simulations based on knowledge gained from prior detonations.

However, the inability to conduct test explosions should retard the proliferation of nuclear weapons to wannabe nations such as Iraq, Libya, Iran and North Korea. Without tests, it would be difficult for them to develop advanced nuclear warheads that are deliverable by ballistic missiles.

Which brings up the ABM Treaty. Many members of Congress favor modifications to the ABM Treaty that would allow the United States to deploy a system of interceptor missiles that could knock down incoming missiles fired by an enemy. The current treaty prohibits deployment of such a system at the multiple sites in the United States that would be necessary to shield the entire nation.

There's a tradeoff, though. Such changes in the ABM Treaty would undercut the effort to reduce the missile arsenals of the United States and Russia. A U.S. anti-missile system would encourage the Russians to retain more of their own missiles so that they could overwhelm the U.S. interceptor system in a nuclear exchange. In short, an anti-missile

system on either side would upset the current balance of nuclear power, which discourages either side from ever using nuclear weapons.

Nevertheless, an anti-missile system in the U.S. would offer protection against attacks from the likes of Iraq, if it ever develops missile capability.

President Clinton should give the Senate an opportunity to weigh these strategic trade-offs. But in the meantime, Helms should not hold up action on a test ban treaty that would advance U.S. security.

(c) Copyright 1998, The Salt Lake Tribune

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>
Date: Tue, 28 Apr 1998 09:46:10 -0400
From: disarmament@igc.org
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org
Subject: Nuc Weapons Forever
To: ctb-followers@igc.org

New Methods Help Maintain Nuclear Arms
Some Aging U.S. Weapons Will Be Rebuilt in Effort to Ensure Long-Term
Reliability

By Walter Pincus
Washington Post Staff Writer
Tuesday, April 28, 1998; Page A06

While the Clinton administration urges the Senate to ratify treaties that end nuclear testing and sharply cut the number of U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons, U.S. government scientists are pressing ahead with new methods for keeping thousands of strategic missile warheads and bombs reliable and accurate for at least 25 more years.

The program, overseen by the Pentagon and Department of Energy (DOE), has begun rebuilding some of the approximately 9,000 nuclear warheads that remain in America's arsenal to keep the U.S. deterrent credible, in part by extending the life of some weapons.

For example, the Mark 21 reentry vehicles that contain the nuclear warheads on MX intercontinental ballistic missiles are scheduled to be taken off those ICBMs and refurbished to make them reliable beyond the year 2025, according to Gene Ives, deputy assistant secretary of energy for military applications and stockpile management.

In the 1980s, when the MX reentry vehicle and its 350-kiloton W87 warhead were first designed and produced, the two were expected to be deployed for 20 years, until 2009, according to documents.

The \$4.1 billion-a-year DOE stockpile stewardship and management program has drawn steady criticism from anti-nuclear groups for more than a year. The Los Alamos Study Group, a collection of 39 disarmament and environmental groups, last week again called for a halt in the program. Greg Mello, the group's director, said the DOE program reveals "a shocking disregard for U.S. commitments, especially those enshrined in the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to end the nuclear arms race."

But Thomas Graham, a former senior official with the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said that without the DOE program, the 1996 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

would have almost no chance for approval by the Republican-controlled Senate, where lawmakers have expressed concern about maintaining the U.S. capacity to wage nuclear war in an age when new limits are being placed on its aging arsenal.

Originally chosen for the MX in 1982, the Mark 21 and W87 nuclear warhead deliver a hydrogen bomb with an explosive power more than 25 times greater than the device that destroyed Hiroshima. Each of the 100 currently deployed MX missiles carries nine to 11 separately targeted Mark 21 reentry vehicles.

The Mark 21/W87 combination was chosen as the first nuclear weapon to be refurbished under the program because of its potential role after the ratification of START II, the reduction agreement awaiting approval by the Senate and the Russian Duma. That agreement calls for multiple warhead ICBMs such as the MX to be dismantled. According to Ives, the Mark 21/W87 "is the warhead of choice" for the new single-warhead Minuteman III ICBM allowed by the treaty.

Radioactive materials in nuclear weapons decay over time, and the plastic, metal and other organic parts in warheads and bombs age and react to radioactivity. "Material breakdown occurs from exposure to radiation, higher than normal temperatures and gases that accumulate over time in a hermetically sealed weapon environment," C. Bruce Tarter, director of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, told Congress recently.

As a result, new techniques are being used to sample gases as an early warning of decay within the stockpile. In addition, a selection of the warheads and reentry vehicles, normally 11 systems a year, has regularly been tested every year, along with their missile and bomb delivery systems.

And although the stockpile is regularly certified to the president as reliable, there has never been a complete test of a nuclear ICBM from launch through space flight to nuclear explosion. No test H-bomb with a real warhead has ever been dropped from an airplane since the atmospheric test ban went into effect in 1964.

Before Congress approved a nuclear test moratorium and President George Bush suspended all U.S. underground testing in 1992, nuclear devices, based on past and future warhead designs, were regularly exploded in caverns beneath the Nevada Nuclear Test Site and at South Pacific test areas. These experimental explosions helped verify the reliability of the stockpile and provided data for future weapon designs.

To replace actual nuclear tests, Los Alamos and Sandia national laboratories have acquired advanced computers that will simulate nuclear explosions. Livermore has under construction the \$1.2 billion National Ignition Facility, whose immense laser capability will allow simulation of weapons-like fusion effects.

Under current schedules, the Mark 21s are to be taken off the MX and the W87 warheads sent to the DOE Pantex plant outside Amarillo, Tex. They will be taken apart there, with the plutonium

triggers sent to Los Alamos in New Mexico and Livermore in California for examination. The remaining nuclear components of the bombs will be sent to Oak Ridge, Tenn., for study.

"We conceptually divide the explosion sequence into each of its parts and test and analyze each of these separately, much as you would test the ignition system, the cooling system and the brakes on your car," Victor H. Reis, assistant secretary of defense programs at DOE, told Congress last month.

There are fewer warheads and types of systems in the stockpile than at any time since the 1960s, when the nuclear arms race began in earnest. With seven nuclear missile and bomb systems now operational and the average age of each at 15 years, the U.S. stockpile "is older than ever before," according to a DOE publication.

"No signs of catastrophic aging" have been uncovered to date in DOE's more comprehensive stockpile stewardship program, according to Livermore's Tarter. There have been some unspecified problems, which officials said were promptly fixed.

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Kathy Crandall, Coordinator
1101 14th Street NW #700, Washington DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext.232
FAX: 202 8998 0172
E-MAIL: disarmament@igc.org

For WHAT YOU CAN DO to achieve a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW!

<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>
Date: Tue, 28 Apr 1998 16:13:40 -0400
From: disarmament@igc.org
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org
Subject: Post Errors on SS
To: ctb-followers@igc.org

From: Stephen Schwartz, Director U.S. Nuclear Weapons Cost Study Project

There are eight factual errors in Walter Pincus' article in today's Post
(I faxed this information to him this morning):

1. The exact yield of the W87 warhead for the MX missile is classified (as are the yields of nearly all other warheads, past and present). But the best and most accurate publicly available data come from the Nuclear Weapons Databook Project at the Natural Resources Defense Council, which has for years placed the yield at 300 kilotons.
2. Therefore, each W87 has a yield 20 times greater than the 15 kiloton bomb dropped on Hiroshima.
3. The DOE has stated that its stockpile stewardship and management program is expected to cost \$45 billion over ten years, for an average annual cost of \$4.5 billion a year (this year the DOE anticipates it will spend \$4.3 billion). In fact, this average annual cost is \$800-900 million more per year (in constant 1996 dollars) than what the Atomic Energy Commission and the DOE spent on average during the Cold War (1948-1991), when nuclear testing and nuclear weapons production were in full operation.
4. There are only (and have never been more than) 50 MX missiles deployed at F.E. Warren Air Force Base in Wyoming and each carries 10 W87s (according to the NRDC).
5. While there has never been a full-scale test of an actual ICBM launch over the North Pole to targets inside Russia (or vice-versa), it is wrong to infer that no launch-to-target testing has occurred or that nuclear warheads have never been carried into space and successfully detonated. Between August 27 and September 6, 1958, the Department of Defense conducted OPERATION ARGUS, a series of three clandestine tests in the South Atlantic about 1,100 miles southwest of Capetown, South Africa. In each test, specially modified Lockheed X-17a three-stage ballistic missiles were launched from the USS Norton Sound carrying low-yield (1.7 kiloton) W25 warheads. Each warhead detonated at a height of about 300 miles. The purpose of the tests was the study how very high-altitude detonations might interfere with communications quipment and ballistic missile performance.

On May 6, 1962, the submarine USS Ethan Allen (SSBN 608) launched a Polaris A2 missile while submerged about 1,500 nautical miles east-northeast of Christmas Island in the Pacific Ocean in a test code-named "Frigate Bird." The missile's re-entry vehicle traveled

about 1,020 nautical miles toward the island, detonating at an altitude of 8,300 feet. The yield of the W47Y1 warhead has been estimated at 600 kilotons. "Frigate Bird" was the first and only operational test of a U.S. SSBN/SLBM weapon system.

Finally, between July 9 and November 1, 1962, the United States successfully launched three Thor intermediate-range ballistic missiles and one STRYPI rocket from (or in the vicinity of) Johnston Island, 780 miles west-southwest of Hawaii. The "Starfish Prime" test detonated a 1.45 megaton W45 warhead at a height of 248 miles; the "Checkmate" test detonated a low-yield XW-50X1 at a height of 91.5 miles; the "Bluegill Triple Prime" test detonated a W50 warhead with a submegaton yield at a height of 30 miles; and the "Kingfish" test detonated a W50 warhead with a submegaton yield at a height of 60 miles.

6. The Partial Test Ban Treaty was ratified and entered into force on October 10, 1963. However, the last U.S. atmospheric nuclear test ("Tightrope") took place on November 4, 1962, 13 miles above Johnston Island, using a low-yield W31 warhead carried aboard a Nike Hercules missile. The last nuclear weapon dropped from a plane ("Housatonic") was a megaton range device dropped from a B-52 bomber on October 30, 1962 and detonated 12,130 feet above Johnston Island.

7. All nuclear test sites used by the United States in the Pacific between 1946-1962 (Enewetak and Bikini Atolls, which together comprised the Pacific Proving Ground, Christmas Island, and Johnston Island) are above the equator and therefore in the North Pacific.

8. There are currently nine types of operational nuclear warheads and gravity bombs in the U.S. stockpile. These weapons are carried aboard two types of ICBMs, two types of SLBMs, three types of cruise missiles, two types of strategic bombers, and several types of tactical aircraft:

--B61 Mods 3, 4, 10 (Air Force and NATO tactical aircraft)

--B61 Mod 7 (B-2A; B-52H)

--B61 Mod 11 (B-2A; F-16)

--W62 (Minuteman III)

--W76 (Trident I/C4)

--W78 (Minuteman III)

--W80-0 (Sea-Launched Cruise Missile)

--W80-1 (Air-Launched Cruise Missile; B-52H)

--W80-1 (Advanced Cruise Missile; B-52H)

--B83 (B-2A; B-52H)

--W87 (MX)

--W88 (Trident II/D5)

In addition, an estimated 400 W84 warheads from the Ground-Launched Cruise Missiles removed under the INF Treaty are being held in reserve status by the DOD at Kirtland Air Force Base in New Mexico.

Finally, the Los Alamos Study Group is not "a collection of 39 disarmament and environmental groups." Pincus has confused LASG with the coalition of organizations (led by NRDC) which is suing DOE over the stockpile stewardship program.

Stephen I. Schwartz
Director
U.S. Nuclear Weapons Cost Study Project
The Brookings Institution
<http://www.brook.edu/fp/projects/nucwcost/weapons.htm>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 29 Apr 1998 19:41:48 +0200 (CEST)
From: "Pol D'Huyvetter" <pol@motherearth.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Action Alert: Citizens Inspections-Oct.1st 1998
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: pold@pop.xs4all.be

Concerning : Citizens Inspection - October 1 1998
at 'nuclear sites of crime'

=> RETURN FORM ATTACHED

Dear friends,

Following our initial call for coordinated actions in 1997, activists organised non-violent direct actions at 13 nuclear weapon related sites in the USA and Europe. Surprisingly the idea for 'Citizens' Inspection Teams' was taken up spontaneously by most groups.

The real threat of war created by the USA around the 'UNSCOM weapons inspection team' in Iraq, made us decide to follow up on this new interesting model of citizens action.

Last month we counted already six attempts of citizens inspections of nuclear weapon facilities. It proves to be an extremely interesting tool for local groups. It creates valuable new angles and opportunities towards politicians, the public, the media, ... the police and court.

Realizing that we are stronger when we act together, we call for an international day of Citizens' Inspections of nuclear "Sites of Crime" on October 1st 1998.

October 1st is the anniversary of the end of Nuremberg Tribunal in 1946. It also coincides closely with the international day of action to free the Israeli whistleblower Mordechai Vanunu. We believe that both events refer to the responsibilities we have as citizens to prevent preparations for nuclear war.

Please fill in the return form and send it back to us if your group wants to organise a non-violent direct action in your area on October 1.

Let's take action for a nuclear weapon free world and unite in spirit!

Don't hesitate to send us your visions and ideas ... or to contact us for more information.

Peace,

Katri Silvonen

Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days network
For Mother Earth International office

Return form

We will organise a Citizens' Inspection at _____

I want to join a Citizens Inspection at _____

Organisation _____

Contact person _____

Address _____

Country _____

Phone _____ Fax _____

E-mail _____

* For Mother Earth International office *

* Lange Steenstraat 16/D, 9000 Gent, Belgium *

* Phone/fax +32-9-233 84 39 *

* Fax +32-9-233 73 02 *

* E-mail: pol@motherearth.org *

* WWW:<http://www.motherearth.org> *

* Postal account : 000-1618561-19 *

* For Mother Earth is member of Abolition 2000 - a global *
network to eliminate nuclear weapons, the International Peace
* Bureau (IPB) and World Information Service on Energy (WISE) *

* For Mother Earth has offices in Belgium, Slovakia, Romania, *
* Sri Lanka and USA, aswell as active members/groups in *
* Belarus, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, France, Finland, *
* Germany, Netherlands and Ukraine *

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 29 Apr 1998 14:20:51 -0400
From: Lachlan Forrow <lforrow@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Boston Mayor calls on all US/Russian Mayors to Endorse
Abolition 2000 Statement at Boston Press Conference on NEJM Article
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id LAA05143
X-Sender: lforrow@pop.igc.org

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id LAB15935

To: Abolition 2000/IPPNW Colleagues

Enclosed is a statement from Mayor Thomas Menino at today's Boston press conference. Simultaneous press conferences were held in NYC, Washington, Pittsburgh, Atlanta, Seattle, and San Francisco. A lot of us are pointing, as I tried to do toward the end of my own remarks below (see last three paragraphs), to Abolition 2000 and events in Geneva this weekend as the keys to the only long-term solution. I was very pleased that Mayor Menino agreed to be so explicit about Abolition 2000.

As mentioned before, Michael Christ will have 1000 copies of the NEJM article to distribute in Geneva when he arrives on Friday.

Best regards to everyone.

Lachlan

Statement of Boston Mayor Thomas M. Menino
On Eliminating the Threat of Nuclear Weapons
April 29, 1998

The end of the Cold War has brought many benefits to those of us who live on either side of the former "iron curtain" — but it has not eliminated the possibility of nuclear disaster. As we approach the new millenium, we must continue to press for a world free of nuclear weapons.

Today's study [in the New England Journal of Medicine] once again reminds us that millions of innocent men, women and children can lose their lives instantly as the result of a nuclear "accident".

I urge all of my fellow mayors in the United States and Russia to join me in calling for an end to this threat through the global "ABOLITION 2000" Campaign. This campaign seeks a signed agreement by the year 2000 committing the world to the permanent elimination of nuclear weapons eithin

a certain time frame.

Mayors work hard every day to save people from the violence of guns and other weapons -- but all our hard work to save lives can be wiped out by one act of insanity. Let's eliminate the insanity, and end the threat of nuclear holocaust.

Remarks by Dr. Lachlan Forrow
Principal Author, NEJM Study on "Accidental Nuclear War"

Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center
April 29, 1998

In March 1962 an entire issue of the New England Journal of Medicine was devoted to articles by physicians in Boston describing in stark scientific terms the medical consequences of thermonuclear war and the inability of the medical profession to respond. Those physicians, founders of Physicians for Social Responsibility, subsequently joined Dr. Albert Schweitzer (1952 Nobel Peace laureate) and others in campaigning for an end to atmospheric nuclear test explosions as the first step in ending a suicidal nuclear arms race between the Soviet Communist government and the United States. With additional scientific information that included documentation of that radioactive strontium-90 from fallout of these tests were detectable in the deciduous teeth of American children, Presidents Kennedy and Krushchev shortly afterward signed the Limited Test Ban Treaty that banned these explosions and public pressure about nuclear weapons rapidly ebbed.

In truth, we now know, the nuclear arms race simply moved underground, continuing at a faster rate than ever. In March 1981, physicians from the United States, Russia, and eleven other countries met at Airlie House Virginia to express their shared concern about the massive increase in superpower arsenals since 1962, as well as increasing rhetoric about the possibility of prevailing in a thermonuclear war. Reviewing again the medical facts regarding the effects of nuclear explosions on human beings, they helped — with millions and millions of non-medical citizens of the U.S. and other nations — bring attention to the grave danger that the combination of Cold War tensions and superpower nuclear arsenals continued to pose. A study by the World Health Organization (see reference 5 of the current paper) estimated that a US-Soviet nuclear exchange would lead not only to hundreds of millions of deaths in the northern hemisphere, but over 1 billion additional "indirect" deaths in the developing world as a result of loss of basic food, fuel, and medical supplies from the destroyed industrialized world. These studies helped mobilize world consciousness and led President Reagan to conclude that "a nuclear war can never be won and must never be fought." With the later ending of the Cold War and the dissolution of the Soviet Union, public concern and public pressure about nuclear weapons rapidly ebbed.

In truth, we now know, the hair-trigger nuclear standoff between Russia and the United States has not ended, and as our study in this week's issue of the New England Journal documents, the risk of at least one scenario -- "accidental" nuclear attack — is actually increasing. As General George Butler, former Commander of all U.S. strategic nuclear forces, has warned recently, an attack such as the one we have described, would not only cause the more than 6 million immediate Americans deaths in nuclear firestorms we have conservatively estimated, and not only cause the hundreds of thousands or millions additional casualties as a result of radiation injuries, but plausibly trigger a U.S. nuclear response that would in turn trigger all-out nuclear war. During a period when Russia is not even our adversary, this is politically, medically, and morally obscene.

Two things are now clear.

First, the fundamental problem of nuclear war will not go away until radical and permanent changes in nuclear weapons arsenals are instituted. Urgently, we appeal for concrete steps that can be instituted by Presidential directives by Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin that would take nuclear weapons off high alert and remove from them the capacity to be rapidly launched. This should, however, be viewed only as an "urgent interim measure" toward the only permanent solution to the danger of nuclear war: the complete and verified abolition of all nuclear weapons and the airtight international control of weapons-usable fissile material.

Second, the solution to this problem requires more than governmental involvement. Twice before public opinion has led to important but small changes in nuclear policies, and both times the underlying logic of nuclear war-planning has continued unabated. This third time must be different. Fortunately, helped by the remarkable capacities of global communication that did not exist at the time of the earlier two public anti-nuclear movements, an unprecedented and rapidly expanding global campaign for the complete abolition of nuclear weapons has emerged. In the days and months ahead you will be hearing more and more about Abolition 2000, a campaign that has quietly but methodically recruited over 1000 co-sponsoring non-governmental organizations in 75 countries over the past three years. Abolition 2000 has a simple goal: a signed global agreement by the year 2000 committing the world to the permanent abolition of nuclear weapons within a specified timeframe.

Today in the U.S. physicians and other colleagues in seven cities are holding simultaneous press conferences protesting the danger of accidental nuclear war. Beginning Saturday in Geneva, a larger group of Abolition 2000 representatives from all over the world will meet to announce details of the global Abolition 2000 campaign, and to present the first 13 million signatures that have been collected on Abolition 2000 petitions, in connection with the 1998 United Nations Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty conference.

Dr. Albert Schweitzer warned in 1962 that "All negotiations regarding the abolition of atomic weapons remain without success because no international public opinion exists which demands this abolition." Beginning this week,

we expect that to change dramatically.

Dr. Forrow is Assistant Professor of Medicine at Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center and Harvard Medical School, President of The Albert Schweitzer Fellowship, and Immediate past Chair of the Board of Directors, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War.

For more information on the Abolition 2000 Campaign, please see:

<www.napf.org/abolition2000/index/html>

Lachlan Forrow, MD

The Albert Schweitzer Fellowship
A co-sponsor of ABOLITION 2000

"Nuclear weapons are against international law and they have to be abolished...All negotiations regarding the abolition of atomic weapons remain without success because no international public opinion exists which demands this abolition."

--Dr. Albert Schweitzer

Return-Path: <owner-pov-l@wccx.wcc-coe.org>
Date: Mon, 4 May 1998 17:10:42 +0200
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
From: majordomo@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Subject: Welcome to pov-l
Reply-To: majordomo@wccx.wcc-coe.org

--

Welcome to the pov-l mailing list!

If you ever want to remove yourself from this mailing list,
you can send mail to "majordomo@info.wcc-coe.org" with the following command
in the body of your email message:

unsubscribe pov-l mupj@igc.apc.org

Here's the general information for the list you've
subscribed to, in case you don't already have it:

POV-L is the listserver for the World Council of Churches' Programme to
Overcome Violence. It includes stories and information about the
programme and its two-year global campaign, "Peace to the City", as well
as notices of peace-related resources and special news and
announcements. This list-server is "read-only"; any questions or items to
be considered for posting should be sent to Sara Speicher at
ses@wcc-coe.org.

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 04 May 1998 11:36:08 -0400
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: 40 Years for a CTBT
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

To: CTBT Organizers
From: disarmament
Subject: 40 Years for a CTBT

Dear CTBT Organizers:

As I am sure you know, the NATO Expansion vote passed on Thurs.* This means that we must push hard now to make sure CTBT is the next major foreign policy issue considered by this Senate.

Please work to make sure that a high volume of letters are going to your Senators' offices RIGHT NOW - even Senators supportive of the CTBT need to hear from us. Urge Senators already supportive of the CTBT to make a floor speech, to talk to Helms and Lott to schedule hearings and a vote on the CTBT this year. We need everyone's voice calling for a CTBT NOW!

* (Despite much hard work that did raise concerns among many Senators, the first round of expansion including Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic was approved by the Senate. Peace and Disarmament advocates along with other concerned citizens will continue to oppose NATO expansion, working against further expansion to the baltics.)

The WHITE HOUSE CTBT TEST BAN NEWS

This week marks anniversary of President's letter to Khrushchev, calling for efforts to end testing

Forty years ago this week President Eisenhower proposed to Soviet Chairman Nikita Khrushchev that technical experts begin work on the practical problems involved in achieving an end to nuclear testing.

In the four decades since that April 28, 1958, letter, American presidents have worked toward the goal of stopping nuclear testing for all time. President Eisenhower hoped to make this his lasting gift to the country, and said the failure to achieve a ban on nuclear testing, "would have to be classed as the greatest disappointment of any administration -- of any decade -- of any time and of any party...."

President Kennedy took up the cause of the test ban. When negotiations were concluded on a Limited Test Ban Treaty, President Kennedy addressed the American people, calling the Treaty "a shaft of light cut into the darkness."

He continued, "Negotiations were concluded in Moscow on a treaty to ban all nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water. For the first time, an agreement

has been reached on bringing the forces of nuclear destruction under international control. ... This limited treaty will radically reduce the nuclear testing which would otherwise be conducted on both sides; it will prohibit the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and all others who sign it, from engaging in the atmospheric tests which have so alarmed mankind; and it offers to all the world a welcome sign of hope. ... The achievement of this goal is not a victory for one side -- it is a victory for mankind. ... It reflects simply our common recognition of the dangers in further testing."

President Clinton has taken the final steps toward completing the work begun by President Eisenhower and furthered by President Kennedy. Upon signing the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty in 1996, President Clinton said, "This week ... we take a giant step forward. By overwhelming global consensus, we will make a solemn commitment to end all nuclear tests for all time. ... This Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty will help to prevent the nuclear powers from developing more advanced and more dangerous weapons. It will limit the ability of other states to acquire such devices themselves. It points us toward a century in which the roles and risks of nuclear weapons can be further reduced, and ultimately eliminated."

The CTBT was transmitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification in September 1997. It still awaits action by the Senate. In his State of the Union address, President Clinton said, "I ask Congress to join me in pursuing an ambitious agenda to reduce the serious threat of weapons of mass destruction. This year, four decades after it was first proposed by President Eisenhower, a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban is within reach ... and I ask the Senate to approve it this year." Produced by the White House Working Group on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

For more information on the CTBT: Phone: 202-647-8677 Fax: 202-647-6928

FROM:
Disarmament Clearinghouse
Kathy Crandall, Coordinator
1101 14th Street NW #700
Washington, DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

FOR WHAT YOU CAN DO for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW:
<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 04 May 1998 12:49:47 -0400
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: Hand- Bill
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

To: ctbt-organizers
From: disarmament
Subject: Hand- Bill

Below is the text for a hand-bill. Formatted, it fits on two sides of a half-sheet of paper.

It is designed for you to use at events - and works great in conjunction with Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW! Buttons.(Contact me soon if you haven't ordered your buttons yet.)

You will note that it is "generic" (not Senator-specific) - That is so that we can use these in all states for all senators. If you would like a camera-ready copy to copy and use let me know - I will even make MINOR edits and changes for you - if you like (we can add your Senators name, for example)

Please feel free to adapt this for your own flyers and hand- bills.

Hope you are having great events - encouraging many letters to come flooding into the Senate!

For more information or assistance:

Disarmament Clearinghouse
Coordinator, Kathy Crandall
1101 14th Street NW 700 Washington DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

FOR WHAT YOU CAN DO for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW:
<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

***** It is
time for the U.S. to lead the way to a
Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW!

Permanently End An Environmental & Health Menace:

Over 2,000 nuclear tests at approximately 20 sites around the globe have spread environmental and health damages worldwide. A 1997 National Cancer Institute Study revealed that

many U.S. citizens were exposed to radioactive iodine from U.S. nuclear tests in the 1950's and 60's, causing between 10,000 and 75,000 cases of thyroid cancer nationwide. Underground U.S. nuclear tests between 1963-1992 also vented radioactivity into the atmosphere.

Curtail the Spread of Nuclear Weapons:

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) will help prevent new nations from joining the nuclear club by taking away the key method for developing nuclear weapons - nuclear testing. The CTBT will also make it more difficult for all nations to develop new, more sophisticated nuclear weapons.

Reliable Verification:

The CTBT establishes an unprecedented global network of stations to monitor the world's test sites. This verification system will combine seismic and satellite data with provisions for on-site inspections.

Essential First Step Toward Nuclear Disarmament:

The CTBT is an essential first step toward nuclear disarmament. Nevertheless, approximately 36,000 nuclear weapons worldwide pose a continuing nuclear threat. Heading in the wrong direction, the U.S. is expanding its nuclear weapons research, development, and experimentation capability with a \$4.5 billion per year "Stockpile Stewardship" program.

Instead, the U.S. should take further steps toward complete nuclear disarmament.

(Reverse Side)

U.S. Leadership Essential:

149 nations have signed the CTBT and France and the U.K. recently ratified the CTBT - the first declared nuclear weapons countries to do so. In order for the CTBT to take effect, it must be ratified by 44 specific nations, including the U.S., Russia, China, India and Pakistan. Prompt U.S. ratification is essential to urging other nations to support the CTBT.

Helms Must Hold Hearings:

In September, 1997 President Clinton sent the CTBT to U.S. Senate where the treaty must be ratified by two thirds (67) of the U.S. Senate. Consideration of the CTBT is being blocked by Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms (R-NC) who is opposed to the CTBT and is refusing to hold hearings.
Don't let one Senator block this treaty.

Key Leaders and Public Support the Treaty:

Opinion polls consistently show the vast majority of Americans - both Republicans and Democrats - strongly support the CTBT. Citizens worldwide have called for a CTBT for over 40 years. Current key leaders endorsing the CTBT include four out of the last five Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"The CTBT is the "longest-sought, hardest-fought" victory in the history of arms control." (President Clinton, 9/24/96)

WHAT YOU CAN DO

Contact your Senator today. Tell your Senator:

Support the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Your leadership is vital to ensure that this essential non-proliferation and arms control measure is ratified this year.

Write to: The Honorable _____ The United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Phone (the Capitol Switchboard): (202) 224-3121

For More Information/ or more that YOU CAN DO:
CTBT Action Web Site: <http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

The Disarmament Clearinghouse: TEL: (202) 898 0150 ext. 232
E-Mail: disarmament@igc.org

LOCAL CONTACT:

For more information or assistance:

Disarmament Clearinghouse
Coordinator, Kathy Crandall
1101 14th Street NW 700 Washington DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

FOR WHAT YOU CAN DO for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW:
<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

To: Christian CND <ccnd@gn.apc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: RE: information on Christian CND
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 11:14 AM 5/8/98 +0100, you wrote:

>Dear Howard:

>

>I hope that the NPT PrepCom in Geneva went well. Christian CND did not send a representative to attend the conference, but thank you for the invitation to the reception on 27 April. If you could email your mailing address to the office, I can send you information and also a copy of the newsletter we put out.

>

>Peace and Happiness,

>

>Nancy

>Christian CND

Dear Nancy:

Our mailing address is 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036, USA; our phone number is 301 896-0013. Fax is the same.

I look forward to receiving your information and developing a relationship with the Christian CNC.

Shalom,
Howard

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: CTBT Grassroots Meeting, Wednesday, May 13
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

I'm just back from Geneva where I spent two weeks following the progress (really lack of progress) of the NPT Preparatory Committee. Therefore, I'm fairly late with this reminder that our next meeting of religious organizations working to build grassroots support for CTBT ratification, plus associates from peace organizations, will take place from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Wednesday, May 13, 1998 at the FCNL Conference Room, 245 Second Street, NE.

Now that the Senate has completed its work on NATO expansion we want to press for hearings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This means intensifying our grassroots activities. Also, we are ready to release the "Statement by American Religious Leaders: Ratify the CTBT", which now has 200 signers. We want to get state-level signers involved in the grassroots campaign.

Hope you can make it on the 13th.

Howard

To: ctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: CTBT grassroots meeting with religious organizations
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

I'm just back from Geneva where I spent two weeks following the progress (really lack of progress) of the NPT Preparatory Committee. Therefore, I'm fairly late with this reminder that our next meeting of religious organizations working to build grassroots support for CTBT ratification, plus associates from peace organizations, will take place from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Wednesday, May 13, 1998 at the FCNL Conference Room, 245 Second Street, NE.

Now that the Senate has completed its work on NATO expansion we want to press for hearings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This means intensifying our grassroots activities. Also, we are ready to release the "Statement by American Religious Leaders: Ratify the CTBT", which now has 200 signers. We want to get state-level signers involved in the grassroots campaign.

Hope you can make it on the 13th.

Howard

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 11 May 1998 11:10:43 -0400
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: More on India Test
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

To: CTBT Organizer
From: disarmament
Subject: More on India Test

Dear Friends of the CTBT:

We are all disappointed by India's nuclear test. As you respond to press/ public inquiries don't forget to 1) Condemn the Indian test and urge restraint of India and other countries reacting to the tests (particularly Pakistan and China) 2) Note that this underscores the need for the CTBT - to permanently and completely solidify the global norm against nuclear testing. More talking points will be forthcoming soon.

APO 05/11 1039 US Disappointed by India Nuke Tests

WASHINGTON (AP) -- The United States is "deeply disappointed" by India's nuclear tests and believes they run counter to an international campaign to outlaw such experiments, President Clinton's spokesman said today.

Clinton is supposed to visit India and Pakistan later this year.

"It's impossible to tell what the impact is on the trip at this point," spokesman Mike McCurry said. He said he did not mean to imply that Clinton might drop his stop in India.

India said it conducted three underground nuclear explosions, its first nuclear tests since 1974.

"The United States is deeply disappointed by the decision of the government of India to conduct three nuclear tests," McCurry said. "This runs counter to the effort the international community is making to promulgate a comprehensive ban on such testing.

"The United States intends to address its concern directly to New Delhi," McCurry said. "We will continue to spare no effort in encouraging countries to both promulgate and ratify the comprehensive test ban. If anything, these tests underscore the importance of that international regime."

The tests were sure to alarm Pakistan, India's rival. The two neighbors have fought three wars in the last 50 years. McCurry said the United States would contact Pakistan and urge restraint on the subcontinent.

RTw 05/11 1038 China mum on India nuclear tests

BEIJING, May 11 (Reuters) - China was mum on Monday hours after India announced it had conducted three underground nuclear tests.

The official Xinhua news agency reported the tests but had no comment. Foreign Ministry officials could not immediately be reached for

comment.

Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee announced on Monday the three underground nuclear tests were conducted in the western state of Rajasthan.

Earlier this month Indian Defence Minister George Fernandes said China had built a sophisticated electronic surveillance base in Myanmar's Coco Islands and was beefing up airfields in Tibet to take supersonic fighters capable of striking at India's borders.

Myanmar denied the allegation.

China expressed "utmost regret and resentment" at comments by Fernandes over the military threat posed by Beijing and warned they could sabotage friendly relations.

Fernandes, a former socialist firebrand whose Samata Party is a key partner in the Hindu nationalist-led ruling coalition, said India had long focused on the threat from Pakistan while ignoring the equal danger posed by China.

China fought a brief border war with India in 1962, but relations have warmed in recent years.

In April, Fernandes accused China of providing Pakistan missile technology after Islamabad announced it had tested its longest-range missile capable of striking targets deep inside India.

Beijing, which has long enjoyed a close military relationship with Pakistan, denied the allegation. REUTERS

*****RTw

05/11 1036 India conducts nuclear tests, Pakistan slams move

NEW DELHI, May 11 (Reuters) - India announced on Monday that it had conducted three underground nuclear tests -- its first in 24 years -- in the desert state of Rajasthan, close to the border with Pakistan.

India's arch-foe Pakistan condemned the experimental blasts and said they would suck Pakistan into an arms race. Islamabad asked the international community to condemn them.

Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee told a hurriedly summoned news conference that the controlled blasts were carried out at 3.45 p.m. (1015 GMT) with a fission device, a low-yield device and a thermonuclear device.

"The measured yields are in line with expected values. Measurements have also confirmed that there was no release of radioactivity into the atmosphere," he said in a statement from the lawn of his residence, a national flag standing beside him.

The British Geological Survey said its equipment had picked up tremors from the unexpected tests measuring 4.7 on the Richter scale -- the equivalent of a light earthquake.

The tests, India's first since its only previous test in 1974, come less than two months after the coalition government led by Vajpayee's Hindu nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) took power.

The BJP made the option to introduce nuclear weapons a key plank of its platform in the elections.

The government said last month that it would decide whether to build nuclear weapons after a strategic defence review.

India has refused to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), saying they are discriminatory because they allow a few countries to indefinitely hold

nuclear arms with no commitment to disarm, while forcing all other to relinquish nuclear weapons.

The nuclear tests follow a spate of controversial comments by India's outspoken defence minister George Fernandes on the military threat posed by China, India's nuclear-armed neighbour to the north.

India and China fought a brief but bloody war in 1962 -- two years before China held its first nuclear test. Many Indian analysts say that test spurred New Delhi's test a decade later.

Fernandes also reacted sharply last month to an announcement by Pakistan, which has been to war with India three times, that it had test-flown a long-range missile.

He accused China of supplying Pakistan with the missile technology and said India's Prithvi missile could reach anywhere in Pakistan.

Pakistan says it is capable of producing nuclear weapons but has never conducted a test.

Indian experts gave the unexpected tests a warm welcome.

"It's wonderful. I am hearing the news just now and I'm speechless," said Raja Ramanna, former defence minister and former head of India's Atomic Energy Commission.

"I think the government has taken a decisive step to ensure strategic security for India," Jyotindra Nath Dixit, former foreign secretary and ambassador to Pakistan, told Reuters.

"Secondly, the government has abandoned the accusation of ambiguity and implied that we are a responsible country, but the world should acknowledge our capacities and concerns and that pressure will not work to limit our technological and political capacities.

"You have Pakistan which says it is already a nuclear weapons power... Though efforts are on to normalise relations with China, it is a military power with missile and nuclear weapons capabilities.

"(The tests) will increase his (Vajpayee's) public credibility and infuse India with a great sense of confidence and pride."

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005

TEL : 202 898 0150 ext. 232

FAX: 202 898 0172

<disarmament@igc.org>

For WHAT YOU CAN DO for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW:

<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 11 May 1998 10:26:04 -0400
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.apc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: India Tests
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

May 11, 1998

India Conducts 3 Nuclear Tests

Filed at 9:01 a.m. EDT

By The Associated Press

NEW DELHI, India (AP) -- India conducted three underground nuclear explosions today, its first nuclear tests since 1974, the prime minister said.

Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee told reporters the explosions in the desert 330 miles southwest of New Delhi did not release radiation into the atmosphere.

The development was sure to alarm Pakistan, India's rival. The two neighbors have fought three wars in the last 50 years.

``These were contained explosions like the experiment conducted in May 1974," Vajpayee said today in a brief statement. He refused to take questions.

He said the devices tested were a fission device, a low-yield device and a thermonuclear device.

``I warmly congratulate the scientists and engineers who have carried out these successful tests," Vajpayee added.

Vajpayee's government, which came to power in March, says India needs nuclear weapons to prevent what it calls military adventurism by neighboring Pakistan.

India first demonstrated its nuclear capability with the 1974 test explosion.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 11 May 1998 12:01:36 -0400
From: Lachlan Forrow <lforrow@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: India conducts nuclear tests!
To: "Bill Robinson" <plough@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>,
"Abolition Caucus" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>
X-Sender: lforrow@pop.igc.org

We should view this as a test of Abolition 2000's ability to mobilize our >1000 organizations in >75 countries. Will someone work on a brief statement and a draft of some action-items that might bring pressure on India that was similar to (or greater than) the French 1995 test protests?

India's embassies and consulates throughout the world should hear our voices, but we also need to (a) connect it to actions that will bring real pressure on India's policy; and (b) prove that we are not singling out India -- we are also putting real pressure on the US, Russia and other NWS's to support Abolition 2000.

--LF

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Mon, 11 May 1998 14:24:01 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: Response to Indian Tests

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: response to Indian tests; request for reports from each of you about your message

Attached is an update on the Indian testing situation. Please forward to me any news updates that you find on this story and please, if you are doing press work, let me know what your message is.

I would also remind folks that with these tests, the 1992 nuclear test moratorium legislation (the Exon-Hatfield-Mitchell) restriction ("the United States shall not conduct a nuclear test explosion after September 1996 unless another nation conducts a nuclear test") has now been set aside. The U.S. signature of the CTBT is now the only restriction on the U.S. testing program.

Thanks, DK

The following e-mail includes:

- * Coalition news release
- * updated articles
- * suggestions from George Perkovich

DK

NEWS RELEASE

"Disarmament Groups Condemn Indian N-Tests"

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: May 11, 1998
CONTACT: Daryl Kimball, (202) 546-0795, extension 136

(May 11, 1998, WASHINGTON, DC) Following the announcement today by recently-elected Indian Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee that India has conducted three nuclear weapon tests, experts from a coalition of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation organizations condemned the Indian government's action and urged restraint by India's neighbor, Pakistan. Vajpayee said that the devices tested were a fission device, a low-yield device and a thermonuclear device. India first conducted a nuclear test in 1974.

"We strongly condemn India's decision to conduct nuclear tests and urge Pakistan to exercise the utmost restraint so that the escalation of nuclear tensions in South Asia is not taken to higher and more dangerous levels," said Robert K. Musil, Executive Director of Physicians for Social Responsibility.

"India's decision to resume nuclear weapons testing underscores the necessity of global adherence to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and swift U.S. Senate approval of the Treaty," said Tom Z. Collina, Director of Arms Control and International Security Programs at the Union of Concerned Scientists.

"It is unclear whether this is the starting point of an Indian nuclear build-up or a last flurry of tests before signing the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty," said Christopher Paine, Senior Research Associate at the Natural Resources Defense Council.

The Treaty, which bans all "nuclear weapon test explosions and all other nuclear explosions," has been signed by 149 countries, including the five declared nuclear weapon states. So far, India and Pakistan have refused to sign the Treaty. Thirteen countries have ratified, including Britain and France.

The Treaty would make it much harder for countries to produce new and more threatening types of nuclear weapons. The Treaty would also help prevent nuclear proliferation because it would prevent nations seeking nuclear arms — like Iran and Iraq — from making smaller nuclear warheads, which are more easily deliverable by ballistic missiles.

Earlier this year, the President called on the Senate to approve the CTBT in 1998. However, Senator Jesse Helms, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, so far has refused to hold hearings on the Treaty. He suggests that the U.S. should resume nuclear testing. In January, a Helms spokesperson said "Chairman Helms has been supportive of the need for nuclear testing"

"The days of nuclear testing should be over -- nuclear arms races undermine the security of all nations. India's provocative and dangerous nuclear test decision should be met with universal condemnation and renewed efforts by all nations to draw down nuclear tensions and nuclear arsenals," said Daryl Kimball, Executive Director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.

For more information on nuclear testing and the Test Ban Treaty, see the Coalition's web site at: <<http://www.clw.org/org/pub/clw/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

APO 05/11 1039 US Disappointed by India Nuke Tests

WASHINGTON (AP) -- The United States is "deeply disappointed" by India's nuclear tests and believes they run counter to an international campaign to outlaw such experiments, President Clinton's spokesman said today.

Clinton is supposed to visit India and Pakistan later this year.

"It's impossible to tell what the impact is on the trip at this point," spokesman Mike McCurry said. He said he did not mean to imply that Clinton might drop his stop in India.

India said it conducted three underground nuclear explosions, its first nuclear tests since 1974.

"The United States is deeply disappointed by the decision of the government of India to conduct three nuclear tests," McCurry said. "This runs counter to the effort the international community is making to promulgate a comprehensive ban on such testing.

"The United States intends to address its concern directly to New Delhi," McCurry said. "We will continue to spare no effort in encouraging countries to both promulgate and ratify the comprehensive test ban. If anything, these tests underscore the importance of that international regime."

The tests were sure to alarm Pakistan, India's rival. The two neighbors have fought three wars in the last 50 years. McCurry said the United States would contact Pakistan and urge restraint on the subcontinent.

RTw 05/11 1038 China mum on India nuclear tests

BEIJING, May 11 (Reuters) - China was mum on Monday hours after India announced it had conducted three underground nuclear tests.

The official Xinhua news agency reported the tests but had no comment. Foreign Ministry officials could not immediately be reached for comment.

Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee announced on Monday the three underground nuclear tests were conducted in the western state of Rajasthan.

Earlier this month Indian Defence Minister George Fernandes said China had built a sophisticated electronic surveillance base in Myanmar's Coco Islands and was beefing up airfields in Tibet to take supersonic fighters capable of striking at India's borders.

Myanmar denied the allegation.

China expressed "utmost regret and resentment" at comments by Fernandes over the military threat posed by Beijing and warned they could sabotage friendly relations.

Fernandes, a former socialist firebrand whose Samata Party is a key partner in the Hindu nationalist-led ruling coalition, said India had long focused on the threat from Pakistan while ignoring the equal danger posed by China.

China fought a brief border war with India in 1962, but relations have warmed in recent years.

In April, Fernandes accused China of providing Pakistan missile technology after Islamabad announced it had tested its longest-range missile capable of striking targets deep inside India.

Beijing, which has long enjoyed a close military relationship with Pakistan, denied the allegation. REUTERS

05/11 1036 India conducts nuclear tests, Pakistan slams move

NEW DELHI, May 11 (Reuters) - India announced on Monday that it had conducted three underground nuclear tests -- its first in 24 years -- in the desert state of Rajasthan, close to the border with Pakistan.

India's arch-foe Pakistan condemned the experimental blasts and said they would suck Pakistan into an arms race. Islamabad asked the international community to condemn them.

Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee told a hurriedly summoned news conference that the controlled blasts were carried out at 3.45 p.m. (1015 GMT) with a fission device, a low-yield device and a thermonuclear device.

"The measured yields are in line with expected values. Measurements have also confirmed that there was no release of radioactivity into the atmosphere," he said in a statement from the lawn of his residence, a national flag standing beside him.

The British Geological Survey said its equipment had picked up tremors from the unexpected tests measuring 4.7 on the Richter scale -- the equivalent of a light earthquake.

The tests, India's first since its only previous test in 1974, come less than two months after the coalition government led by Vajpayee's Hindu nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) took power.

The BJP made the option to introduce nuclear weapons a key plank of its platform in the elections.

The government said last month that it would decide whether to build nuclear weapons after a strategic defence review.

India has refused to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), saying they are discriminatory because they allow a few countries to indefinitely hold nuclear arms with no commitment to disarm, while forcing all other to relinquish nuclear weapons.

The nuclear tests follow a spate of controversial comments by India's outspoken defence minister George Fernandes on the military threat posed by China, India's nuclear-armed neighbour to the north.

India and China fought a brief but bloody war in 1962 -- two years before China held its first nuclear test. Many Indian analysts say that test spurred New Delhi's test a decade later.

Fernandes also reacted sharply last month to an announcement by Pakistan, which has been to war with India three times, that it had test-flown a long-range missile.

He accused China of supplying Pakistan with the missile technology and said India's Prithvi missile could reach anywhere in Pakistan.

Pakistan says it is capable of producing nuclear weapons but has never conducted a test.

Indian experts gave the unexpected tests a warm welcome.

"It's wonderful. I am hearing the news just now and I'm speechless," said Raja Ramanna, former defence minister and former head of India's Atomic Energy Commission.

"I think the government has taken a decisive step to ensure strategic security for India," Jyotindra Nath Dixit, former foreign secretary and ambassador to Pakistan, told Reuters.

"Secondly, the government has abandoned the accusation of ambiguity and implied that we are a responsible country, but the world should acknowledge our capacities and concerns and that pressure will not work to limit our technological and political capacities.

"You have Pakistan which says it is already a nuclear weapons power... Though efforts are on to normalise relations with China, it is a military power with missile and nuclear weapons capabilities.

"(The tests) will increase his (Vajpayee's) public credibility."

From: George Perkovich
To: joseph@ceip.org
Date: Monday, May 11, 1998 7:28AM

Dear colleagues in various networks.

I would offer the following advice in understanding and responding to the Indian nuclear tests.

First, there were hints that this would happen. Most recently, a statement by Atomic Energy Commission chairman R. Chidambaram in February that test simulations are fine if you have the necessary codes, as the U.S. and others do, but if you do not have the necessary codes, the only way to get them is to test.

Second, the BJP is the only party to hold power in India which has not shared the moral rejection of nuclear weapons posited by the Congress party since Nehru. In other words, normative identity has played an important role in restraining India's nuclear program; the new government did not share that normative commitment, hence was freer to test.

Now, in terms of reaction I think it is extremely important that we try to make the best of the situation. If India now declares that it will sign the CTBT and participate positively in the FMCT negotiations, I think a major gain will have resulted, much like what happened after France did its rushed series in the Pacific. The U.S. and the international community should hold its fire on sanctions until we see what India intends to do. If India takes these positive steps on these treaties, the international response should be relatively mild. However, if India continues to reject the CTBT, FMCT and other elements of the global agenda to reduce nuclear danger, then all states should impose what sanctions they can.

Space must be given for the Indians to do the positive thing and announce signing the CTBT, etc. If the pressure from sanctions comes today or this week, politics within India will dictate defiance. India will never subject itself to the colonialism of the nonproliferation regime. But if we give them space, they may do something positive.

Bottom line: this is a very regrettable development, but it's one that India could turn into a positive step by signing the CTBT and making progress on the FMCT. We should watch to see if India will now take these steps. If they do not in the very near future, the international community should exert severe pressure.

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: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Mon, 11 May 1998 14:27:18 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: Coalition response to Indian tests

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Coalition response to Indian tests

Attached is the Coalition's press statement in connection with the Indian tests.

I would also remind folks that with these tests, the 1992 nuclear test moratorium legislation (the Exon-Hatfield-Mitchell) restriction ("the United States shall not conduct a nuclear test explosion after September 1996 unless another nation conducts a nuclear test") has now been set aside. The U.S. signature of the CTBT is now the only restriction on the U.S. testing program -- and ratification is all the more important.

Thanks, DK

NEWS RELEASE

"Disarmament Groups Condemn Indian N-Tests"

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: May 11, 1998
CONTACT: Daryl Kimball, (202) 546-0795, extension 136

(May 11, 1998, WASHINGTON, DC) Following the announcement today by recently-elected Indian Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee that India has conducted three nuclear weapon tests, experts from a coalition of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation organizations condemned the Indian government's action and urged restraint by India's neighbor, Pakistan. Vajpayee said that the devices tested were a fission device, a low-yield device and a thermonuclear device. India first conducted a nuclear test in 1974.

"We strongly condemn India's decision to conduct nuclear tests and urge Pakistan to exercise the utmost restraint so that the escalation of nuclear tensions in South Asia is not taken to higher and more dangerous levels," said Robert K. Musil, Executive Director of Physicians for Social Responsibility.

"India's decision to resume nuclear weapons testing underscores the necessity of global adherence to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and swift U.S. Senate approval of the Treaty," said Tom Z. Collina, Director of Arms Control and International Security Programs at the Union of Concerned Scientists.

"It is unclear whether this is the starting point of an Indian nuclear build-up or a last flurry of tests before signing the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty," said Christopher Paine, Senior Research Associate at the Natural Resources Defense Council.

The Treaty, which bans all "nuclear weapon test explosions and all other nuclear explosions," has been signed by 149 countries, including the five declared nuclear weapon states. So far, India and Pakistan have refused to sign the Treaty. Thirteen countries have ratified, including Britain and France.

The Treaty would make it much harder for countries to produce new and more threatening types of nuclear weapons. The Treaty would also help prevent nuclear proliferation because it would prevent nations seeking nuclear arms — like Iran and Iraq — from making smaller nuclear warheads, which are more easily deliverable by ballistic missiles.

Earlier this year, the President called on the Senate to approve the CTBT in 1998. However, Senator Jesse Helms, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, so far has refused to hold hearings on the Treaty. He suggests that the U.S. should resume nuclear testing. In January, a Helms spokesperson said "Chairman Helms has been supportive of the need for nuclear testing"

"The days of nuclear testing should be over -- nuclear arms races undermine the security of all nations. India's provocative and dangerous nuclear test decision should be met with universal condemnation and renewed efforts by all nations to draw down nuclear tensions and nuclear arsenals," said Daryl Kimball, Executive Director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.

For more information on nuclear testing and the Test Ban Treaty, see the Coalition's web site at: <<http://www.clw.org/org/pub/clw/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

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: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>
Date: Mon, 11 May 1998 15:26:32 -0400
From: disarmament@igc.org
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org
Subject: Indian Test - Response
To: ctb-followers@igc.org

Rtw 05/11 1435 FOCUS-India under fire over shock nuclear tests

By John Chalmers

NEW DELHI, May 11 (Reuters) - India drew fire from around the globe on Monday after a shock announcement that it had conducted three underground nuclear tests, its first in 24 years.

The government said its blasts, carried out close to the Pakistan border in the desert state of Rajasthan, established that it had "proven capability" for a nuclear arms programme.

Islamabad, quick to assail its arch-foe over the unexpected tests, accused New Delhi of sucking Pakistan into a nuclear arms race and vowed to meet the threat it now felt.

China, India's nuclear-armed neighbour to the north, was silent.

But Washington, branding the move as "flying in the face" of international efforts for a global ban on nuclear testing, said it would lodge a formal protest with India and urged Pakistan not to respond with tests of its own.

U.S. officials said the test may force the United States to impose sanctions, which could hit aid programmes and credits to the poverty-stricken country.

United Nations Secretary-General Koffi Annan expressed "deep regret" over the blasts and the European Union was joined by both Germany and Canada with comments voicing dismay.

Foreign security experts, many astonished by the news, said the explosions could spark testing by China and Pakistan, destabilising the subcontinent.

Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee told a hurriedly summoned news conference that the three controlled tests were carried out at 3.45 p.m. (1015 GMT) with a fission device, a low-yield device and a much-bigger thermonuclear device.

"The measured yields are in line with expected values," he said in a statement from the lawn of his residence, a national flag standing beside him. "Measurements have also confirmed that there was no release of radioactivity into the atmosphere."

The British Geological Survey said its equipment had picked up tremors from the tests measuring 4.7 on the Richter scale -- the equivalent of a light earthquake.

The blasts were conducted in Pokhran, an area east of the city of Jaisalmer and about 100 km (63 miles) south of the border with Pakistan.

Pokhran was also the site of India's only previous test, on May 18, 1974.

The Press Trust of India said Monday's test devices were exploded 100 metres (328 feet) below the ground.

The tests come seven weeks after the coalition led by Vajpayee's

Hindu nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party took power.

The BJP made the option to introduce nuclear weapons a key plank of its platform in spring elections, but the government said last month that it would decide whether to build nuclear weapons only after a strategic defence review.

India has refused to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

It says the treaties are discriminatory because they allow a few countries to hold and refine nuclear arms indefinitely with no commitment to disarm, while forcing all others to relinquish nuclear weapons.

The nuclear tests follow a spate of controversial remarks by Defence Minister George Fernandes on the threat posed by China.

India and China fought a brief but bloody border war in 1962, two years before Beijing held its first nuclear test.

Fernandes also reacted sharply last month to an announcement by Pakistan, which has been to war with India three times, that it had test-flown a long-range missile.

He accused Beijing, which has long enjoyed a close military relationship with Islamabad, of supplying Pakistan with the missile technology. Pakistan says it is capable of producing nuclear weapons but has never conducted a test.

Indian experts gave the tests a rapturous welcome.

"It's wonderful. I am hearing the news just now and I'm speechless," said Raja Ramanna, former defence minister and former head of India's Atomic Energy Commission.

But Islamabad lashed out at New Delhi, accusing it of sucking Pakistan into a "nuclear arms race."

"I condemn this very strongly and the international community and world must condemn this very strongly and put sanctions against India because now they are more or less trying to say 'to hell with you'," Foreign Minister Gohar Ayub Khan told Reuters Television in an interview.

However, the Indian government held out an olive branch on its support for moves towards global disarmament.

It said in a statement that it supported efforts to "realise the goal of a truly comprehensive international arrangement which would prohibit underground testing of all weapons..." REUTERS

RTna 05/11 1442 Pakistan vows to meet India nuclear threat

By Raja Asghar

ISLAMABAD (Reuters) - Pakistan vowed Monday to meet the threat it felt from three nuclear tests by archfoe India and said its defenses would be made impregnable.

Foreign Minister Gohar Ayub Khan told parliament that Pakistan, another nuclear threshold power, "reserves the right to take all appropriate measures for its security."

"Such threats will be met by the determination of the Pakistani nation," he told the Senate.

Khan told reporters the Defense Committee of Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif's cabinet could decide whether Pakistan should also carry out a nuclear test in response to Monday's Indian explosions near Pakistan's border.

Asked by reporters if Pakistan would respond to the Indian tests

in the same manner, Khan said: "It's not for me to say. It is for the Defense Committee of the cabinet to decide."

"They should be condemned very, very strongly and India has forced the subcontinent into an arms race, to a nuclear weaponry race and missile race," he told Reuters Television earlier.

"Pakistan reserves the right to take all appropriate measures for its security," Khan said in a brief statement to the Senate (upper house) almost five hours after India carried out the tests in the Rajasthan western desert.

He said Sharif, who was due to return home late at night after attending a summit in Kazakhstan, had assured Pakistanis that the country's "defense would be made impregnable against any Indian threat, be it nuclear or conventional."

Chiefs of the armed forces, who have a great say in Pakistan's nuclear program, are also represented on the Defense Committee.

"Pakistan has taken absolutely necessary steps for its defense and security," the official APP news agency quoted army chief General Jahangir Karamat as telling reporters at a diplomatic reception Monday evening.

Senate Opposition leader Aitzaz Ahsan said the Indian tests were a threat to the security of not only Pakistan but the whole of South Asia.

"India has propelled South Asia into a total and perhaps irreparable imbalance," he said, and promised that the opposition would go "an extra mile" if the government came out with a policy of consensus to meet the challenge.

"If India has carried out three nuclear tests, Pakistan should carry out 30 tests," another opposition senator, Iqbal Haider, said.

Khan regretted that Pakistan's reminders in the past to the international community, particularly the permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, about India's nuclear plans "did not receive the attention that they merited."

"The responsibility for dealing a death blow to the global efforts at nuclear non-proliferation rests squarely with India."

The tests were staged one month after Pakistan test-fired the "Ghauri" medium-range missile which, it said, would be a deterrent to India's arsenals.

Pakistan has said in the past that it can make nuclear weapons but has taken a policy decision not to do so and will not sign the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty or the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty unless India does the same.

RTw 05/11 1435 EU expresses dismay at Indian nuclear tests
(Adds quotes from Fatchett, diplomat, background)

LONDON, May 11 (Reuters) - The European Union on Monday expressed dismay at three Indian nuclear tests conducted earlier in the day and said officials from the 15-nation bloc would discuss the matter on Tuesday.

Junior British foreign minister Derek Fatchett said in a statement that the EU had a strong interest in the peace and stability of the region. Britain currently holds the six-month rotating EU presidency.

But the EU reaction was markedly softer than that of the United States, which said it would file a formal protest to India.

A diplomat at one major Western embassy said the EU had decided Washington stood more chance of exerting some influence over India.

"It's obvious the EU has allowed the Americans to take the lead on this," the diplomat said.

A British official said the EU wanted above all else to promote restraint in the Indian sub-continent but declined to be drawn on whether Britain -- also a nuclear power -- would issue a separate reaction.

France, the only other European state with nuclear weapons, has so far remained silent. German Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel condemned the tests as a step in the wrong direction.

Fatchett's statement said the EU was fully committed to the implementation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, neither of which India has signed.

"The Presidency expresses its dismay at the news of the Indian nuclear test...it is ensuring the implications of this test are discussed by the member states at the (EU's) Political Committee on May 12," he said.

India says the two treaties are discriminatory because they allow a few countries to hold and refine nuclear arms indefinitely with no commitment to disarm, while forcing all others to relinquish the weapons. REUTERS

RTw 05/11 1429 U.S. urges Pakistan not to follow India with test

WASHINGTON, May 11 (Reuters) - The United States on Monday urged Pakistan not to respond with its own nuclear tests after India announced it had carried out three underground atomic explosions.

"We strongly urge Pakistan to refrain from responding with a nuclear test of its own," State Department spokesman James Rubin told reporters.

Rubin, at a news briefing, said he could not confirm that India had in fact conducted nuclear tests, although the U.S. government was "analyzing the data."

But he called India's announcement of the tests a "very very negative development" and confirmed that senior U.S. officials are now considering "next steps," including sanctions as a reaction to the unexpected development.

Sanctions could affect direct bilateral aid, trade assistance and international financing, he said.

Rubin said India's ambassador to Washington had discussed the tests with Undersecretary of State Thomas Pickering and indicated the United States found the Indian explanation unsatisfactory.

The United States did not believe that India has improved its security with these tests and called on New Delhi once again to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, he said. REUTERS

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse

Kathy Crandall, Coordinator

1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005

TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232

FAX: 202 898 0172

<disarmament@igc.org>

FOR WHAT YOU CAN DO for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW:

<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>
Date: Mon, 11 May 1998 15:50:50 -0400
From: disarmament@igc.org
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org
Subject: White House on India Test
To: ctb-followers@igc.org

White House Press Briefing at 1:30 pm Monday, May 11

Q What is the President reaction to the nuclear tests in India and how will he express that reaction?

MR. MCCURRY: The President is deeply distressed by the announcement of three nuclear tests. He has authorized a formal presentation of our displeasure to be made to the government in New Delhi. While it was foreseen, given the electoral program of the newly-elected party that they might take this step, it still flies in the face of an international consensus about the need to promulgate and nurture the new regime on a comprehensive test ban, and we will certainly be sharing those thoughts and others with the new government in India.

Q Will this jeopardize any presidential plans to go to India?

MR. MCCURRY: It's impossible to speculate at this point about what impact this might have on the President's future travel plans.

Q Are sanctions being anticipated?

MR. MCCURRY: Sanctions are already anticipated when non-nuclear member states violate the restrictions that exist, or the consensus about those restrictions. There are certain unilateral U.S. sanctions that may apply, and those are under study at this point.

Q And what would those be?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not fully aware. Apparently in law, I believe there is a Glenn amendment that may be applicable, but we're looking at that question now.

Q Are you saying the President might decide not to go -- hasn't he already accepted an invitation?

MR. MCCURRY: He has and I'm declining to speculate on whether this will have any impact on those plans.

Q Do you think that this heralds a new kind of

government in India, where they will be more belligerent and they're preparing more of their arms for --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, there is a new government and that new government made clear during the campaign how it wished to approach the posture it would take with respect to nuclear matters. But setting that aside, we think it still is a negative development to see these tests publicly announced and undertaken by the government. And for all the reasons that we are working hard to promulgate the Comprehensive Test Ban, we would the governments would refrain from expanding the use of fissile materials at a time when we are trying to limit it.

Q Who is talking to them? Who is carrying the message?

MR. MCCURRY: We'll have to check and see. I think initially it was going to be communicated through Embassy New Delhi, but we can get more on that. They were addressing some of that over at the State Department as I came out here.

FROM: Disarmament Clearinghouse
1101 14th Street NW #700
Washington, DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>

For WHAT YOU CAN DO for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW:
<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Mon, 11 May 1998 17:55:01 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: Indian tests, pt.4 (Pakistani and Indian Press Statements)

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: official statements from Pakistan and India -- FYI

Pakistan Press Statement

MOST IMMEDIATE ACTION

From: Foreign Islamabad
To: All Pakistan Missions Abroad
No: D.G. (UN) - 5/98
Dated: 11 May 1998

Head of Mission from D.G. (UN),

Forwarded herewith for your information is the text of the Pakistan Foreign Minister's statement in the Senate regarding the Indian nuclear tests conducted today.

Please issue.

(Salman Bashir)
Director General (UN)

STATEMENT OF THE FOREIGN MINISTER TO THE SENATE

The news of resumption of nuclear testing by India has not come as a surprise to us. For the past 24 years, Pakistan had consistently drawn the attention of the international community to India's nuclear aspirations.

We had also pointed out the duplicity surrounding India's political pronouncements and its clandestine nuclear weapons programme.

The Prime Minister of Pakistan had recently drawn the attention of the international community particularly states permanent members of the United Nations Security Council regarding Indian plans to induct nuclear weapons.

Pakistan's repeated reminders to the international community particularly to the leaders of states permanent members of the Security Council unfortunately did not receive the attention that they merited.

The international community has, in fact, by adopting a dismissive approach encouraged India to achieve its nuclear aspirations.

The responsibility for dealing a death blow to the global efforts at

nuclear non-proliferation rests squarely with India.

Pakistan reserves the right to take all appropriate measures for its security.

The Prime Minister has assured the people of Pakistan that Pakistan defence would be made impregnable against any Indian threat be it nuclear or conventional.

(India Press Statement)

11 May 1998

PRESS STATEMENT

As announced by the Prime Minister this afternoon, today India conducted three underground nuclear tests in the Pokhran range. The tests conducted today were with a fission device, a low yield device and a thermonuclear device. The measured yields are in line with expected values. Measurement have also confirmed that there was no release of radioactivity into the atmosphere. These were contained explosions like the experiment conducted in May 1974.

These tests have established that India has a proven capability for a weaponised nuclear programme. They also provide a valuable database which is useful in the design of nuclear weapons of different yields for different applications and for different delivery systems. Further, they are expected to carry Indian scientists towards a sound computer simulation capability which may be supported by sub-critical experiments, if considered necessary.

The Government is deeply concerned, as were previous Governments, about the nuclear environment in India's neighbourhood. These tests provide reassurance to the people of India that their national security interests are paramount and will be promoted and protected. Succeeding generations of Indians would also rest assured that contemporary technologies associated with nuclear option have been passed on to them in this the 50th year of our independence.

It is necessary to highlight today that India was in the vanguard of nations which ushered in the Partial Test Ban Treaty in 1963 due to environmental concerns. Indian representatives have worked in various international forums, including the Conference on Disarmament for universal, non-discriminatory and verifiable arrangements for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction. The Government would like to reiterate its support to efforts to realise the goal of a truly comprehensive international arrangement which would prohibit underground nuclear testing of all weapons as well as related experiments described as 'sub-critical' or 'hydronuclear.'

India would be prepared to consider being an adherent to some of the undertakings in the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. But this cannot

obviously be done in a vacuum. It would necessarily be an evolutionary process from concept to commitment and would depend on a number of reciprocal activities.

We would like to reaffirm categorically that we will continue to exercise the most stringent control on the export of sensitive technologies, equipment and commodities - especially those related to weapons of mass destruction. Our track record has been impeccable in this regard. Therefore we expect recognition of our responsible policy by the international community.

India remains committed to a speedy process of nuclear disarmament leading to total and global elimination of nuclear weapons. Our adherence to the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Biological Weapons Convention is evidence of our commitment to any global disarmament regime which is non-discriminatory and verifiable. We shall also be happy to participate in the negotiations for the conclusion of a fissile material cut-off treaty in the Geneva based Conference on Disarmament.

In our neighbourhood we have many friends with whom relations of fruitful cooperation for mutual benefit have existed and deepened over a long period. We assure them that it will be our sincere endeavour to intensify and diversify those relations further for the benefit of all our peoples. For India, as for others, the prime need is for peaceful cooperation and economic development.

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: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 11 May 1998 16:08:03 -0700 (PDT)
From: Peace Action - National Office <panukes@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: india's test pt 2
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

here's the press release we sent out earlier.

Bruce

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE CONTACT: Bruce Hall at Peace Action
MAY 11, 1998 202.862.9740 x 3038

PEACE ACTION CONDEMNS INDIAN NUCLEAR TESTS

NUCLEAR BLASTS UNDERSCORE NEED FOR PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP ON NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT AND TEST BAN TREATY

WASHINGTON - Peace Action today condemned the Indian government's decision to resume nuclear testing at its Rajasthan test site and urged India to immediately institute a moratorium on further nuclear tests. The largest grassroots peace and disarmament organization in the United States, Peace Action, said the reported tests underscore the urgent need for President Clinton's leadership on nuclear disarmament.

"India is running the risk of igniting a dangerous nuclear arms race on the Asian Subcontinent," said Peace Action Executive Director Gordon Clark. "The arms race between the United States and Russia was an environmental and economic catastrophe. We strongly urge India not to make these same tragic mistakes."

According to press reports India conducted tests on three nuclear devices today; a fission device, a thermonuclear device (hydrogen bomb), and a low-yield device. India last conducted a nuclear test in 1974. India's neighbor, Pakistan, is widely believed to possess nuclear weapons capability as well. In a statement today, Pakistan said it reserved the "right to take all appropriate measures for its security."

"As India's nuclear tests vividly demonstrates, the United States cannot forever maintain a do as I say but not as I do nuclear weapons policy," said Clark. "Either the US backs up its non-proliferation rhetoric with real leadership to further reduce and ultimately eliminate nuclear weapons, or more countries join the nuclear club."

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, signed by over 140 nations including the five declared nuclear powers, would ban "any nuclear

weapons test explosion or any other nuclear explosion." In order for that treaty to become international law, it must be signed and ratified by a list of 44 specific countries including India and Pakistan. Both country's have refused to sign the treaty, which now awaits ratification in the U.S. Senate. Republican Senator Jesse Helms has been using his position as chair of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee to prevent the Senate from debating the merits of the treaty.

"India's test should be seen as a wake-up call to the Clinton administration," said Peace Action field organizer Bruce Hall. "Nuclear disarmament should be President Clinton's top personal priority for the remainder of his term. The immediate next step is Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty."

-30-

??

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 11 May 1998 15:12:08 -0700 (PDT)
From: Peace Action - National Office <panukes@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: India's test - response
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

To : Abolitionists everywhere
From: Bruce Hall at Peace Action
Date: May 11, 1998
Re : India's test

Dear friends,

Here's a suggested action step on India's nuclear test. I have sent this out with US activists in mind but I feel that it can easily be adopted to initiatives in other countries.

Enjoy,

Bruce

URGENT URGENT URGENT URGENT

INDIA TESTS THREE NUCLEAR BOMBS

Dear friends -

As many of you have heard by now, Indian officials have announced that three nuclear tests took place this afternoon in the western state of Rajasthan. Seismic stations in Britain have picked up the event and early estimates are that it was around 4.7 on the Richter Scale.

Here's an immediate suggestion on what to do, plus some background based on the information available. This is a nuanced issue with implications for US ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the US Stockpile Stewardship Program. It will probably take us all more time to fully formulate our response, but the very first thing that we all need to do is to reaffirm our opposition to nuclear testing at any place, any yield, or any time.

Thanks!

Bruce Hall
Peace Action

What you can do

Fax the Indian Embassy!

Ambassador Naresh Chandra

Embassy of India
2107 Massachussettes Avenue
Washington, DC 20008
fax: 202 265-4351

Your Excellency:

- * As a non-governmental group in the United States with a long-standing commitment to the total elimination of nuclear weapons, we strongly condemn India's decision to resume nuclear testing.
- * We have worked hard over the years to halt the U.S. nuclear testing program and continue urge the United States to live up to its obligations under Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty which obligates the United States to pursue in good faith obligations toward nuclear disarmament.
- * In particular, we continue to oppose the United States' multi-billion dollar Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program. We have protested US subcritical experiments.
- * We have appreciated India's historic leadership for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and for a world without nuclear weapons. We can only look upon these nuclear tests in Rajasthan with regret. They have tarnished your country's past leadership.
- * Worse, nuclear testing may ignite a dangerous nuclear arms race on the Asian subcontinent at a time when the world is waking up finally to the futility of nuclear weapons.
- * We strongly urge you renounce further nuclear testing and sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
- * We strongly urge you to join the growing diplomatic movement aimed at accelerating the nuclear disarmament process.

Sincerely,

BACKGROUND

It is not absolutely clear what India did today, but based on a statement by Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee, weapons scientists conducted simultaneous experiments on a thermonuclear device (hydrogen bomb), fission device, and a low-yield device. India last conducted a nuclear test in 1974, but has tried to maintain a sort of nuclear ambiguity since then.

Based on what I know about India's nuclear weapons program, I would say that some of these experiments may have been to develop smaller nuclear warheads for the long-range Agni and the medium-range Pritvhi missiles. India claims to have the capability to strike any target in Pakistan. With development of the Agni II, they are working on the capability to strike targets in large parts of China.

In addition, I would bet that the fission device was an experiment in "boosting." Boosting describes the process in which tritium is injected into the center of the weapons plutonium core to provide more loose neutrons during the initial stages of a nuclear explosion. More loose neutrons means more fissioning atoms and therefore more bang for less buck in terms of explosive power. Almost all U.S. nuclear weapons use this boosting process which is why the United States Department of Energy wants to resume the production of tritium. Boosting is an essential concept for a nation that wants to develop lighter, more efficient nuclear weapons and was one of the major objectives of the early U.S. testing program.

WHAT THIS MEANS

We still need more information. The key question right now is, "Is this the beginning of a series of Indian nuclear tests or an isolated incident."

Under a worst case scenario, expect a Pakistani nuclear test in the coming weeks or months and a miniature nuclear arms race on the Asian Subcontinent.

Expect Republicans to use India's nuclear missile program to bolster their case for the ballistic missile defense program here in the United States.

Expect Republicans (Senator Kyl from Arizona comes to mind) to begin discussions or even introduce legislation on the need for the United States to resume nuclear testing. Under the 1992 nuclear moratorium the United States is prohibited from conducting a nuclear test after 1996 unless another country first conducts a test. As you remember Kyl tried to undo that moratorium in the summer of 1996. Of course our signature on CTBT commits the United States to maintain its moratorium but that fact may not

Obviously, this is very bad news for efforts to get the CTBT ratified in the United States Senate.

The Silver Lining

Yes, there is a potential silver lining in this scenario. India's test might serve as a bit of a wake-up call to a public and administration largely complacent on nuclear disarmament matters. In this sense, India's test might provide us with an organizing opportunity similar to, although smaller than, the opportunity given to us by French President Jacques Chirac when he resumed nuclear testing in the South Pacific. The repercussions of that decision ultimately included the Canberra Commission, the zero-yield CTBT, the South Pacific Nuclear Weapons Free Zone, and General Lee Butler's decision to come out publicly in favor of nuclear abolition. I'm sure it also had a major impact on the World Court decision.

Hold on, things just got more interesting.

To: bridget@fcnl.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: CTBT STATEMENT BY RELIGIOUS LEADERS
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Bridget:

Would you please send the CTBT statement and signers to Mark Brown, as requested in his e-mail to me.

Thanks, Howard

At 11:38 PM 5/11/98 -0400, Mark Brown wrote:

>To: mupj@igc.apc.org
>
>Howard,
>
>Thank you for your note. I am in Chicago for meetings this week so I will
>not be able to be at the CTBT meeting on Wednesday.
>
>Would it be possible for you to email the CTBT statement with all of the
>signatures? I would like to share it with people here in Chicago. It's
>great that there are 200 signers.
>
>Talk with you soon,
>
>Mark
>
>
>
>Mark B. Brown
>Assistant Director (International Affairs and Human Rights)
>Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs
>Washington, D.C.
>Mon, May 11, 1998
>
>email: mark.brown@ecunet.org
>
>
>

Return-Path: <ledwidge@psr.org>
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 10:09:35 -0400
From: Lisa Ledwidge <ledwidge@psr.org>
To: ledwidge@psr.org
Subject: India tests / PSR response and more
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id TAA22750

May 11, 1998

To: Physicians for Social Responsibility activists and friends
Fr: Lisa Ledwidge, Associate Director for PSR Security Programs

India conducted three nuclear tests today. Attached please find:

- * PSR press release
- * Reuters press clip
- * India Press Statement
- * White House press briefing

Here also is a message from Bob Tiller, Director of PSR Security Programs, with suggestions on responding to this unfortunate yet eventful development:

[T]he most important step that we all can take in response to India's action is to work hard for Senate ratification of the CTBT. The U.S. should be a leader in the global struggle to end testing, not a follower. The U.S. government will put itself in a strong position to denounce India's nuclear weapons testing by ratifying CTBT.

If you have opportunities in the coming days to make speeches or write letters to the editor, please be sure to say that the single most appropriate response that the U.S. can make to these tests is to ratify the CTBT. If you want to go on with additional points about U.S. policy, you can mention: (a) continuing to refrain from testing, (b) de-alerting of nuclear weapons, (c) closing all nuclear test sites worldwide, including the U.S. site in Nevada.

We will keep you posted as more unfolds. For current information and ACTIONS, visit PSR's web site <http://www.psr.org>.

==

P R E S S R E L E A S E
Physicians for Social Responsibility Denounces
Indian Nuclear Test

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: May 11, 1998

Contact: Robert W. Tiller, 202-898-0150, ext. 220
Sharon Pickett, 301-365-9307

The world was shocked to learn that India performed three nuclear tests today. Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR) strongly denounces

this dangerous and irresponsible act and calls on India to refrain from further nuclear testing.

"India's decision to test encourages countries such as Pakistan to enter the nuclear arms race and undermines the 1970 Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty now observed by 185 countries," said Robert K. Musil, Ph.D., Executive Director of Physicians for Social Responsibility. "This action will undoubtedly spur some misguided U.S. legislator to advocate a resumption of U.S. testing just when we should be moving full speed ahead with ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty."

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), a global agreement to ban testing of nuclear weapons, has been signed by 149 countries and ratified by thirteen. The United States is a signatory but has not ratified it. "Our nation should be demonstrating international leadership by ratifying the CTBT this summer," said Robert W. Tiller, PSR's Director of Security Programs.

The CTBT would help to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and curtail the development of new types of weapons by both nuclear and non-nuclear states. The treaty is verifiable, providing for an on-site inspection system as well as a sophisticated network of air, water and ground-based monitoring stations that would be capable of detecting nuclear test explosions anywhere in the world.

Opponents of the CTBT claim that we need to test nuclear bombs in order to ensure the reliability of our nuclear arsenals. But non-explosive tests and inspections are more than adequate to ensure the safety and reliability of existing weapons. The chairman of the joint chiefs of staff and four of his predecessors have all endorsed ratification of the CTBT and confirmed that CTBT implementation would not diminish national security.

Despite widespread public support for the CTBT, Senator Jesse Helms has blocked CTBT hearings in the Senate and appears determined to prevent the U.S. from ratifying this important treaty. Senator Helms and his supporters may try to use India's nuclear test as one more delaying tactic to stall action on CTBT.

"In addition to escalating the arms race, today's nuclear explosion threatens the health and safety of the entire international community," said Dr. Musil. "The Indian government claims that its test posed no threat to the environment. But nuclear explosions, even when they are conducted underground, release deadly radioactive materials into the atmosphere and water table, posing health risks for generations to come. A recent report by the National Cancer Institute reveals that radioactive fallout from nuclear testing in the 1950s and early '60s resulted in severe health consequences for millions of Americans."

Physicians for Social Responsibility is an organization of health care professionals and others working to end nuclear testing and abolish nuclear weapons. It is the U.S. affiliate of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, recipient of the 1985 Nobel Peace Prize.

###

== == == == == == == == ==

Rtw 05/11 1435 FOCUS-India under fire over shock nuclear tests

By John Chalmers

NEW DELHI, May 11 (Reuters) - India drew fire from around the globe on Monday after a shock announcement that it had conducted three underground nuclear tests, its first in 24 years.

The government said its blasts, carried out close to the Pakistan border in the desert state of Rajasthan, established that it had "proven capability" for a nuclear arms programme.

Islamabad, quick to assail its arch-foe over the unexpected tests, accused New Delhi of sucking Pakistan into a nuclear arms race and vowed to meet the threat it now felt.

China, India's nuclear-armed neighbour to the north, was silent.

But Washington, branding the move as "flying in the face" of international efforts for a global ban on nuclear testing, said it would lodge a formal protest with India and urged Pakistan not to respond with tests of its own.

U.S. officials said the test may force the United States to impose sanctions, which could hit aid programmes and credits to the poverty-stricken country.

United Nations Secretary-General Koffi Annan expressed "deep regret" over the blasts and the European Union was joined by both Germany and Canada with comments voicing dismay.

Foreign security experts, many astonished by the news, said the explosions could spark testing by China and Pakistan, destabilising the subcontinent.

Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee told a hurriedly summoned news conference that the three controlled tests were carried out at 3.45 p.m. (1015 GMT) with a fission device, a low-yield device and a much-bigger thermonuclear device.

"The measured yields are in line with expected values," he said in a statement from the lawn of his residence, a national flag standing beside him. "Measurements have also confirmed that there was no release of radioactivity into the atmosphere."

The British Geological Survey said its equipment had picked up tremors from the tests measuring 4.7 on the Richter scale -- the equivalent of a light earthquake.

The blasts were conducted in Pokhran, an area east of the city of Jaisalmer and about 100 km (63 miles) south of the border with Pakistan.

Pokhran was also the site of India's only previous test, on May 18, 1974.

The Press Trust of India said Monday's test devices were exploded 100 metres (328 feet) below the ground.

The tests come seven weeks after the coalition led by Vajpayee's Hindu nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party took power.

The BJP made the option to introduce nuclear weapons a key plank of its platform in spring elections, but the government said last month that it would decide whether to build nuclear weapons only after a strategic defence review.

India has refused to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

It says the treaties are discriminatory because they allow a few countries to hold and refine nuclear arms indefinitely with no commitment to disarm, while forcing all others to relinquish nuclear weapons.

The nuclear tests follow a spate of controversial remarks by Defence Minister George Fernandes on the threat posed by China.

India and China fought a brief but bloody border war in 1962, two years before Beijing held its first nuclear test.

Fernandes also reacted sharply last month to an announcement by Pakistan, which has been to war with India three times, that it had test-flown a long-range missile.

He accused Beijing, which has long enjoyed a close military relationship with Islamabad, of supplying Pakistan with the missile technology. Pakistan says it is capable of producing nuclear weapons but has never conducted a test.

Indian experts gave the tests a rapturous welcome.

"It's wonderful. I am hearing the news just now and I'm speechless," said Raja Ramanna, former defence minister and former head of India's Atomic Energy Commission.

But Islamabad lashed out at New Delhi, accusing it of sucking Pakistan into a "nuclear arms race."

"I condemn this very strongly and the international community and world must condemn this very strongly and put sanctions against India because now they are more or less trying to say 'to hell with you'," Foreign Minister Gohar Ayub Khan told Reuters Television in an interview.

However, the Indian government held out an olive branch on its support for moves towards global disarmament.

It said in a statement that it supported efforts to "realise the goal of a truly comprehensive international arrangement which would prohibit underground testing of all weapons..." REUTERS

== == == == == == == == ==

(India Press Statement)

11 May 1998

PRESS STATEMENT

As announced by the Prime Minister this afternoon, today India conducted three underground nuclear tests in the Pokhran range. The tests conducted

today were with a fission device, a low yield device and a thermonuclear device. The measured yields are in line with expected values.

Measurement

have also confirmed that there was no release of radioactivity into the atmosphere. These were contained explosions like the experiment conducted in May 1974.

These tests have established that India has a proven capability for a

weaponised nuclear programme. They also provide a valuable database which is useful in the design of nuclear weapons of different yields for different applications and for different delivery systems. Further, they are expected to carry Indian scientists towards a sound computer simulation capability which may be supported by sub-critical experiments, if considered necessary.

The Government is deeply concerned, as were previous Governments, about the nuclear environment in India's neighbourhood. These tests provide reassurance to the people of India that their national security interests are paramount and will be promoted and protected. Succeeding generations of Indians would also rest assured that contemporary technologies associated with nuclear option have been passed on to them in this the 50th year of our independence.

It is necessary to highlight today that India was in the vanguard of nations which ushered in the Partial Test Ban Treaty in 1963 due to environmental concerns. Indian representatives have worked in various international forums, including the Conference on Disarmament for universal, non-discriminatory and verifiable arrangements for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction. The Government would like to reiterate its support to efforts to realise the goal of a truly comprehensive international arrangement which would prohibit underground nuclear testing of all weapons as well as related experiments described as 'sub-critical' or 'hydronuclear.'

India would be prepared to consider being an adherent to some of the undertakings in the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. But this cannot obviously be done in a vacuum. It would necessarily be an evolutionary process from concept to commitment and would depend on a number of reciprocal activities.

We would like to reaffirm categorically that we will continue to exercise the most stringent control on the export of sensitive technologies, equipment and commodities - especially those related to weapons of mass destruction. Our track record has been impeccable in this regard. Therefore we expect recognition of our responsible policy by the international community.

India remains committed to a speedy process of nuclear disarmament leading to total and global elimination of nuclear weapons. Our adherence to the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Biological Weapons Convention is

evidence of our commitment to any global disarmament regime which is non-discriminatory and verifiable. We shall also be happy to participate in the negotiations for the conclusion of a fissile material cut-off treaty in the Geneva based Conference on Disarmament.

In our neighbourhood we have many friends with whom relations of fruitful cooperation for mutual benefit have existed and deepened over a long period. We assure them that it will be our sincere endeavour to intensify and diversify those relations further for the benefit of all our peoples. For India, as for others, the prime need is for peaceful cooperation and economic development.

== == == == == == == == ==

White House Press Briefing at 1:30 pm Monday, May 11

Q What is the President reaction to the nuclear tests in India and how will he express that reaction?

MR. MCCURRY: The President is deeply distressed by the announcement of three nuclear tests. He has authorized a formal presentation of our displeasure to be made to the government in New Delhi. While it was foreseen, given the electoral program of the newly-elected party that they might take this step, it still flies in the face of an international consensus about the need to promulgate and nurture the new regime on a comprehensive test ban, and we will certainly be sharing those thoughts and others with the new government in India.

Q Will this jeopardize any presidential plans to go to India?

MR. MCCURRY: It's impossible to speculate at this point about what impact this might have on the President's future travel plans.

Q Are sanctions being anticipated?

MR. MCCURRY: Sanctions are already anticipated when non-nuclear member states violate the restrictions that exist, or the consensus about those restrictions. There are certain unilateral U.S. sanctions that may apply, and those are under study at this point.

Q And what would those be?

MR. MCCURRY: I'm not fully aware. Apparently in law, I believe there is a Glenn amendment that may be applicable, but we're

looking at that question now.

Q Are you saying the President might decide not to go -- hasn't he already accepted an invitation?

MR. MCCURRY: He has and I'm declining to speculate on whether this will have any impact on those plans.

Q Do you think that this heralds a new kind of government in India, where they will be more belligerent and they're preparing more of their arms for --

MR. MCCURRY: Well, there is a new government and that new government made clear during the campaign how it wished to approach the posture it would take with respect to nuclear matters. But setting that aside, we think it still is a negative development to see these tests publicly announced and undertaken by the government. And for all the reasons that we are working hard to promulgate the Comprehensive Test Ban, we would the governments would refrain from expanding the use of fissile materials at a time when we are trying to limit it.

Q Who is talking to them? Who is carrying the message?

MR. MCCURRY: We'll have to check and see. I think initially it was going to be communicated through Embassy New Delhi, but we can get more on that. They were addressing some of that over at the State Department as I came out here.

end

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: A-Days@motherearth.org, induran@motherearth.org, nukenet@envirolink.org,
ike@swva.net, lforrow@igc.apc.org, plough@watservl.uwaterloo.ca,
panukes@igc.apc.org, palist@igc.apc.org
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 13:17:41 +1000
From: Friends of the Earth - Sydney <foesydney@peg.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: INDIAN NUCLEAR TEST
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, pol@motherearth.org
X-Sender: foesydney@pop.peg.apc.org (Unverified)

John Hallam
Friends of the Earth Sydney,
Suite 15,
1st Floor, 104 Bathurst Street,
Sydney, NSW, 2000.

Fax(61)(2)9283-2005 ph(61)(2)9283-2006.

foesydney@peg.apc.org <http://www.peg.apc.org/~foesydney/>

URGENT: NEED THE FAX NUMBER OF THE INDIAN PRIME MINISTER IN DELHI TO SEND HIM A LETTER.

DEAR People,
Very sad to see what the indian government has chosen to do.

I'm putting this release out today, with copies also to our foreign minister Alexander Downer, not that he is exactly likely to do anything.

I'd like also to get together a letter from Australian and other groups to the indian Prime Minister. However, I need an address and preferably a fax number for this.

Do any of you have a fax number for the Indian PM? can you send it to me as a matter of urgency?

The recent test is a reminder of why I got into this business in the first place.

Do try and send me that fax number - of the Indian PM, and/or the foreign minister, in Delhi.

INDIAN N-TEST SHOWS AUSTRALIA SHOULD LEAVE URANIUM IN THE GROUND SAYS F.O.E.

Antinuclear group Friends of the Earth has called on the Government to take strong steps to prevent a nuclear arms race in the Indian subcontinent, and to 'wake up' to the connection between nuclear proliferation and the nuclear fuel cycle as a whole.

According to FOE Sydney nuclear campaigner John Hallam,
"India's nuclear test should have come as no surprise, as the ruling right-wing BJP has made its intention to perform a nuclear test very clear, right

from the time that the CTBT was signed and before. The BJP said it would perform a nuclear test. It has now claimed to have performed three nuclear tests at once. The nuclear nightmare is well and truly back on the agenda.

India's test blows a huge hole right through the whole CTBT process. In spite of France and the UK's entirely laudable ratification of that treaty, it will make its ratification by the US more difficult than ever and create a lobby there for US tests. Should that take place, the entire process of nuclear disarmament will unravel completely. This must not happen.

However, it is going to take a little more than the Australian government saying that it 'regrets' the nuclear test to put the world back on the right track, and we should be doing much much more.

This should come as a wake - up call to the Australian government, which has done nothing since the commendable work it did to get the CTBT passed by the UN general assembly.

The problem is that nuclear proliferation of this type is intimately connected with the very existence of the nuclear fuel cycle as a whole. The so-called 'civil' and the military use of nuclear material is inextricable. India's very first nuclear test of 1974, was conducted with plutonium derived from a civil research reactor (CIRUS) supplied by Canada. Material for the current test presumably came either from that source or from India's own Dhruva reactor.

The clear lesson is one which the antinuclear movement has been saying for decades: The civil nuclear fuel cycle leads to nuclear proliferation. The only rational response to this is to put the genie back in the bottle: To renounce the dubious benefits of the nuclear fuel cycle, and in Australia's case, to leave uranium where it belongs - in the ground.

Contact: John Hallam,
(02)9283-2006, ah(02)9251-7320, h(02)9810-2598

John Hallam
foesydney@peg.apc.org

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 00:14:14 -0400
From: "Ross Wilcock" <rwilcock@execulink.com>
Importance: Normal
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: FW: Re: Nuclear Hypocrisy
To: "Abolition-Caucus@Igc. Org (E-mail)" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

Non-member submission from [Richard Salvador <salvador@hawaii.edu>]

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

Date: Mon, 11 May 1998 08:13:00 -1000
From: Richard Salvador <salvador@hawaii.edu>
X-Sender: salvador@uhunix5
To: "Boyle, Francis" <FBOYLE@law.uiuc.edu>
cc: "'Abolition Caucus List (E-mail)'" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>,
"a-days@motherearth.org" <a-days@motherearth.org>
Subject: Re: Nuclear Hypocrisy

Thanks for your remarks Francis,
I was jolted out of bed this morning, when I heard a brief
mention of India's nuclear explosions on the radio. Yes, it's
a terrible development, just days after the second NPT prepcomm
in Geneva. What do all these mean? Perhaps we are getting
closer to a terrible state of affairs.

Richard
Honolulu, Hawai'i

On Mon, 11 May 1998, Boyle, Francis wrote:

> Mailinglist Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days-network
>
> Dear Friends:
> Sadly, this story speaks for itself. A terrible development. But
> the five Permanent Members of the Security Council have only themselves
> to blame for their rank nuclear hypocrisy on the NPT and the CTBT. FAB
>
> NEW DELHI, India (AP) -- India conducted three underground nuclear
> explosions today, its first nuclear tests since 1974, the
> prime minister
> said.
> Francis A. Boyle
> Law Building
> 504 E. Pennsylvania Ave.
> Champaign, Ill. 61820
> Phone: 217-333-7954
> Fax: 217-244-1478
> fboyle@law.uiuc.edu
>
>

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

Cc: A-Days@motherearth.org, foesydney@pop.peg.apc.org, ike@swva.net,
induran@motherearth.org, lforrow@igc.apc.org, nukenet@envirolink.org,
palist@igc.apc.org, panukes@igc.apc.org, plough@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca

Date: Mon, 11 May 1998 22:40:14 -0700 (PDT)

From: Mark Stansbery <walk@igc.apc.org>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Re: INDIAN NUCLEAR TEST

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, foesydney@peg.apc.org, pol@motherearth.org

May 11, 1998

Hello All,

Today marks the wake up call that so many of us have expected. With the nuclear tests by India and continued sanctions on Iraq, Lybia, Cuba, and North Korea, the United States leadership had better get off the pot. The Nuclear Industry has taken the world hostage for their own self interest, and we can not let elected officials (or those who wish to replace them) feel anything but direct heat on these foreign policy issues.

President Clinton should make a loud speech about the urgent need for global consensus by pressing for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. We will watch and organize appropriately. If USA leadership is vacant during this time of global conjuncture, minus the May 11, 1998 hypocritical condemnation, international nonviolent, direct actions planned will proceed without restraint.

As folks begin to energize their electoral muscles, we must demonstrate to those who will lead that they can not hide or use business as usual as their mantra with the looming shadow of India's first nuclear detonation since 1974. Global nuclear abolition is our goal, so we must not jump into any quick isolation of India's government and scientific communities. The world has waited a long time for the USA and other permanent Security Council member states (all nuclear powers) to comply with the Non-Proliferation Treaty signed so many years ago. This wake up call can only agitate further progress for nuclear abolition. I say this statement while expecting the Indian governmental leadership will use this explosion as a means to wake up the global community to the urgency for the abolition of global nuclear war-industrial capabilities.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty held hostage and Economic Sanctions used to strangle civilian populations into revolt as proxi soldiers demonstrate that USA and United Nations Security Council permanent members will defend their self interests. When can we reject loyal

opposition as a commonplace tool, and interject self interest of the non-nuclear people. These days are dark and sad; however, when organizing global opposition to the nuclear warfare industry, which robs children and women of their lives due to malnutrition and starvation and steals potential opportunities or options of self-determination, we must accelerate our organizational pace and strength.

--2--

Chaos or community must be our cry. If global leaders can not dismantle their nuclear stockpiles, civilian inspection teams and industrial whistleblowers must be the new "patriots." South Central Asia and other regions on the global map must be given global leadership in their roles creating "weapons of mass destruction" free zones.

We must attempt to override USA propaganda and link with folks who organize for their self-determination. A civilian opposition can create visions beyond the Western hypocritical, nuclear warfare legacy. This vision is reinforced by the International Court of Justice 1996 decision, which makes all threats and possession of nuclear warfare capabilities illegal. We call on all law-abiding individuals to present civilian summons and create inspection teams that call on the NATO defense ministries and secretaries to enforce this decision.

A malignant neglect characterizes the global leadership so far for the CTBT passage. As the old song goes, "... time she keeps on slipping, slipping, slipping...;" can we afford not to stand strong against this disease infected leadership? The dirty little secrets that the nuclear industry holds tight and the global leadership cover-up of national security defined property rights clearly demonstrate well conceived efforts to maintain the nuclear industrial profitability. Our organizing must make the industry not profitable, and in fact, costly for all people involved in developing and promoting the nuclear industry. From mining the uranium from indigenous peoples' lands, to the processing in low income communities, to the targeting of countries of color by weapons of mass destruction, to the decommissioning and storage of waste byproducts of the industry, the stakeholders are everywhere. As the old saying goes, "...we are all downwinders....," it declares a trueism. It would be easy to settle into complacency or cynicism, but our role for this time and many generations to come, does not allow our self-pity. We must take powerful actions to redirect the global future so that it is non-nuclear and increasingly non-violent.

Peace, Mark D. Stansbery

for these organizations:

For Mother Earth (North American Coordination Team,
Columbus Office)

Columbus Campaign for Arms Control

Ohio Peace March for Global Nuclear Disarmament

Community Organizing Center

Alternatives to Militarism Project

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 15:20:20 +0900 (JST)
From: cnic-jp@po.ijnet.or.jp (Citizens' Nuclear Information Center)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: CNIC VEHEMENTLY PROTEST THE INDIAN NUCLEAR TESTING
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

CNIC statement on Indian nuke test

For Immediate Release
May 12, 1998

CNIC is releasing the underwritten letter of protest addressed to the Indian Prime Minister as our comment regarding the Indian Government's underground nuclear testing conducted on May 11.

CNIC VEHEMENTLY PROTEST THE INDIAN NUCLEAR TESTING

Dear Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee,

The Citizens' Nuclear Information Center feel an inexpressible outrage and strongly protest the underground nuclear testing conducted by the Indian Government on May 11 at a desert in Rajasthan, 550 km southwest of New Delhi.

Your government has continued to express criticism over the attitudes of the five super nuclear states which seem to be in an attempt to emphasize only the issue of proliferation but are keen on developing nuclear warheads, and have shown concerns to the insufficiency of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). However, it is undeniably evident that the Indian Government's attitude represented by yesterday's testing is no different from those of the big nuclear states which have continued to stick to the anachronistic nuclear deterrence argument that does nothing more than to pressure the rest of the world with nuclear threat. Yesterday's testing, therefore, has wiped away all justifications in your arguments to this day.

Furthermore, your decision to hold the testing immediately after the Meeting of the Preparatory Committee for the NPT Review Conference was held is extremely provocative, and will trigger a new race in warhead development not only among the five big nuclear powers but among countries such as Israel, Pakistan and Iraq. We fear that such a move may possibly reverse the present world trend towards nuclear arms reduction achieved through enormous efforts in the past years that has succeeded in the establishment of NPT and CTBT.

By proceeding with the nuclear testing, the trust in your country has no doubt been lost. We urge that your Government immediately put an end to all form of nuclear development programs, and become a member of NPT and ratify CTBT.

Lastly, CNIC declare the intention to continue cooperating with the people around the world working to achieve peace, and place our greatest efforts in realizing the total abolition of nuclear power.

Yours, in

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 10:32:21 -0700
From: Lysiane Alezard <mvtpaix@globenet.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Protest to Indian test
To: abolition caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>

The Mouvement de la Paix strongly condemns the 3 Indian nuclear tests and urges nuclear powers to comply with the NPT.

By conducting 3 underground nuclear tests, the Indian government has just committed a terrible act of serious consequences. No State had conducted a nuclear test for over two years. In September 1996, 156 countries, including the five nuclear powers, had signed a comprehensive test ban treaty.

This decision contradicts aspirations to speed up the nuclear disarmament process, dominating in world public opinion.

It has become really urgent, unless a new nuclear arms race is started, for nuclear powers to comply with their international commitments and move towards the elimination of nuclear weapons, as advocated in NPT article VI. This is the only attitude likely to discourage other powers from also acquiring nuclear weapons.

This is what dozens of NGOs from throughout the world, including the Mouvement de la Paix, came to say in Geneva, last week, on the occasion of the NPT prepcom.

Yet, the outcome of this meeting gives the reverse signal. Nuclear powers have not announced any concrete steps to genuinely move towards the elimination of nuclear weapons, which is the only way to better guarantee global security.

The Mouvement de la Paix states again with insistence the demands it formulated last Tuesday to French representatives in Geneva : stop modernizing nuclear programmes and no more lab testing ! It is still time to review the military programme confirmed a few weeks ago !

On Thursday at 6 PM, the Mouvement de la Paix urges peace committees and all associations, unions, organizations willing to express together their protest, to rally at the Indian Embassy in Paris or to send messages.

The Mouvement de la Paix urges peace committees, citizens to give exceptional vigor to the International petition for the abolition of nuclear weapons launched simultaneously by a thousand organizations throughout the world, as initiated by the international network Abolition 2000.

--

* Lysiane ALEZARD - Mouvement de la Paix *
* mvtpaix@globenet.org *
* Tel 33 1 40 12 09 12 - Fax 33 1 40 11 57 87 *
* The Mouvement de la Paix is a member of Abolition 2000,*
* International Peace Bureau, World Peace Council *

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 10:02:54 -0700
From: Vijai K Nair <magoo@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in>
Organization: Forum For Strategic & Security Studies
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: India Validates its Nuclear arsenal.
To: akapur@watarts.uwaterloo.ca
X-Link: WINDMAIL for LAN and standalone PC (laka.antenna.nl)
X-Pmflags: 34078848

Dear Folks,

1. Francis Boyle has this to say on India testing its nuclear arsenal on 11 May 1998. [Boyle, Francis [FBOYLE@LAW.UIUC.EDU]: "Dear Friends: Sadly, this story speaks for itself. A terrible development. But the five Permanent Members of the Security Council have only themselves to blame for their rank nuclear hypocrisy on the NPT and the CTBT. FAB"]

2. India,'s Official Statement is as follows:

"As announced by the Prime Minister this afternoon, today India conducted three underground nuclear tests in the Pokhran range. The tests conducted today were with a fission device, a low yield device and a thermonuclear device. The measured yields are in line with expected values. Measurement have also confirmed that there was no release of radioactivity into the atmosphere. These were contained explosions like the experiment conducted in May 1974.

These tests have established that India has a proven capability for a weaponised nuclear programme. They also provide a valuable database which is useful in the design of nuclear weapons of different yields for different applications and for different delivery systems. Further, they are expected to carry Indian scientists towards a sound computer simulation capability which may be supported by sub-critical experiments, if considered necessary.

The Government is deeply concerned, as were previous Governments, about the nuclear environment in India's neighbourhood. These tests provide reassurance to the people of India that their national security interests are paramount and will be promoted and protected. Succeeding generations of Indians would also rest assured that contemporary technologies associated with nuclear option have been passed on to them in this the 50th year of our independence.

It is necessary to highlight today that India was in the vanguard of nations which ushered in the Partial Test Ban Treaty in 1963 due to environmental concerns. Indian representatives have worked in various international forums, including the Conference on Disarmament for universal, non-discriminatory and verifiable arrangements for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction. The Government would like to reiterate its support to efforts to realise the goal of a truly comprehensive international arrangement which would prohibit underground nuclear testing of all weapons as well as related experiments described as

'sub-critical' or 'hydronuclear.'

India would be prepared to consider being an adherent to some of the undertakings in the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. But this cannot obviously be done in a vacuum. It would necessarily be an evolutionary process from concept to commitment and would depend on a number of reciprocal activities.

We would like to reaffirm categorically that we will continue to exercise the most stringent control on the export of sensitive technologies, equipment and commodities - especially those related to weapons of mass destruction. Our track record has been impeccable in this regard. Therefore we expect recognition of our responsible policy by the international community.

India remains committed to a speedy process of nuclear disarmament leading to total and global elimination of nuclear weapons. Our adherence to the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Biological Weapons Convention is evidence of our commitment to any global disarmament regime which is non-discriminatory and verifiable. We shall also be happy to participate in the negotiations for the conclusion of a fissile material cut-off treaty in the Geneva based Conference on Disarmament.

In our neighbourhood we have many friends with whom relations of fruitful cooperation for mutual benefit have existed and deepened over a long period. We assure them that it will be our sincere endeavour to intensify and diversify those relations further for the benefit of all our peoples. For India, as for others, the prime need is for peaceful cooperation and economic development."

3. Last night some friends from England had asked me for my comments. Those are attached to this missive.

4. The internet is full of how "India has started a nuclear arms race." My comment is that those who arrived in the arena after the event started, or chose to concentrate on issues other than the event itself, or chose ostrich like to selectively ignore events on a portion of the 'track', - are not in a

position to make such an accusation. India did not start the nuclear arms race. India has done everything within its power to convince the world to abjure nuclear weapons. India could have, if it was so inclined, joined the nuclear arms race 30 years ago - and then where would we have been? India has

shown remarkable constraint even without becoming party to discriminatory treaties that form the non-proliferation regime. Ever since India tested a nuclear device in 1974, it has been the target of stringent restrictions by the US and a number of European powers. India has silently watched China's continued vertical proliferation being rewarded by escalating technology assistance from the very same US that has embargoed India. India has seen limited sanctions being placed and hurriedly removed against China and Pakistan for their collusion in nuclear related enhancements. India sees [even if the West refuses to do so] a clear cut and growing capacity of

regional states to inflict horrendous destruction on her people. India has just been witness to the introduction of IRBMs into the region with ineffectual sanctions being placed on two entities that never did have access

to US resources or technology - what has been embargoed. Indian sovereignty has been consistently abused by external engineering of a 'low intensity conflict' and subversion of its societal coherence.

FOR HOW LONG, TO WHAT EXTENT and WHY DOES THE WORLD COMMUNITY EXPECT INDIA TO TAKE EVERY ABUSE, BEING HEAPED ON IT, LYING DOWN.

If you would, it may be worth one's while to consider all these issues before arriving at any conclusions.

There is - as all in India are painfully aware, no other route other than "elimination of nuclear weapons" to global stability. Lets eliminate the nuclear arms race. Yes, provided the surgery commences at the core of the malignancy - the NWS. Cosmetic surgery on the periphery of the malignancy has

no curative capabilities - and if anything the infection spreads to other tissues. This is equally true of the malignancy of security by nuclear deterrence. India would, I am sure, willingly join the curing process if it is addressed squarely at the roots. If not, no amount of coercion of any kind

will work.

Regards

Vijai K Nair.

*****Brigadier Vijai K Nair,

Executive Director

Forum for Strategic & Security Studies

Safdarjung Airport

New Delhi 110 003

INDIA

Tele 091 11 8572483 & 091 11 4628336. Fax: 091 118 572425

E-mail: magoo@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in

***** RESPONSE TO

QUERIES FROM THE UK ON 11 MAY 1998

I would like to start my response by drawing to your attention two earlier occurrences:

(a) You may remember, you had asked me a specific question at the co-ordinating conference - What is India's nuclear status? I recall my answer - "In so far as I am concerned, India is a nuclear weapon state and those that continue to hide behind the convenient charade of "threshold" and "nuclear capable" are deluding themselves into believing what they want to believe because it fits their hopes or interests."

(b) In case you missed a recent piece out of Washington, it is replicated here: DIPLOMATIC WEDGE - "... In welcoming his guests at a dinner honoring Indian Foreign Secretary Krishnan Raghunath ... Indian Ambassador Naresh

Chandra declared that diplomacy between India and the United States, at least recently, is like golf - a game that unfolds over a vast landscape. "THE ONLY PROBLEM IS THAT WE HAVE BEEN PLAYING ON DIFFERENT COURSES" he joked about the state of bilateral affairs before a strategic dialogue was kicked off last year by Thomas R. Pickering, UNAVOIDABLY, he said, SOME LOOSE BALLS WENT INTO THE ROUGH."

"Maybe for a moment we were going to get into loose cannons," Pickering quipped in response and in reference to Washington's efforts to dissuade India and Pakistan from testing nuclear missiles. "

Frankly, I do not see why the world is surprised. But there is good reason for what has happened.

For forty years now, India has been talking to the deaf. It was not heard because what it said was unpalatable to the selective hearer. Over the past 7 years India attempted to caution the NWS, and the recipients of their nuclear umbrella, that all things were not well as perceived in our part of the world. To no avail. Regional developments that have been particularly aggravating made no difference to the NWS who looked at "this ineffectual" state "wingeing" about its national security. I found this particularly so with the young men who came to - from Whitehall - they only wanted to hear what their bosses had told them what they expected India should do!! All that has happened is that India has intensified the decibel level of its arguments by conducting a test. Suddenly the DEAF ARE HEARING.

The question is what are they hearing. Is it a distorted signal or has it been assimilated for what it is.

What has India done?

(a) For months it gave out unqualified signals that it had come to the point where it had serious concerns about its national security and that it was looking seriously at operationalising its nuclear option.

(b) At 1545 hours today, May 11, 1998, India conducted THREE nuclear tests at its Pokharan test site, involving (i) a fission device, (b) a low yield device and (iii) a thermo-nuclear device. These were contained test conducted underground with ZERO external radiactivity. All three tests were in line with the planned for yield.

(c) Pawar [Congress] and Jaipal Reddy's [Janata Dal] endorsement of the tests shows national consensus. Public opinion is overwhelmingly supportive of the Government's actions. Even the Industrial establishment has endorsed this happening as the doubts on the issues which were debilitating factors in external expectations are now behind them.

My comments:

1. India has asserted its sovereign right to validate and operationalise the means necessary to DEFEND itself in a debilitating nuclear security environment. [If I may add, India has much more justification to field a nuclear deterrent for its security than the UK has.]

2. The act cannot be undone - the fact of three highly sophisticated nuclear tests having been conducted cannot be erased. You will note that a "thermonuclear device" or a "low yield device" cannot be developed and fired in a months time. This is the end product of a long term plan with lots of technical and engineering effort. The Congress and the UF Governments had obviously activated the process many years ago. Therefore, to saddle it to the BJP and obfuscate the real issues under the guise of theocratic dust would not only be unjustified, but counterproductive.

3. The Government has not actuated the tests to fulfill their party's election manifesto nor is it a knee jerk action. It is a result of a seriously considered lon-term strategy - what in the West is called "nuclear strategy."

4. India, besides validating its nuclear deterrent, needs to create a meaningful data bank on which it can guarantee the safety, maintenance and reliability of its weapon systems. For this a series of tests are inescapable. After all, and I refer you to the agonising within the establishment in a state with 'state of the art' technology, such as the US on SSMP to achieve the same ends. The US and UK have a bank of data from over

1000 nuclear tests on which to base future deterrence capabilities. Are we in

India to depend on God and lady luck?

5. The actuation of the strategy is most probably a consequence of (a) A realisation that the elimination of nuclear weapons is a pipe dream. (b) Threat thresholds have attained proportions that demand action. (c) Ambiguity was fast losing its efficacy in the global 'arms control' environment and space to create necessary infrastructure was closing in uncomfortably.

6. Obviously India has sufficient warheads in place to risk the ire of the world before testing these devices. BBC commentator's question - whether India will weaponise - is redundant. I do not think a clearer message could have been sent. India, like the other NWS will not amplify each detail of its nuclear strategy for the curious. Resorting to deafness now is as redundant as ambiguity.

7. India has, by its actions declared itself a nuclear weapon state. Whats in its inventory is obviously classified and will not be divulged to the domestic or foreign public.

8. It has signalled - categorically - a limited nuclear deterrence strategy and, by virtue of the type of devices tested, has made it clear that its final objective is way beyond what the demonstrated capabilities suggest. Therefore, it is safe to assume that a well considered and mature nuclear strategy has been formulated and is now being put into place.

9. The fission test leaves some questions. (a) was it validation of the current assets in the inventory? or (b) was it a trigger device for things to come?

10. The low yield device also generates questions which should have analysts going round in circles!! I do not privy to what it is about but I am certain

that the system knows what it is doing.

11. The fusion device could be a technology demonstrator. I for one have always been sceptical about this form of subterfuge taken by India. Looking at it purely from my own analytical angle, I would suggest that the targeting philosophy of India's nuclear strategy calls for this capability. As you may recall in my thesis [Nuclear India] I had come to the conclusion that a limited number of megaton size devices would be necessary to fulfill specific requirements.

12. The question on US reaction. Pain is unavoidable but how much can be administered effectively once the cat is out? To start with I have no doubt that the Indian government has very carefully calculated ALL COSTS of its actions. Some points to ponder are (a) Ever since 1974 all US domestic laws have been applied to India and there is little else that it can do without actually declaring itself hostile to India. That would be a US decision about which India can do nothing. It would require a response that India must have thought out. (b) US aid to India is a paltry \$21 million, a fraction of what India farms out in aid to other countries. (c) Stopping loans from US banks would hardly be noticed by India as they do not amount to all that much. (d) Voting against provision of loans to India from institutions such as the IMF is a function of votes - and even then, it cannot stop what has been sanctioned and is in the pipeline. The effect would begin to be felt in 3 years time. (e) The US cannot ignore the Indian market vis-a-vis its own economic imperatives, except to its disadvantage. (f) India is NOT PARTY TO THE NPT OR THE CTBT and, therefore, has not violated any international norms or agreements. The question of 'Opinio Juris' as used by the US and UK at the ICJ on the question of legality of nuclear weapons - is now on the other foot. (g) And the threat to stop high technology exports to India is a lot of wind. Such restrictions have been imposed for the last two decades and nothing of technological value has been forthcoming from the US.

13. What the world has to understand, and moreso the developed countries, is that India has turned an irreversible leaf and their immediate reactions notwithstanding, they will have to live with the change. The only way to correct that is to start HONEST negotiations for the universal elimination of nuclear weapons. As I K Gujral said this evening, India will be second to none to eliminate its nuclear weapons capability if the NWS agree to eliminate their nuclear weapons.

14. Reaction borne of frustration is not going to help. If anything, it will create new factors to debilitate the global security environment. The refusal of the NWS to come on board the elimination wagon has lead to pain on all sides. There are no winners - all will hurt whether they like it or not. Therefore, before jumping off the deep end, it would do the developed Western powers a world of good to assimilate where we have got to and the reasons for this sad happening. The need of the hour is to analyse the new status created by India's actions and act maturely to reach an amicable solution. They need to be more understanding of interests other than their own. Realise that India would definitely board the elimination wagon if they were to do so.

At the same time I must add that India cannot be coerced into stepping back from its actions and any attempt to that end would be futile. It is the one country that has taken a long long time to deliberate and then arrive at this

conclusion. It has explored every avenue possible - even to the extent to appear to be a weak and pliable state. A decision taken after so much deliberation cannot be wished away by ANY OTHER STATE THAT EXPECTS INDIA TO PLACE THAT STATES SECURITY CONCERNS BEFORE INDIAN SECURITY CONCERNS.

After the test Brijesh Mishra the BJP spokesman stated - The nuclear tests carried out today had three objectives: (a) Establish that India had a proven nuclear weapons capability. (b) Generate a data bank for future design of weapons of different yields, for different applications and different delivery systems. (c) Data to provide the basis for future simulation support including critical experiments if considered necessary.

He went on to say that the Government was deeply concerned about the nuclear environment in the neighbourhood and it aimed to provide the reassurance to the people that their security will be provided at all costs.

I was saddened at --- when I realised that those from within the nuclear establishments of the NWS were not being able to pick up the signals that we were sending them. As I said one felt one was talking to the deaf.

Finally, - in answer to your direct questions (a) The messages that were being sent out clearly indicated that the time to weaponise was upon us and it was being seriously considered. Therefore, I am at a loss to understand how you got signals to the contrary. (b) India's development programme is very much more advanced from the days when the NWS were first into developing

their nuclear arsenals and were still trying to understand where they wanted to go. Therefore, a simultaneous thrust directed at more than one objective is now feasible - as was proved today. Remember that our scientists have not been idling for 24 years. Furthermore, it deals appropriately with the possibility of the developed world applying escalatory pressure at each step.

They can do it all once and for all and understand that India is way ahead of where it was thought to be.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: "pichao@email.gcn.net.tw" <pichao@email.gcn.net.tw>,
"robwcpuk@gn.apc.org" <robwcpuk@gn.apc.org>,
"tellis@rand.org" <tellis@rand.org>,
"tmccarthy@miis.edu" <tmccarthy@miis.edu>,
"wagingpeace@napf.org" <wagingpeace@napf.org>
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 13:12:16 +200
From: Appel des Cent <appel100@worldnet.fr>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: RE: India Validates its Nuclear arsenal.
To: "akapur@watarts.uwaterloo.ca" <akapur@watarts.uwaterloo.ca>,
"Vijai K Nair" <magoo@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in>
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igcb.igc.org id FAA05885

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id FAB06100

Dear peace friends,

Hoping the french Atomic Energy Commission (CEA) is not going to congratulate their indian counterpart as they did in 74

here are some personal comments, while no official letter has been sent out by Appel des Cent pour la Paix (it's on its way and will be sent to P5 representatives and India).

- 1) french ambassador (at the CD in Geneva) Bourgois stated a couple of days ago "No, I don't believe India will go ahead with testing" (I)
- 2) french ambassador Bourgois stated off the record one year ago "yes, there are enough nuclear weapons states interested that India has a veto in the CTBT because they don't want the CTBT to entry into force
- 3) civil nuclear reactor of that kind (candu heavy water reactors) are the kind used by France in the 50's to acquire the PU necessary for the bomb, and in the very near future, I shall sent out a report of French atomic energy people involved in the first reactor of that type (G1 in Marcoule)
- 4) Look at who has to be blamed : France's rhetoric during 23 years againts NPT and CTBT is exactly the rhetoric used by Indian officials against this nuclear "apartheid" (and in 74, French President Giscard d'Estaing praised franco-indian relationship as 2 "non aligned countries".

Hoping this is usefull for our future debates

Ben Cramer

<http://home.worldnet.fr/~appel100>

De : Vijai K Nair[SMTP:magoo@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in]

Date d'envoi : mardi 12 mai 1998 19:02

A : akapur@watarts.uwaterloo.ca

Cc : abolition-caucus@igc.org; tellis@rand.org; barker3@llnl.gov; byronweng@cuhk.edu.hk;

DALEYM@ssonwpob.us-state.gov; lasg@igc.apc.org; gtanham@concentric.net; chyn7@ms5.hinet.net; ike@swva.net;

jdean@uscusa.org; bailey16@llnl.gov; ndc@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in; wagingpeace@napf.org; pichao@email.gcn.net.tw;

robwcpuk@gn.apc.org; org@gn.apc.org; tmccarthy@miis.edu

Objet : India Validates its Nuclear arsenal.

Dear Folks,

1. Francis Boyle has this to say on India testing its nuclear arsenal on 11 May 1998. [Boyle, Francis [FBOYLE@LAW.UIUC.EDU]: "Dear Friends: Sadly, this story speaks for itself. A terrible development. But the five Permanent Members of the Security Council have only themselves to blame for their rank nuclear hypocrisy on the NPT and the CTBT. FAB"

2. India,'s Official Statement is as follows:

"As announced by the Prime Minister this afternoon, today India conducted three underground nuclear tests in the Pokhran range. The tests conducted today were with a fission device, a low yield device and a thermonuclear device. The measured yields are in line with expected values. Measurement have also confirmed that there was no release of radioactivity into the atmosphere. These were contained explosions like the experiment conducted in May 1974.

These tests have established that India has a proven capability for a weaponised nuclear programme. They also provide a valuable database which is useful in the design of nuclear weapons of different yields for different applications and for different delivery systems. Further, they are expected to carry Indian scientists towards a sound computer simulation capability which may be supported by sub-critical experiments, if considered necessary.

The Government is deeply concerned, as were previous Governments, about the nuclear environment in India's neighbourhood. These tests provide reassurance to the people of India that their national security interests are paramount and will be promoted and protected. Succeeding generations of Indians would also rest assured that contemporary technologies associated with nuclear option have been passed on to them in this the 50th year of our independence.

It is necessary to highlight today that India was in the vanguard of nations which ushered in the Partial Test Ban Treaty in 1963 due to environmental concerns. Indian representatives have worked in various international forums, including the Conference on Disarmament for universal, non-discriminatory and verifiable arrangements for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction. The Government would like to reiterate its support to efforts to realise the goal of a truly comprehensive international arrangement which would prohibit underground nuclear testing of all weapons as well as related experiments described as 'sub-critical' or 'hydronuclear.'

India would be prepared to consider being an adherent to some of the undertakings in the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. But this cannot obviously be done in a vacuum. It would necessarily be an evolutionary process from concept to commitment and would depend on a number of reciprocal activities.

We would like to reaffirm categorically that we will continue to exercise the most stringent control on the export of sensitive technologies, equipment and commodities - especially those related to weapons of mass destruction. Our track record has been impeccable in this regard. Therefore we expect recognition of our responsible policy by the international community.

India remains committed to a speedy process of nuclear disarmament leading to total and global elimination of nuclear weapons. Our adherence to the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Biological Weapons Convention is evidence of our commitment to any global disarmament regime which is

non-discriminatory and verifiable. We shall also be happy to participate in the negotiations for the conclusion of a fissile material cut-off treaty in the Geneva based Conference on Disarmament.

In our neighbourhood we have many friends with whom relations of fruitful cooperation for mutual benefit have existed and deepened over a long period. We assure them that it will be our sincere endeavour to intensify and diversify those relations further for the benefit of all our peoples. For India, as for others, the prime need is for peaceful cooperation and economic development."

3. Last night some friends from England had asked me for my comments. Those are attached to this missive.

4. The internet is full of how "India has started a nuclear arms race." My comment is that those who arrived in the arena after the event started, or chose to concentrate on issues other than the event itself, or chose ostrich like to selectively ignore events on a portion of the 'track', - are not in a position to make such an accusation. India did not start the nuclear arms race. India has done everything within its power to convince the world to abjure nuclear weapons. India could have, if it was so inclined, joined the nuclear arms race 30 years ago - and then where would we have been? India has shown remarkable constraint even without becoming party to discriminatory treaties that form the non-proliferation regime. Ever since India tested a nuclear device in 1974, it has been the target of stringent restrictions by the US and a number of European powers. India has silently watched China's continued vertical proliferation being rewarded by escalating technology assistance from the very same US that has embargoed India. India has seen limited sanctions being placed and hurriedly removed against China and Pakistan for their collusion in nuclear related enhancements. India sees [even if the West refuses to do so] a clear cut and growing capacity of regional states to inflict horrendous destruction on her people. India has just been witness to the introduction of IRBMs into the region with ineffectual sanctions being placed on two entities that never did have access to US resources or technology - what has been embargoed. Indian sovereignty has been consistently abused by external engineering of a 'low intensity conflict' and subversion of its societal coherence.

FOR HOW LONG, TO WHAT EXTENT and WHY DOES THE WORLD COMMUNITY EXPECT INDIA TO TAKE EVERY ABUSE, BEING HEAPED ON IT, LYING DOWN.

If you would, it may be worth one's while to consider all these issues before arriving at any conclusions.

There is - as all in India are painfully aware, no other route other than "elimination of nuclear weapons" to global stability. Lets eliminate the nuclear arms race. Yes, provided the surgery commences at the core of the malignancy - the NWS. Cosmetic surgery on the periphery of the malignancy has no curative capabilities - and if anything the infection spreads to other tissues. This is equally true of the malignancy of security by nuclear deterrence. India would, I am sure, willingly join the curing process if it is addressed squarely at the roots. If not, no amount of coercion of any kind

will work.

Regards

Vijai K Nair.

*****Brigadier Vijai K Nair,

Executive Director

Forum for Strategic & Security Studies

Safdarjung Airport

New Delhi 110 003

INDIA

Tele 091 11 8572483 & 091 11 4628336. Fax: 091 118 572425

E-mail: magoo@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in

RESPONSE TO

QUERIES FROM THE UK ON 11 MAY 1998

I would like to start my response by drawing to your attention two earlier occurrences:

(a) You may remember, you had asked me a specific question at the co-ordinating conference - What is India's nuclear status? I recall my answer - "In so far as I am concerned, India is a nuclear weapon state and those that continue to hide behind the convenient charade of "threshold" and "nuclear capable" are deluding themselves into believing what they want to believe because it fits their hopes or interests."

(b) In case you missed a recent piece out of Washington, it is replicated here: DIPLOMATIC WEDGE - "... In welcoming his guests at a dinner honoring Indian Foreign Secretary Krishnan Raghunath ... Indian Ambassador Naresh Chandra declared that diplomacy between India and the United States, at least recently, is like golf - a game that unfolds over a vast landscape. "THE ONLY PROBLEM IS THAT WE HAVE BEEN PLAYING ON DIFFERENT COURSES" he joked about the state of bilateral affairs before a strategic dialogue was kicked off last year by Thomas R. Pickering, UNAVOIDABLY, he said, SOME LOOSE BALLS WENT INTO THE ROUGH."

"Maybe for a moment we were going to get into loose cannons," Pickering quipped in response and in reference to Washington's efforts to dissuade India and Pakistan from testing nuclear missiles. "

Frankly, I do not see why the world is surprised. But there is good reason for what has happened.

For forty years now, India has been talking to the deaf. It was not heard because what it said was unpalatable to the selective hearer. Over the past 7 years India attempted to caution the NWS, and the recipients of their nuclear umbrella, that all things were not well as perceived in our part of the world. To no avail. Regional developments that have been particularly aggravating made no difference to the NWS who looked at "this ineffectual" state "wingeing" about its national security. I found this particularly so with the young men who came to - from Whitehall - they only wanted to hear what their bosses had told them what they expected India should do!! All that has happened is that India has intensified the decible level of its arguments by conducting a test. Suddenly the DEAF ARE HEARING.

The question is what are they hearing. Is it a distorted signal or has it been assimilated for what it is.

What has India done?

(a) For months it gave out unqualified signals that it had come to the point where it had serious concerns about its national security and that it was looking seriously at operationalising its nuclear option.

(b) At 1545 hours today, May 11, 1998, India conducted THREE nuclear tests at its Pokharan test site, involving (i) a fission device, (b) a low yield device and (iii) a thermo-nuclear device. These were contained test conducted underground with ZERO external radiactivity. All three tests were in line with the planned for yield.

(c) Pawar [Congress] and Jaipal Reddy's [Janata Dal] endorsement of the tests shows national consensus. Public opinion is overwhelmingly supportive of the Government's actions. Even the Industrial establishment has endorsed this happening as the doubts on the issues which were debilitating factors in external expectations are now behind them.

My comments:

1. India has asserted its sovereign right to validate and operationalise the means necessary to DEFEND itself in a debilitating nuclear security environment. [If I may add, India has much more justification to field a nuclear deterrent for its security than the UK has.]
2. The act cannot be undone - the fact of three highly sophisticated nuclear tests having been conducted cannot be erased. You will note that a "thermonuclear device" or a "low yield device" cannot be developed and fired in a months time. This is the end product of a long term plan with lots of technical and engineering effort. The Congress and the UF Governments had obviously activated the process many years ago. Therefore, to saddle it to the BJP and obfuscate the real issues under the guise of theocratic dust would not only be unjustified, but counterproductive.
3. The Government has not actuated the tests to fulfill their party's election manifesto nor is it a knee jerk action. It is a result of a seriously considered lon-term strategy - what in the West is called "nuclear strategy."
4. India, besides validating its nuclear deterrent, needs to create a meaningful data bank on which it can guarantee the safety, maintenance and reliability of its weapon systems. For this a series of tests are inescapable. After all, and I refer you to the agonising within the establishment in a state with 'state of the art' technology, such as the US on SSMP to achieve the same ends. The US and UK have a bank of data from over 1000 nuclear tests on which to base future deterrence capabilities. Are we in India to depend on God and lady luck?
5. The actuation of the strategy is most probably a consequence of (a) A realisation that the elimination of nuclear weapons is a pipe dream. (b)

Threat thresholds have attained proportions that demand action. (c) Ambiguity was fast losing its efficacy in the global 'arms control' environment and space to create necessary infrastructure was closing in uncomfortably.

6. Obviously India has sufficient warheads in place to risk the ire of the world before testing these devices. BBC commentator's question - whether India will weaponise - is redundant. I do not think a clearer message could have been sent. India, like the other NWS will not amplify each detail of its nuclear strategy for the curious. Resorting to deafness now is as redundant as ambiguity.

7. India has, by its actions declared itself a nuclear weapon state. Whats in its inventory is obviously classified and will not be divulged to the domestic or foreign public.

8. It has signalled - categorically - a limited nuclear deterrence strategy and, by virtue of the type of devices tested, has made it clear that its final objective is way beyond what the demonstrated capabilities suggest. Therefore, it is safe to assume that a well considered and mature nuclear strategy has been formulated and is now being put into place.

9. The fission test leaves some questions. (a) was it validation of the current assets in the inventory? or (b) was it a trigger device for things to come?

10. The low yield device also generates questions which should have analysts going round in circles!! I do not privy to what it is about but I am certain that the system knows what it is doing.

11. The fusion device could be a technology demonstrator. I for one have always been sceptical about this form of subterfuge taken by India. Looking at it purely from my own analytical angle, I would suggest that the targeting philosophy of India's nuclear strategy calls for this capability. As you may recall in my thesis [Nuclear India] I had come to the conclusion that a limited number of megaton size devices would be necessary to fulfill specific requirements.

12. The question on US reaction. Pain is unavoidable but how much can be administered effectively once the cat is out? To start with I have no doubt that the Indian government has very carefully calculated ALL COSTS of its actions. Some points to ponder are (a) Ever since 1974 all US domestic laws have been applied to India and there is little else that it can do without actually declaring itself hostile to India. That would be a US decision about which India can do nothing. It would require a response that India must have thought out. (b) US aid to India is a paltry \$21 million, a fraction of what India farms out in aid to other countries. (c) Stopping loans from US banks would hardly be noticed by India as they do not amount to all that much. (d) Voting against provision of loans to India from institutions such as the IMF is a function of votes - and even then, it cannot stop what has been sanctioned and is in the pipeline. The effect would begin to be felt in 3 years time. (e) The US cannot ignore the Indian market vis-a-vis its own economic imperatives, except to its disadvantage. (e) India is NOT PARTY TO THE NPT OR THE CTBT and, therefore, has not violated any international norms or agreements. The question of 'Opinio Juris' as used by the US and UK at the

ICJ on the question of legality of nuclear weapons - is now on the other foot. (f) And the threat to stop high technology exports to India is a lot of wind. Such restrictions have been imposed for the last two decades and nothing of technological value has been forthcoming from the US.

13. What the world has to understand, and moreso the developed countries, is that India has turned an irreversible leaf and their immediate reactions notwithstanding, they will have to live with the change. The only way to correct that is to start HONEST negotiations for the universal elimination of nuclear weapons. As I K Gujral said this evening, India will be second to none to eliminate its nuclear weapons capability if the NWS agree to eliminate their nuclear weapons.

14. Reaction borne of frustration is not going to help. If anything, it will create new factors to debilitate the global security environment. The refusal of the NWS to come on board the elimination wagon has lead to pain on all sides. There are no winners - all will hurt whether they like it or not. Therefore, before jumping off the deep end, it would do the developed Western powers a world of good to assimilate where we have got to and the reasons for this sad happening. The need of the hour is to analyse the new status created by India's actions and act maturely to reach an amicable solution. They need to be more understanding of interests other than their own. Realise that India would definitely board the elimination wagon if they were to do so.

At the same time I must add that India cannot be coerced into stepping back from its actions and any attempt to that end would be futile. It is the one country that has taken a long long time to deliberate and then arrive at this conclusion. It has explored every avenue possible - even to the extent to appear to be a weak and pliable state. A decision taken after so much deliberation cannot be wished away by ANY OTHER STATE THAT EXPECTS INDIA TO PLACE THAT STATES SECURITY CONCERNS BEFORE INDIAN SECURITY CONCERNS.

After the test Brijesh Mishra the BJP spokesman stated - The nuclear tests carried out today had three objectives: (a) Establish that India had a proven nuclear weapons capability. (b) Generate a data bank for future design of weapons of different yields, for different applications and different delivery systems. (c) Data to provide the basis for future simulation support including critical experiments if considered necessary.

He went on to say that the Government was deeply concerned about the nuclear environment in the neighbourhood and it aimed to provide the reassurance to the people that their security will be provided at all costs.

I was saddened at --- when I realised that those from within the nuclear establishments of the NWS were not being able to pick up the signals that we were sending them. As I said one felt one was talking to the deaf.

Finally, - in answer to your direct questions (a) The messages that were being sent out clearly indicated that the time to weaponise was upon us and it was being seriously considered. Therefore, I am at a loss to understand how you got signals to the contrary. (b) India's development programme is very much more advanced from the days when the NWS were first into developing their nuclear arsenals and were still trying to understand where they wanted to go. Therefore, a simultaneous thrust directed at more than one objective

is now feasible - as was proved today. Remember that our scientists have not been idling for 24 years. Furthermore, it deals appropriately with the possibility of the developed world applying escalatory pressure at each step. They can do it all once and for all and understand that India is way ahead of where it was thought to be.

Return-Path: <joe@fcnl.org>
X-Sender: joe@local.fcnl.org
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 09:18:14 -0400
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
From: Joe Volk <joe@fcnl.org>
Subject: Re: CTBT Grassroots Meeting, Wednesday, May 13

5/12/98

Howard,

Good morning and welcome back. How about those India nuclear tests! Perhaps you've now heard that a memorial service for Dr. Benjamin Spock will be held at the Friends Meeting of Washington (Florida Avenue Meetinghouse) Wed 13 May 12 noon to 2 pm with a reception following. I think Fran Teplitz has been trying to contact you to arrange a change in the time of the CTBT meeting.

Cheers,

Joe

At 12:47 PM 5/11/98 -0700, you wrote:

>Dear Colleagues:

>

>I'm just back from Geneva where I spent two weeks following the progress
>(really lack of progress) of the NPT Preparatory Committee. Therefore, I'm
>fairly late with this reminder that our next meeting of religious
>organizations working to build grassroots support for CTBT ratification,
>plus associates from peace organizations, will take place from 1:00 to 2:30
>p.m., Wednesday, May 13, 1998 at the FCNL Conference Room, 245 Second
>Street, NE.

>

>Now that the Senate has completed its work on NATO expansion we want to
>press for hearings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This means
>intensifying our grassroots activities. Also, we are ready to release the
>"Statement by American Religious Leaders: Ratify the CTBT", which now has
>200 signers. We want to get state-level signers involved in the grassroots
>campaign.

>

>Hope you can make it on the 13th.

>

>Howard

>

>

>

Joe Volk
Executive Secretary
Friends Committee on National Legislation
245 Second Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002
Phone: 202/ 547-6000

Fax: 202/ 547-6019

E-mail: joe@fcnl.org

Web page: <http://www.fcnl.org/pub/fcnl>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 10:34:17 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: special web site section on Indian tests

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball, Executive Director

RE: updated section on Coalition CTBT site on Indian Tests

For further updates, analysis and links on the Indian nuclear test situation, see the Coalition's CTBT web site
<<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

The site includes the statements of the Indian and Pakistani governments, press statements from NGOs, the 1992 Exon-Hatfield-Mitchell nuclear test moratorium legislation (now voided by the Indian Test), the 1994 Glenn bill to impose sanctions on undeclared states that test, and more.

If you have a document, press statement, published op-ed or letter to the editor, or useful link on the Indian testing situation, its implications for international security and the effort to end nuclear testing, please forward an electronic version that might be added to the site.

Also, John Pike is posting a good number of India nuclear testing related items on the Federation of American Scientists Web Site <<http://www.fas.org>>

DK

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: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 07:59:50 -0500
From: "Boyle, Francis" <FBOYLE@LAW.UIUC.EDU>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Sensitivity: Private
Subject: More Nuclear Hypocrisy
To: "'Abolition Caucus List (E-mail)'" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>, "'a-days@motherearth.org'" <a-days@motherearth.org>

Dear Friends:

Today we hear everyone in Washington asking for sanctions against India because of these tests. Yet, it is well known that Israel has tested a nuclear device and currently has an inventory of at least 200+ nuclear weapons and an IRBM delivery capability. But no one will even mention that matter in the American news media.

Remember what happened during the Carter administration. Israel and the apartheid Afrikaner regime in South Africa tested a nuclear device near the Indian Ocean. The Carter administration immediately orchestrated a flimsy cover-up, publicly claiming that it was a meteorite hitting the satellite, in order to avoid the triggering of sanctions against Israel. Of course, the news media in the United States dutifully accepted the cover-up and the matter disappeared down the Orwellian memory hole. What we see now in Washington are crocodile tears being shed over the Indian tests. The United States has done absolutely nothing to stop Israel's rapidly escalating nuclear weapons program despite more than enough leverage to do so. Some are more equal than others.

Francis A. Boyle
Professor of International Law

Francis A. Boyle
Law Building
504 E. Pennsylvania Ave.
Champaign, Ill. 61820
Phone: 217-333-7954
Fax: 217-244-1478
fboyle@law.uiuc.edu

Return-Path: <bridget@fcnl.org>
X-Sender: bridget@local.fcnl.org
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 13:11:35 -0400
To: mupj@igc.org, mark_brown.parti@ecunet.org
From: Bridget Moix <bridget@fcnl.org>
Subject: ctbt statement

Howard and Mark,

The CTBT statement is attached as a file and pasted below. hope it's useful. if you have corrections or suggestions for making it more organized, appealing, etc, please let me know.

thanks much for all your work on this.

peace,
bridget

A Statement by
American Religious Leaders:
Ratify the CTBT

May 1998

As persons entrusted by our diverse religious communities with special responsibilities to address the issues of justice and peace, we have joined in this appeal for Senate action to approve the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) before the August recess.

For more than forty years, the nuclear arms race dominated the Cold War policies of the United States. Within our faith communities, those policies raised the profoundest questions about the sacredness of God's creation, our moral responsibilities, and human destiny. With the end of the Cold War, the issues of the nuclear threat have changed, but the threat remains and the profound moral questions persist. The retention of thousands of nuclear weapons, combined with the threats of proliferation and terrorism, requires renewed attention to these issues. At the moral core of nuclear issues is the credibility of nuclear-weapon states in seeking to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons by or to other states or political groups.

We believe that ratification of the CTBT during 1998 is the most urgent and timely action that could contribute significantly toward reducing the nuclear danger. We are reminded that ratification of the CTBT would help fulfill U.S. commitments under the Limited Test Ban Treaty and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and is consistent with current U.S. law. In fact, the CTBT would make permanent internationally the current moratorium on nuclear testing which the U.S. already observes. The international verification regime of this treaty provides a means to effectively monitor such a permanent ban on testing and to restrict further proliferation of nuclear weapons technology. U.S. leadership on ratification of this

treaty is critical.

The United States Senate has within its powers the capacity to take decisive action on some of the most fateful issues affecting the security of our nation and the peace of our planet. We urge the Senate to proceed swiftly this session to devote the most serious consideration to the honoring of our previous treaty commitments and to the merits of the CTBT. We earnestly hope our senators will then decide it is time to consent to the treaty's ratification.

We assure our senators of our determination to interpret this issue as a vital matter of religious conscience for our communities -- and we pray for their own good health and wisdom.

Yours faithfully,

National:

Rev. Dr. Joan Brown Campbell
General Secretary
National Council of Churches

Rev. Dr. Albert M. Pennybacker
Associate General Secretary for Public Policy
National Council of Churches

Rabbi Eric Yoffie
President
Union of American Hebrew Congregations

Rabbi Arthur Waskow
Director
The Shalom Center

Clifton Kirkpatrick
Stated Clerk of the General Assembly
Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

Rev. Ted Keating, SM
Director for Justice and Peace
Catholic Conference of Major Superiors of Men's Institutes

Frank T. Griswold
Presiding Bishop and Primate
The Episcopal Church

Rev. Michael Dodd
Director
Columban Fathers' Justice and Peace Office

Kathy Thornton, RSM,

National Coordinator
NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby

Ronald J. Sider
President
Evangelicals for Social Action

Paul H. Sherry
President
United Church of Christ

Charles McCollough
Office for Church in Society
United Church of Christ

Rev. Tyrone S. Pitts
General Secretary
Progressive National Baptist Convention, Inc.

Bishop McKinley Young
African Methodist Episcopal Church

The Rev. Dr. Daniel E. Weiss
General Secretary
American Baptist Churches, USA

Dr. Willie T. Snead
Sr. President
National Missionary Baptist Convention of America

Dr. Thomas White Wolf Fassett
General Secretary
General Board of Church and Society
United Methodist Church

Bishop William Boyd Grove
Ecumenical Officer
United Methodist Council of Bishops

Bishop Nathaniel Linsey, Senior Bishop
Christian Methodist Episcopal Church

Howard Hallman
Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Archbishop Mor Cyril Aphrem Karim
Eastern Archdiocese
Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch

Dr. Richard L. Hamm
General Minister and President
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) in the United States and Canada

Gordon L. Sommers
President
Moravian Church, Northern Province

Ms. Joanne Chadwick
Commission for Women
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

The Rev. H. George Anderson
Presiding Bishop
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

The Rev. Leslie F. Weber, Jr
Division for Church in Society
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Ms. Robin Janac
Division for Congregational Ministries
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Ms. Joyce M. Bowers
Mission History & Research
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Mr. Robert E. Pope
Mission Investment Fund of the ELCA
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Ms. Gertrude E. Milliken
Women of the ELCA
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

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

The Rev. Russell O. Siler
Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Susan Shank Mix
President
Church Women United

John K. Stoner
Coordinator
New Call to Peacemaking

Metropolitan Theodosius (Lazor)
Primate
Orthodox Church in America

John A. Buehrens
President
Unitarian Universalist Association

Rev. Joel D. Baehr
Unitarian Universalist Association, Board of Trustees

Bradley H. Patterson, Jr.
Member, Board of Trustees
Unitarian Universalist Association

Joan Van Becelaere
President
Covenant of Unitarian Universalist Pagans

George B. Stoltzfus
General Secretary
Mennonite Church

James P. Schrag
General Secretary
General Conference Mennonite Church

Lynette Meck
Executive Director
Mennonite Central Committee, U.S.

Ronald J.R. Mathies
Executive Director
Mennonite Central Committee

J. Daryl Byler
Director
Washington Office
Mennonite Central Committee

Dr. Bert Beach
General Conference of the Seventh Day Adventist Church

Rev. Bill Moroney
Missionaries of Africa

Jim Wallis
Executive Director
Sojourners

The Rev. Dr. Joseph M. Mason
Interim Executive Director
Church of the Brethren, General Board

Heather Nolen
Coordinator
Church of the Brethren, Washington Office

Christopher Bowman
General Board Chair
Church of the Brethren

General Board Members, Church of the Brethren:

Ruth Davidson Clark
Phyllis M. Davis
Mary Jo Flory-Steury
Roger Forry
Stafford C. Frederick
Wayne Judd
Edward L. Kerschensteiner
David R. Miller
Donald L. Parker
Tracy W. SAdd
Martha Stover Barlow

Johan Maurer
General Secretary
Friends United Meeting

Bruce Birchard
General Secretary
Friends General Conference (for ID purposes only)

Kara Newell
Executive Director
American Friends Service Committee

Joe Volk
Executive Secretary
Friends Committee on National Legislation

Regional:

Bishop Michael J. Kaniecki, SJ
Roman Catholic Diocese of Fairbanks, Alaska

Rev. Richard A. Heacock, Jr.
President
Alaska Christian Conference

The Rt. Rev. Mark MacDonald
Episcopal Diocese of Alaska

Rev. Richard J. Olson
International Federation for Earth's Preservation
Homer, Alaska

Frank Chingliak

President of the Provincial Board
Moravian Church in Alaska

Bishop Donald Parsons
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Anchorage, Alaska

The Rev. Floyd M. Schoenhals
Bishop, Arkansas-Oklahoma Synod
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Dr. F. Gladwin Connell
Conference Council Director
Little Rock Annual Conference

Sr. Joan Pytlik
Diocesan Social Action Director
Catholic Diocese of Little Rock, Arkansas

Chris Smith
District Executive
Church of the Brethren, Atlantic Northeast

Jean G. Kapusicik
Unitarian Universalist Board of Trustees
Central Midwest District

The Rev. George Paul Mocko
Bishop, Delaware-Maryland Synod
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Ms. Theda Blackwelder
Lutheran Office on Public Policy
Wilmington, Delaware

The Rev. William B. Trexler
Bishop, Florida-Bahamas Synod
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

The Rev. Kenneth R. Olsen
Bishop, Metropolitan Chicago Synod, Illinois
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

The Rev. Frederick Aigner
Lutheran Social Services of Illinois

The Rev. Daniel Schwick
Lutheran Social Services of Illinois

Herman Kauffman
District Executive
Northern Indiana
Church of the Brethren

Bishop Fritz Mutti
United Methodist Church
Kansas Area

Dr. Joe M. Hendrixson
Executive Director
Kansas Ecumenical Ministries

Timothy W. Ashton
District Executive
Massachusetts Bay District of Unitarian Universalist Churches

James L. Kinsey
District Executive
Michigan
Church of the Brethren

The Rev. Mark S. Hanson
Bishop, Saint Paul Area Synod, Minnesota
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

The Rev. Arlen D. Hermodson
Bishop, Northwestern Minnesota Synod
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

The Rev. Glenn Nycklemoe
Bishop, Southeastern Minnesota Synod
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Bishop M.L. Meadors, Jr.
United Methodist Church
Jackson, Mississippi

Mississippi Religious Leaders Conference
Don Fortenberry, Executive Director
Bishop A.C. Marble, President, Board of Directors

The Rev. Richard N. Jessen
Bishop, Nebraska Synod
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

The Rev. Robert L. Isaksen
Bishop, New England Synod
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Rev. Francis Mazur (representing 19 faith groups)
Buffalo Area Metropolitan Ministries, New York

Rev. Garrie Stevens
Conference Council Director
North Central New York Conference

United Methodist Church

The Rev. David W. Preisinger - Assistant to Bishop Lee M. Miller
Upstate New York Synod
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Sally Breen
Social Justice Chair
Northeast District
Unitarian Universalist Association

Rev. Glenn H. Turner, District Minister
Northeast District
Unitarian Universalist Association

Rev. Calvin O. Dame
Northeast District Trustee
Unitarian Universalist Association

Connie R. Burkholder
District Executive
Northern Plains
Church of the Brethren

The Rev. Dale R. Skogman
Bishop, Northern Great Lakes Synod
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Collins Kilburn
Executive Director
North Carolina Council of Churches

Greg Coleridge
Director
Northeast Ohio
American Friends Service Committee

Tom Zuercher
District Executive
Church of the Brethren, Northern Ohio

James H. Zeisloft
Executive Director
United Methodist Witness in Pennsylvania

Randall Yoder
District Executive
Church of the Brethren, Middle Pennsylvania

Georgia R. Markey
District Executive
Church of the Brethren, Southern Pennsylvania

The Rev. Gregory R. Pile

Bishop, Allegheny Synod, Pennsylvania
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

The Rev. Paull E. Spring
Bishop, Northwestern Pennsylvania Synod
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

The Rev. David R. Strobel
Bishop, Northeastern Pennsylvania Synod
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

The Rev. Bill Dalke
Conference Minister
Rocky Mountain Conference
United Church of Christ

Peace and Justice Task Force
Rev. Robert A. Kinsey, Chair
Rocky Mountain Conference
United Church of Christ

The Rev. Robert W. Mattheis
Bishop, Sierra Pacific Synod
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

The Rev. Ronald B. Warren
Bishop, Southeastern Synod
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Bishop Nathaniel Jarrett, JR.
Presiding Bishop
African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church
Southwestern Delta Episcopal District

The Rev. James E. Bennett
Bishop, Southwestern Texas Synod
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

The Rev. Paul J. Blom
Bishop, Texas-Louisiana Gulf Coast Synod
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Bishop K. Woodrow Hearn
United Methodist Church
Texas Annual Conference

The Rev. Mark B. Herbener
Bishop, Northern Texas-Northern Louisiana Synod
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Bishop Walter F. Sullivan
Catholic Diocese of Richmond, Virginia

The Rev. Richard F. Bansemer

Bishop, Virginia Synod
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

The Rev. Robert M. Keller
Bishop, Eastern Washington-Idaho Synod
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

John Boonstra
Executive Minister
Washington Association of Churches

The Rev. David C. Wold
Bishop, Southwestern Washington Synod
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

The Rev. Theodore F. Schneider
Bishop, Metropolitan Washington D.C. Synod
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Jay Rogers Fike
District Executive
Church of the Brethren, West Marva

The Rev. Robert D. Berg
Bishop, Northwest Synod of Wisconsin
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Local Leaders and Congregations:

David K. Fison, Retired Pastor
United Methodist Church
Anchorage, Alaska

Rabbi Eugene Levy
Congregation Bnai Israel
Little Rock, Arkansas

Edward G. Matthews
Senior Pastor
First United Methodist Church
Little Rock, Arkansas

Rev. Bryan G. Fulwider
St. Paul United Methodist Church
Little Rock, Arkansas

Rev. Dr. Carolyn Tyler
Interfaith Disaster Recovery (for ID purposes only)
Little Rock, Arkansas

Sister Maria Liebeck
Daughters of Charity
Little Rock, Arkansas

Rev. J. Edwin Bacon, Jr.
Rector
All Saints Episcopal Church
Pasadena, California

Mary Ann Coyle, SL
President
Loretto Community
Englewood, Colorado

Rev. Jonathan W. Wymans
Pastor
First Congregational United Church of Christ
Pueblo, Colorado

Rev. Karen Sorenson
Pastor
Christ Congregational United Church of Christ
Pueblo, Colorado

Rabbi Abe Reich
United Hebrew Center
Pueblo, Colorado

Bishop Charles A. Buswell
Catholi Bishop of Pueblo Diocese (retired)
Pueblo, Colorado

Rev. David Foncannon
Pastor
Pueblo Mennonite Church
Pueblo, Colorado

Rev. Patrick O'Hurley
Westminister Presbyterian Church
Pueblo, Colorado

Rev. Roger L. Hupp
Center for Inner Peace
Pueblo, Colorado

Thomas McGuigan, Clerk
Georgia Lord, Assistant Clerk
Atlanta Meeting, Religious Society of Friends
Atlanta, Georgia

Ms. Carol Q. Cosby

Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)
Indiana

Richard B. Gardner
Academic Dean
Bethany Theological Seminary
Richmond, Indiana

The Rev. Carl A. Anderson
First Lutheran Church
Rock Island, Illinois

Loring R. Henderson
Clerk
Oread Friends Meeting (Quaker)
Kansas

Rev. Christopher Grundy
United Church of Christ, Plymouth Congregational
Lawrence, Kansas

The Rev. Gerald D. Buss, Sr.
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Hiawatha, Kansas

The Rev. Bryan D. Jessup
The Unitarian Universalist Church
Sanford, Maine

Rev. Charles Demere
Pax World Service (formerly)
St. Mary's County, Maryland

Mr. Herbert Blinder
American Ethical Union
Bethesda, Maryland

The Rev. Mark A.G. Huffmen
St. Timothy Lutheran Church
Timonium, Maryland

James M. Bank
Minister
Unitarian Universalist Church of Silver Spring, Maryland

Rev. Dr. Thomas Mikelson
First Parish in Cambridge, Massachusetts

Rev. Kaaren Waack
Minister
The First Unitarian Universalist Society of
Rockport, Massachusetts

The Rev. Paul D. Lutz
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Duluth, Minnesota

The Rev. Howard D. Wagner
St. Petri Lutheran Church
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Nielsville, Minnesota

Ms. Susan M. Peterson
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Rochert, Minnesota

Rev. Gloria Weber
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Editor, Interfaith Voices for Peace and Justice Directory
St. Louis, Missouri

Rev. Christy Dowdy
Chairperson
Peace & Justice JSAT, Interchurch Ministries of Nebraska

Rev. Galen Wray
Centenary United Methodist Church
Beatrice, Nebraska

First Lutheran Church, Blair, Nebraska:

Ms. Patricia Bentsen
Mr. Jerome L. Christensen
Mr. Jon Hougen
Ms. Dania Hundtoft
Mr. Delvin D. Hutton
Ms. Trudy Hutton
Mr. Gerald Kobs
Ms. Donna Kobs
Mr. Lloyd Neve
Ms. Muriel Neve
Mr. Laurids Pedersen
Ms. Betty Wolsmann

The Rev. Jennifer E. Dyer
St. John's Lutheran Church
Elma, New York

Mr. G. William Glidden
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Plattsburgh, New York

Henry Elkins
Clerk
Purchase Quarterly Meeting
New York Yearly Meeting
Religious Society of Friends

Sally Miller
Clerk
Syracuse Monthly Meeting of Friends

Helen Stabler
Co-Clerk
Syracuse Monthly Meeting of Friends

Rev. James D. Matthews
Pastor
St. Lucy's Roman Catholic Church
Syracuse, New York

Rev. William L. Coop
Compassion and Advocacy Chair
Cayuga/Syracuse Presbytery, and
Pastor
South Presbyterian Church
Syracuse, New York

Rev. Harold Garman
Pastor
University United Methodist Church
Syracuse, New York

Byrdie Palmore
Member, Board of UUA Review
Secretary, Unitarian Universalist Congregation of Hillsborough, North Carolina

Erdman B. Palmore, PhD, HC
Co-Chair, Community Action Committee
Unitarian Universalist Congregation of Hillsborough,
North Carolina

Val Rosado
Member and Past Moderator of Coordinating Council
Unitarian Universalist Congregation of Hillsborough,
North Carolina

Rev. Robert Murphy
Unitarian Universalists in East Carolina
Morehead City, North Carolina

Rev. Charles G. Kast
Unitarian Universalist
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Rev. Dr. Werner Lange
Pastor
Auburn Community Church, United Church of Christ
Chagrin Falls, Ohio

Dean Wolfe
Chair
Episcopal Peace Fellowship in Ohio

Jay Penniman
Clerk
Salem Friends Meeting
Salem, Oregon

Pittsburgh Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends
Liane Norman, Clerk

Arthur M. Crawford
Retired Minister
United Methodist Church
Meadville, Pennsylvania

Rev. Judy Welles
Unitarian Universalists of the Cumberland Valley
Carlisle, Pennsylvania

Marcus and Glenda Keyes
Co-Directors
Justice-Peace-Integrity of Creation
Catholic Diocese of Knoxville, Tennessee

Tandy Schiffer
Director of Religious Education
Oak Ridge Unitarian Universalist Church
Oak Ridge, Tennessee

Donald P. Clark, Convener
Network for Environmental and Economic Responsibility
United Church of Christ
Pleasant Hill, Tennessee

Rev. Richard Lammers
Peace Committee
Pleasant Hill Community Church
Pleasant Hill, Tennessee

Tennessee Valley Unitarian Universalist Church:
Reverend Lynn Thomas Strauss, Parish Minister
Sophronia Ward, President
Mary C. Nelson, Minister Emerita
Evelyn Carter, Director of Religious Education
William Dunhler

Rev. Jane Dwinell
First Universalist Parish, UU
Derby Line, Vermont

The Rev. Frederick Schneider

Lutheran Church of Our Savior
Richmond, Virginia

Ms. Viola M. Van Gilder
Lutheran Peace Fellowship
Seattle, Washington

Robert E. Hughes
Board of Church and Society, Chair
United Methodist Church
Mercer Island, Washington

Attachment Converted: C:\INTERACT\data\download\Rellead2.wpd

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 12:40:42 -0400
From: "NGO Comm. on Disarmament" <disarmtimes@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: SecGen press release
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Sender: disarmtimes@pop.igc.org

SG/SM/6555
11 May 1998

>
>
> SECRETARY-GENERAL EXPRESSES REGRET OVER ANNOUNCEMENT THAT INDIA
> CONDUCTED THREE UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR TESTS
>

> Following is a statement issued today by the Spokesman
> for Secretary-General Kofi Annan:
>
>

> The Secretary-General has learned with deep regret of the
> announcement that India had conducted three underground nuclear tests
on

> Monday. He wishes to note that, for quite some time now, there has
been

a de facto moratorium on nuclear testing. The moratorium and the
> successful conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty
(CTBT) in

> September 1996 are seen by the international community as setting a
norm with

> regard to nuclear nonproliferation. While noting that India is not a
> signatory to the CTBT, the Secretary-General is nevertheless concerned
that

the latest testing is inconsistent with the pattern which has been firmly
> endorsed by the international community. He calls on all States for
maximum

> restraint with a view to facilitating nuclear non-proliferation and
> nuclear disarmament. The Secretary-General strongly supports accelerated
> measures of nuclear disarmament, cessation of all nuclear tests by all
> States and strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation regime.
>

* * * * *

Roger Smith
Network Coordinator
NGO Committee on Disarmament
777 U.N. Plaza #3B, New York, NY 10017, USA
tel 1.212.687.5340 fax 1.212.687.1643
disarmtimes@igc.apc.org <http://www.peacenet.org/disarm/>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 16:22:53 +0100 (BST)
From: robwcpuk@gn.apc.org (Rob Green)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: INDIAN NUCLEAR TEST
To: Mark Stansbery <walk@igc.apc.org>
X-Authentication-Warning: mail.gn.apc.org: Host ag084.du.pipex.com [193.130.246.84] claimed to be [193.130.245.111]
X-Sender: robwcpuk@pop.gn.apc.org

Dear Mark,

Thank you for your eloquent reaction. Just one correction: the ICJ Advisory Opinion was confined to the threat or USE of nukes - not possession (the ICJ would have found a way not to answer the question if it had been on possession!).

Please also note that India acquired its bomb material from nuclear energy generation - unlike Iraq. So this is dramatic evidence of the slogan "Nuclear power powers the Bomb".

Best wishes,
Rob Green, UK Chair World Court Project

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 18:44:15 +0200
From: wilpf@iprolink.ch (WILPF)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Abolition Using India Like They Used Us!
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: wilpf@pop.iprolink.ch (Unverified)

Dear All,

I think that we need to use this latest explosion to build outrage and anti-nuclear fervour and to build our Abolition 2000 network.

It was with the saddest saddest looks on our faces in Australia that at times we admitted the French did the anti-nuclear movement a favour in 1995.

How can we use the disappointments of late to foster public reaction?

I think it was Ross who said that we could use some words to propell ourselves into the media and into the debate wherever we are, emphasising that while nuclear weapons exist, we're all up shit creek.

This is a draft of some ideas. Anyone can take from this or tell me if I've gone out of line, or that I've constructed some of these sentences clumsily.

We should all remember that no-one speaks or writes for the network, but that means that we should all talk about Abolition all the time, as member organisations, to the extent that we can - which is by using the statement.

love flick

DRAFT

India Did Not Start the Nuclear Arms Race but Abolition 2000 Promises to End It!

The Abolition 2000 Network condemns every nuclear test conducted in any environment, anywhere in the world. As a network opposed to nuclear testing we deeply regret that India, the country that sparked the idea for a Test Ban Treaty in 1954, is now aggressively walking down the nuclear path.

Nuclear testing by the Bharatiya Janata Party of India sent a message to the world that is clear: While nuclear weapons exist and while the possession of them denotes political power, nuclear proliferation has and will continue to happen.

Abolition 2000, a global network to eliminate nuclear weapons, made up of over 1000 church, union, women's, lawyers & physicians organisations

believe that;

"Our common security requires the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.....nuclear weapons states should initiate immediately 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.

The recent Non-Proliferation Treaty Preparatory Committee (PrepCom) ended in deadlock three days before India decided to test 3 nuclear devices. At the two week PrepCom held in Geneva April 27-May 9, the Nuclear Weapons States failed again, as they have failed for over 50 years, to send the non-proliferation message that nuclear weapons are decreasing in importance for achieving prestige in political forums or for accomplishing military objectives. Rather, the intransigence of the nuclear weapons states on the issue of nuclear disarmament indicated the very opposite.

The Nuclear Weapon States have violated Article 6 of the Non-Proliferation Treaty since it entered into force in 1970. Article 6 reads, "Each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes 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..."

The Abolition 2000 network is also united in its demand for a truly comprehensive test ban treaty, with a zero threshold and with the stated purpose of precluding nuclear weapons development by all states.

The Abolition 2000 networking statement goes further on the issue of testing by asserting the need to, "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."

While the CTBT agreed in 1996 could have been a significant restraint measure, its credibility was immediately weakened by the states that used the loophole that justified lab testing. India is now following the United States, Russia and France down the computer simulation path. India's stated position is that the nuclear tests conducted, "are expected to carry Indian scientists towards a sound computer simulation capability which may be supported by sub-critical experiments, if considered necessary."

Will the 1998 PrepCom experience, and now these nuclear tests serve to foster the impatience necessary to unite those determined to see the negotiation of a Nuclear Weapons Convention? The Abolition 2000 network says loudly, "YES", the anti-nuclear community is growing in numbers, in resources, in imagination and in power. According to recent polls 87% of all US Americans think we should negotiate a treaty to eliminate nuclear weapons. 87% of the British public support negotiations towards a global ban on nuclear weapons, and 75% of Canadians say that the existence of nuclear weapons makes the world a more dangerous place.

In 1995 the Abolition 2000 network began and has continued to grow as the

voices of ordinary citizens join those of the judges of the International Court of Justice who ruled on the general illegality of nuclear weapons, the 60 generals and admirals from 17 countries and the Canberra Commission all of whom state the very obvious: The only complete defence is the elimination of nuclear weapons and the assurance that they will never be produced again."

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
International Secretariat
1, rue de Varembe
C.P. 28
1211 Geneva 20
Tel: +41 22 733 61 75
Fax: +41 22 740 10 63

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 14:03:20 -0400
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Products from India
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

Is anyone compiling a list of products from India, which might be used by those who want to stop purchasing and using them?

Shalom,
Bob Tiller
Physicians for Social Responsibility

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>

Date: Wed, 13 May 1998 14:15:15 -0400

From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>

Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility

To: bmusil@psr.org, ledwidge@psr.org, paexec@igc.org, paprog@igc.org,
panukes@igc.org, wandwill@clark.net, vision@igc.org, joe@fcnl.org,
bridget@fcnl.org, kathy@fcnl.org, meldredge@igc.org, dkimball@clw.org,
jsmith@clw.org, dculp@nrdc.org, disarmament@igc.org, mupj@igc.org,
tcollina@ucsusa.org, tperry@ucsusa.org, stevenraikin@delphi.com,
billnrns@aol.com, armsintern@ucsusa.org, ctbt@2020vision.org,
billeisen@rocketmail.com

Subject: Next CTBT grassroots meeting

Dear Friends,

This week's events in India have been discouraging, but they should reinforce our conviction that we must get the CTBT in place.

After several attempts to clarify the time and date of the next CTBT grassroots meeting (sometimes called the "Executive Directors Group"), this is the definitive word:

Date: Thursday, May 14

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Place: FCNL, 245 Second St. N.E.

Please note that this is the same time suggested by Fran and Kathy in an e-mail last week. Because of scheduling changes, we will not be meeting with the religious grassroots group.

We have some very welcome news on the money front --- Ploughshares has indeed made several grants for CTBT work over the next few weeks. One of those grants is \$25,000 for grassroots work, made through the Disarmament Clearinghouse. The organizations charged with deciding how to spend it are: Peace Action, WAND, PSR, 20/20 Vision and FCNL. We will take some time to hear suggestions from everyone at tomorrow's meeting. Then the representatives from those five organizations will remain at the conclusion of the meeting and talk further about the money.

Please call me if you have suggestions for the agenda. And, of course, your initiatives for grassroots efforts are needed. See you on Thursday.

Shalom,
Bob Tiller

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 13 May 1998 12:44:46 +0200
From: wilpf@iprolink.ch (WILPF)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: Abolition Using India Like They Used Us!
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: wilpf@pop.iprolink.ch

DEAR ALL, PLEASE NOTE THE IDEAS OF ROB GREEN IF YOU WANT TO USE ANY OF THE DRAFT I PUT UP - THEY'RE GREAT. THANKS ROB!!

LOVE FLICK

Dear Flick,

Well done! A few suggested *changes* and [deletions] follow in the text.
Great to work with you in Geneva. By the way, if you really want me on the NGO Cttee, I won't resist - but I warn you that I'll be difficult to track down, let alone attend a meeting!

Love & best wishes,
Rob

>
>DRAFT
>
>
>India Did Not Start the Nuclear Arms Race but Abolition 2000 Promises to
>End It!
>
>The Abolition 2000 Network condemns every nuclear test conducted in any
>environment, anywhere in the world. As a network opposed to nuclear testing
>we deeply regret that India, the country that sparked the idea for a Test
>Ban Treaty in 1954, is now ag*g*ressively *blundering* [walking] down the
>nuclear *blind alley* [path].
>
>Nuclear testing by the Bharatiya Janata Party of India sent a message to
>the world that is clear: While nuclear weapons exist and while the
>possession of them denotes political power, nuclear proliferation *is
>almost inevitable* [has and will continue to happen].
>
>Abolition 2000, a global network to eliminate nuclear weapons, made up of
>over 1000 church, union, women's, lawyers & physicians organisations
>believe that*:*
>
>"Our common security requires the complete elimination of nuclear
>weapons.....nuclear weapons states should initiate immediately 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.*"*
>
>The recent Non-Proliferation Treaty Preparatory Committee (*NPT* PrepCom)

>*meeting* ended in deadlock three days before India decided to test 3
>nuclear devices. *Despite two weeks of intensive discussions* [At the two
>week PrepCom held] in Geneva [April 27-May 9], the Nuclear Weapons States
>*(NWS)* failed again, as they have failed for over 50 years, to send *-
>and get -* the [non-proliferation] message that nuclear weapons are *now
>effectively an illegal, militarily useless liability.* [decreasing in
>importance
>for achieving prestige in political forums or for accomplishing military
>objectives. Rather, the intransigence of the nuclear weapons states on the
>issue of nuclear disarmament indicated the very opposite.]
>
>The *NWS* have violated Article *VI* of the *NPT* since it entered into
>force in 1970. *It* [Article 6] reads, "Each of the Parties to the Treaty
>undertakes 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..." *In the World Court's 8 July 1996 Advisory
>Opinion, the judges unanimously reinforced this by deciding that this
>meant that negotiations should be concluded; moreover, the Court went
>further by omitting the clause in Article VI relating to a treaty on
>general and complete disarmament - behind which hitherto the NWS have
>hidden.*
>
>The Abolition 2000 network is also united in its demand for a truly
>*C*omprehensive *T*est *B*an *T*reaty *(CTBT)*, with a zero threshold and
>[with] the stated purpose of precluding nuclear weapons development by all
>states.
>
>*Its Vision* [The Abolition 2000 networking] *S*atement goes further on
>the issue of testing by asserting the need to, "prohibit nuclear weapons
>research,
>design, development, and testing through laboratory experiements 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."
>
>While the *1996* CTBT [agreed in 1996] could have been a significant restraint
>measure, its credibility was immediately weakened by the *NWS using*
>[states that used] the loophole that justified lab testing. India is now
>following the United States, Russia and France down the computer
>simulation path. India's stated position is that the nuclear tests
>conducted, "are expected to carry Indian scientists towards a sound
>computer simulation capability which may be
>supported by sub-critical experiments, if considered necessary."
>
>Will the 1998 PrepCom experience, and now these nuclear tests*,* serve to
>*generate* [foster] the *controlled anger* [impatience necessary] to
>*mobilise* [unite] those determined to see the negotiation of a Nuclear
>Weapons Convention? The Abolition 2000 network says loudly, "YES"!*!* [the
>anti-nuclear community is growing in numbers, in resources, in imagination
>and in power.] According to recent polls *an overwhelming* 87% of all
>Americans *and British - and no less than 93% of Canadians - agree that
>their governments* [think we] should negotiate a treaty to eliminate
>nuclear weapons*, like the widely-acclaimed one for chemical weapons*.
>[87% of the British public support negotiations towards a global ban on

>nuclear weapons, and 75% of Canadians say that the existence of nuclear
>weapons makes the world a more dangerous place.]

>

>*The Abolition 2000 network*, launched in 1995,* [began and] has continued
>to grow as the voices of ordinary citizens join those of *General Lee
>Butler USAF (Ret), in charge of all strategic US nuclear forces from
>1991-94, 60 other Generals and Admirals from 17 countries, over 120
>civilian leaders, the Canberra Commission on Elimination of Nuclear
>Weapons, and the US National Academy of Sciences. In the words of the
>Canberra Commission: "The risks of retaining nuclear arsenals in
>perpetuity far outweigh any possible benefit imputed to deterrence... The
>end of the Cold War has created a new climate for international action to
>eliminate nuclear weapons, a new opportunity. It must be exploited
>quickly or it will be lost."*

>

>

>Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
>International Secretariat
>1, rue de Varembe
>C.P. 28
>1211 Geneva 20
>Tel: +41 22 733 61 75
>Fax: +41 22 740 10 63

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
International Secretariat
1, rue de Varembe
C.P. 28
1211 Geneva 20
Tel: +41 22 733 61 75
Fax: +41 22 740 10 63

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 15:47:18 -0700 (PDT)
From: marylia@igc.org (marylia)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Action Alert/India test response
To: nukenet@envirolink.org
X-Sender: marylia@pop.igc.apc.org (Unverified)

Hi friends (who get some of our newsletter articles electronically). Please take a minute to carry out the two actions listed below. Peace Action (thank you Bruce especially for the ambassador's fax #) and other groups are circulating similar action alerts. The sheer number of responses that we can generate may count, more than we may think!!! Peace, Marylia

Action Alert - India Tests

Monday, as we prepared to go to press, we got the news that India had just tested three nuclear devices (read bombs); one fission, one thermonuclear and one described as low-yield. These tests demonstrate that India's nuclear weapons capabilities have become more advanced since the country's prior nuclear test in 1974. Today's blasts threaten to inflame an arms race on the Asian subcontinent, where Pakistan is nuclear capable and China is a declared nuclear power.

Moreover, the Indian government suggested it would mimic the U.S. with a "stockpile stewardship" program of its own, saying in a prepared press statement that the three tests will "provide a valuable database which is useful in the design of nuclear weapons of different yields for different applications and for different delivery systems. Further, they are expected to carry Indian scientists towards a sound computer simulation capability which may be supported by subcritical experiments, if necessary."

What Can You Do?

1. Write a letter of condemnation to the Indian Embassy c/o Ambassador Naresh Chandra, 2107 Massachusetts Ave., Washington, DC 20008. Or, fax the Ambassador at (202) 265-4351. Be sure to point out that you have long-opposed U.S. nuclear testing, including the subcritical tests and the construction of fusion test facilities like NIF. Tell India that all nuclear tests--in whatever form and in whatever location on the planet--must stop. Nuclear weapons make the whole world less secure, not more.

2. Send the same message to the U.S. government. Hawks may seize upon this as an excuse to press for resumption of a full, underground nuclear test program. Remind them that the U.S. has conducted over a thousand nuclear tests. Urge the U.S. to demonstrate leadership by: ratifying the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty it has already signed; cancelling the dangerous, provocative "Stockpile Stewardship" program and joining the growing movement aimed at global nuclear disarmament.

Marylia Kelley
Tri-Valley CAREs (Citizens Against a Radioactive Environment)

Peace - Justice - Environment since 1983
5720 East Ave. #116, Livermore, CA USA 94550
(510) 443-7148 - phone
(510) 443-0177 - fax

To: abolition-caucus
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Indian nuclear testing is morally wrong
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Abolitionists:

The position of Methodists United for Peace with Justice on Indian nuclear testing derives from the philosophy articulated by Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, in a statement sent to delegates of the 1998 session of the NPT Preparatory Committee. They stated: "Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment...When used as an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt."

Based upon this reasoning, we consider the testing of nuclear weapons by India to be morally wrong and therefore should be condemned. As India uses nuclear weapons as a deterrent, they will hold innocent Chinese and Pakistanis hostage for political purposes. If used in war, Indian nuclear weapons will slaughter innocent people of their enemies. Moreover, India's possession of nuclear weapons will put its own population at greater risk to nuclear attack by China and perhaps soon by Pakistan. Accordingly, I believe that the Abolition 2000 network should condemn Indian nuclear testing unequivocally.

What surprises me is the number of people in the Abolition 2000 network who are making excuses for India, particularly using the argument that the fault lies with the nuclear weapon states, which have failed to carry out their NPT responsibility for nuclear disarmament. While I join in the condemnation of the nuclear weapon states and am trying hard to get the United States to move toward nuclear abolition, I find this particular argument like the child who misbehaves and explains, "the dog made me do it." Nuclear testing is wrong. No excuse can provide adequate justification.

If you accept the argument that India has justification, you are entering the very slippery slope of nuclear proliferation. So is Pakistan now justified to test and deploy nuclear weapons? Can Israel disclose its nuclear arsenal, blame it on Arab hostility, and claim a seat on the UN Security Council? Can Germany argue that since Russia won't eliminate its nuclear arsenal and the U.S. nuclear umbrella may not last forever, it must start a nuclear weapons program? Can Japan make the same argument with regards to China? Can Brazil note that it sat as an observer at the 1998 NPT Preparatory Committee meeting, saw the nuclear weapons states block even discussion of nuclear disarmament, and therefore will re-start its nuclear weapons development program? Can Argentina then respond that it, too, must develop nuclear weapons? This is the endless change of nuclear proliferation when you start admitting that any nation has a legitimate reason for becoming a nuclear weapons state.

Therefore, I believe that the Abolition 2000 network should state clearly that India was wrong in conducting nuclear tests. We should ask India to forgo further tests, sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and cease further development and deployment of nuclear weapons.

We should speak separately to the nuclear weapon states, saying that Indian nuclear testing highlights the necessity for them to move speedily toward nuclear abolition. Otherwise, the global nuclear non-proliferation regime will collapse due to their lack of good-faith performance. We might suggest that an immediate step would be to create an ad hoc committee within the Conference on Disarmament to commence multilateral discussion on global nuclear disarmament. This discussion could lead to negotiations for a nuclear weapons convention. In the meantime the nuclear weapons states should commence taking all their nuclear weapons off alert by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and other means. This task should be completed by December 31, 1999.

In summation, let's address the nuclear weapons states directly for what they must do, but let's also reject India's excuses for nuclear testing, which was a wrongful act.

Shalom,
Howard W. Hallman

To: dkimball@clw.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Request for media support funding
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Daryl:

Because I was in Geneva, I didn't respond to your request for proposals for additional funding for CTBT-related projects. I'm back and am moving ahead with publicity for release of the religious leaders' statement on the CTBT and the relationship with Indian nuclear testing.

We have a proposal from the Rabinowitz firm to help get the statement out to the press for a fee of \$1,500. The First Freedom Forum will put up \$1,000, leaving a balance of \$500 to raise. Yesterday at our meeting we talked about also trying to get the release to newspapers in six states with members on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: Tennessee, Indiana, Kansas, Nebraska, Wyoming, and Oregon. We have signers in all six states. If we ask Rabinowitz to take this assignment, this would be an additional fee of an amount to be determined, perhaps \$500 to \$1,000.

Therefore, I request the decision makers on new CTBT project funds to allocate up to \$1,500 for this purpose.

Please call me if you need more information.

Shalom,
Howard

To: mark_brown@ecunet.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Statement on India and CTBT
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Mark:

Here is some suggested language that might be used by Bishop Anderson.

"The United States should press India to cease further nuclear weapons testing and sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. For the U.S. to play this leadership role, it is essential that the U.S. Senate ratify the treaty."

Modify this as you choose and let me know what we can include in a news release.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <joe@fcnl.org>
X-Sender: joe@local.fcnl.org
Date: Thu, 14 May 1998 17:46:18 -0400
To: mupj@igc.org
From: Joe Volk <joe@fcnl.org>
Subject: sound bytes
Cc: bridget@clark.net

5/14/98

Howard,

Here's my attempt. If these don't work, make up something and get me or Bridget to sign off on the quote:

The strongest possible rebuttal of India's violation of the international moratorium on nuclear weapons test explosions will be the immediate Senate ratification of the CTBT. Frightened by India's mistake and speaking with bravado, Majority Leader Trent Lott and Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee Helms have retreated backward into the 20th century's nuclear nightmare. They are toe-ing up at the old starting line to restart the nuclear weapons race. If that race is run again, we risk crossing the finish line -- this time into thousands of Hiroshimas and Nagasakis here and abroad. Let us hope that the wisdom of the U.S. public will prevail and awaken our Senators to the moral imperative that history must move forward into a 21st century free of the threat of nuclear war. We call on all senators -- Republican and Democrats -- to bring Senators Lott and Helms to their senses. Therefore, U.S. religious leaders across our land join together in an appeal to the Senate to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty now.

U.S. religious leaders call on the U.S. Senate to send the strongest possible signal to India and the rest of the world by immediately ratifying the CTBT. Let the United States be the nation to lead the world, not backwards to the destruction of the nuclear arms race, but forward, to a new century free of the threat of nuclear war.

JV
Joe Volk
Executive Secretary
Friends Committee on National Legislation
245 Second Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002
Phone: 202/ 547-6000
Fax: 202/ 547-6019
E-mail: joe@fcnl.org
Web page: <http://www.fcnl.org/pub/fcnl>

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 4 May 1998 14:11:17 -0700 (PDT)
From: Peace Action - National Office <panukes@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: Re: 40 Years for a CTBT
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org, disarmament@igc.apc.org

Hey,

You might be interested to know that the Senate Foreign Relations committee is meeting as whole only once this week. They will be considering the ambassadors to Jordon and Syria. Other than that the slate for them is pretty clean.

Bruce

>
> To: CTBT Organizers
> From: disarmament
> Subject: 40 Years for a CTBT
>
> Dear CTBT Organizers:
> As I am sure you know, the NATO Expansion vote passed on Thurs.* This
> means that we must push hard now to make sure CTBT is the next major
> foreign policy issue considered by this Senate.
>
> Please work to make sure that a high volume of letters are going to your
> Senators' offices RIGHT NOW - even Senators supportive of the CTBT need
> to hear from us. Urge Senators already supportive of the CTBT to make a
> floor speech, to talk to Helms and Lott to schedule hearings and a vote
> on the CTBT this year. We need everyone's voice calling for a CTBT NOW!
>
>
> * (Despite much hard work that did raise concerns among many Senators,
> the first round of expansion including Poland, Hungary and the Czech
> Republic was approved by the Senate. Peace and Disarmament advocates
> along with other concerned citizens will continue to oppose NATO
> expansion, working against further expansion to the baltics.)
>
> *****
> The WHITE HOUSE CTBT TEST BAN NEWS
> This week marks anniversary of President's letter to Khrushchev, calling
> for efforts to end testing
>
> Forty years ago this week President Eisenhower proposed to Soviet
> Chairman Nikita Khrushchev that technical experts begin work on the
> practical problems involved in achieving an end to nuclear testing.
>
> In the four decades since that April 28, 1958, letter, American
> presidents have worked toward the goal of stopping nuclear testing for
> all time. President Eisenhower hoped to make this his lasting gift to
> the country, and said the failure to achieve a ban on nuclear testing,
> "would have to be classed as the greatest disappointment of any
> administration -- of any decade -- of any time and of any party...."
>

> President Kennedy took up the cause of the test ban. When negotiations
> were concluded on a Limited Test Ban Treaty, President Kennedy addressed
> the American people, calling the Treaty "a shaft of light cut into the
> darkness."
> He continued, "Negotiations were concluded in Moscow on a treaty to ban
> all nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water.
> For the first time, an agreement
>
> has been reached on bringing the forces of nuclear destruction under
> international control. ... This limited treaty will radically reduce the
> nuclear testing which would otherwise be conducted on both sides; it
> will prohibit the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union,
> and all others who sign it, from engaging in the atmospheric tests
> which have so alarmed mankind; and it offers to all the world a welcome
> sign of hope. ... The achievement of this goal is not a victory for one
> side -- it is a victory for mankind. ... It reflects simply our common
> recognition of the dangers in further testing."
>
> President Clinton has taken the final steps toward completing the
> work begun by President Eisenhower and furthered by President Kennedy.
> Upon signing the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty in 1996,
> President Clinton said, "This week ... we take a giant step forward. By
> overwhelming global consensus, we will make a solemn commitment to end
> all nuclear tests for all time. ... This
> Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty will help to prevent the nuclear powers
> from developing more advanced and more dangerous weapons. It will limit
> the ability of other states to acquire such devices themselves. It
> points us toward a century in which the roles and
> risks of nuclear weapons can be further reduced, and ultimately
> eliminated."
>
> The CTBT was transmitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to
> ratification in September 1997. It still awaits action by the Senate.
> In his State of the Union address,
> President Clinton said, "I ask Congress to join me in pursuing an
> ambitious agenda to reduce the serious threat of weapons of mass
> destruction. This year, four decades after it was first proposed by
> President Eisenhower, a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban is within reach
> ... and I ask the Senate to approve it this year."
> Produced by the White House Working Group on the Comprehensive Test Ban
> Treaty
>
> For more information on the CTBT: Phone: 202-647-8677 Fax:
> 202-647-6928
> *****
> FROM:
> Disarmament Clearinghouse
> Kathy Crandall, Coordinator
> 1101 14th Street NW #700
> Washington, DC 20005
> TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232
> FAX: 202 898 0172
> <disarmament@igc.org>
> FOR WHAT YOU CAN DO for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW:

> <http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

Return-Path: <owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>
Date: Tue, 05 May 1998 15:15:08 +0200
From: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Cc: impress@slt.lk
Subject: pov-1: March/April Bulletin from.... Bethlehem!
Sender: owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Reply-To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org

----- Start of message from list: pov-1 ---->

In addition to the seven cities in the Campaign, we continue to encourage other groups, organizations, and cities to join the campaign at a variety of levels, including developing web pages on the issues faced in their region and the response, and developing monthly bulletins to be shared through the Peace to the City Campaign. We have been working especially hard to ensure the participation of a city in the Middle East and in Eastern Europe.

We are now extremely happy to welcome the city of Bethlehem in the campaign thanks to Wi'am: Palestinian Conflict Resolution Center. Following the visit of POV staff coordinator to Bethlehem in January 1998 the members of Wi'am became excited about the Campaign and have now joined. We are very pleased to be able to share their work in nonviolent conflict mediation in the West Bank. We are encouraged by their witness in the land where Jesus was born, their commitment to peacebuilding, and enthusiasm and we appreciate their support.

Bethlehem Peace to the City Campaign
March/April Bulletin

WI AM: BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

Wi'am was created to provide a means for resolving conflict within the Palestinian community at a time when power was being transferred between Israeli occupiers and the Palestinian Authority. Wi'am opened its doors in March of 1995, the result of local initiative and with support from international non-governmental organizations. Catholic Relief Services, DanChurchAid, Diakonia, the Lutheran Church of the Redeemer (English-speaking congregation), Mennonite Central Committee, the Pontifical Mission, Presbyterian Church (USA), United Church of Christ (USA), the World Council of Churches and World Vision are all involved in providing support for the work of Wi'am.

Stalled peace negotiations, state-sponsored as well as terrorist violence, continued human rights violations, economic hardship due to the Israeli-imposed closure and political instability are all regional problems which feed cycles of community violence. There is a growing need here for persons trained in conflict resolution and mediation to resolve disputes.

The strategy of Wi'am is:

- To expand the precedent for nonviolent conflict mediation in the West Bank;
- To train community members from all backgrounds in effective nonviolent conflict mediation;
- To develop youth proficiency in finding alternatives to violence;
- To strengthen women's involvement in formal community leadership;
- To develop the center to accommodate expanding programs;
- To coordinate a network of Palestinian conflict resolution centers throughout the occupied territories.

BENEFICIARIES

The work of Wi'am benefits people of the West Bank from all ages and backgrounds--children, men, women, young couples, employees, employers, students at schools and universities, teachers and community leaders. Since 1995, thousands of people have been directly and indirectly affected by the work of Wi'am. In each mediation, an average of twenty-five persons are directly affected; and because conflicts within the Palestinian community frequently involve extended families, the number of people benefiting from mediated cases swells well beyond those immediately involved. Recognizing the economic and social difficulties facing families within Palestinian society, Wi'am is focusing more of its efforts on young people, women and children.

Since opening its doors in 1995, the center has intervened in over 1000 conflicts, involving:

- Cross-cultural disputes: Israeli-Palestinian disputes in business, transportation, construction
- Israeli military closure-related issues: economic stresses, human rights violations, debt and
- payment disputes, problems exacerbated by unemployment
- Youth delinquency: theft, drug and alcohol abuse, student-administration conflicts, vandalism
- Domestic disputes: abuse, inheritance, tenant-landlord disputes
- Environmental issues: dumping, land and water rights
- Workplace disputes: labor-management conflicts, contractual disagreements

PROJECT OVERVIEWS

Wi'am's program pays particular attention to several new and ongoing projects:

Sulha / Conflict Resolution Project: Wi'am is a nonpartisan center renowned for providing mediation services to the Palestinian population in the West Bank. Sulha, the traditional Arabic method of reconciliation, is used in conjunction with western mediation techniques to resolve conflict. When a severe conflict erupts, a group of mediators responds immediately to establish a binding commitment to nonviolence, to bring the two conflicting parties together in honor and humility, to address the

wrongs done, and to create constructive relationships between the disputants and Wi'am's mediators. When appropriate, Wi'am works in cooperation with the Palestinian Authority. To date, Wi'am has dealt with over 1000 of these cases, successfully resolving 87% of the disputes.

Volunteer Training Project: This is a crucial, ongoing part of the entire program. Wi'am's conflict mediation effort in the West Bank is successful thanks to the commitment of its corps of volunteer mediators. Training workshops are held regularly for Wi'am staff, volunteers, and the general public to improve conflict resolution skills. Experienced representatives from Wi'am have served as trainers in nonviolent mediation programs internationally, most recently in the United States and Germany.

Community Education Project: Wi'am focuses educational and personal development efforts on women and youth. Women Against Violence, a working group within Wi'am, coordinates activities and workshops to address the needs of women in the region, to examine the effects of social violence on women and children, and to advocate formal leadership for women in their communities. Wi'am has also found that constructive approaches to conflict are best learned in youth. Wi'am coordinates conflict resolution training in several secondary schools in the Bethlehem area. The center hosts an ongoing Ecumenical Youth Group and an interfaith gathering, Democracy and Conflict Resolution, for teens. Long-range goals include establishing a community center for Bethlehem youth.

Center Development: Wi'am has only begun to meet the conflict resolution needs of the Palestinian community. Program expansion anticipated for the next decade requires further development of the center's capacity, including administrative staff, office space, personnel and equipment.

News from March 1998

In the Region:

March was another difficult month in the region. On March 10th, three Palestinians were killed and four others wounded when Israeli soldiers opened fire on a commuter van at the Tarkumiya checkpoint, near Hebron. The soldiers claimed that the driver had attempted to run the roadblock and ram his vehicle into Israeli personnel. However, eyewitnesses have stated that the van, full of laborers returning home from work, had already been waved on when the soldiers opened fire. Observers question why the soldiers chose to fire into the windows and cab of the vehicle first, rather than at the tires or into the air. A military investigation has cleared the soldiers of wrongdoing.

This tragedy sparked days of protests and clashes between Israeli soldiers and Palestinians in Hebron, resulting in approximately 100 injured and one more death. A 13-year-old boy was killed on his way home from school after being shot in the head by an Israeli soldier.

On March 13th, four Arabs were hurt in an explosion near Damascus Gate of the Old City of Jerusalem. While investigators have given no

conclusive finding, it has been strongly suspected that Israeli extremists planted the bomb.

On March 29th, the body of a high-ranking member of the militant Islamic group Hamas, Mohi ad-Deen Sharif, was found in the wreckage of an exploded car in Ramallah. It appeared at first glance that Sharif had blown himself up accidentally in the process of transporting an explosive device, but autopsy reports found that he had been shot to death before the explosion. Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu was quick to deny Israeli involvement, while Hamas has called for reprisals against Israel for the assassination. After its own investigation, the Palestinian Authority announced that Sharif's murder was due to internal fighting within Hamas-- a claim denied by Hamas. Israeli troops have remained on full alert.

Responses from other peacemaking NGOs:

Christian Peacemaker Team, Peace Now, Rabbis for Human Rights, the Israeli Committee Against Home Demolitions, Bat Shalom, and individuals from various Christian organizations have moved in protest of the forced eviction and home demolition of the family of Yusif and Zuhur Al-Atrash, in Hebron.

The Al-Atrash home is one of hundreds of Palestinian homes slated for demolition this year. The family has lived legally on the land since Ottoman times, but these homes are often demolished to clear way for new or expanding-- and also illegal-- Israeli settlements. The Al-Atrashes caught international attention recently with their effort to rebuild their home in spite of the standing Israeli demolition order. With volunteer help and contributions, the family began rebuilding immediately after the March 3rd demolition. On March 22nd, Israeli military and police raided the site and journalists who happened to be visiting at the time filmed the brutal assaults on the nonviolent family members. The father, Yusif, mother, Zuhur, and two children were beaten, subdued and arrested.

Contributions eventually managed to raise the exorbitant bails for the family members, and work resumed on the site immediately. It was of particular concern that Zuhur and her 17 year-old daughter-- both unarmed-- had been beaten severely. The daughter was hospitalized several times as a result of kicks to the torso, abdomen and throat she received from soldiers.

Christian Peacemaker Teams (CPT) has accepted an invitation to maintain a 24-hour international presence at the site as work continues. For more information contact the Wi'am Center, or see the CPT website and request CPT Hebron's direct e-mail updates. International grassroots advocacy and letter-writing has played an important role on behalf of the family, and is still very much needed.

Wi'am Center highlights:

In addition to volunteer involvement with the Al-Atrash home demolition protest, Wi'am volunteers and staff were busy in March with a steady increase in sulha and informal conflict resolution efforts in the Bethlehem

area.

Wi'am held an extensive public conference in Bethlehem as part of the Community Education Project. The series focused on the further development of civil democracy in Palestinian society. Participants included members of the Palestinian Authority and leading governmental parties, as well as a surprising and encouraging mixture of representatives from opposition parties, and various grassroots community leaders. This was one of the first and most ambitious of such activities facilitated by Wi'am. The candid, provocative but creative conference surpassed most expectations and raised hopes for the development of future Palestinian leadership.

The Wi'am Center's Director, Zoughbi Zoughbi, participated in a rigorous seminar hosted by the International Center for Ethics, Justice and Public Life at Brandeis University in the US. The purpose of the seminar was to gather community leaders from areas of chronic unresolved conflict, including South Africa, Bosnia, the Middle East and various inner-city locations around the world, and to facilitate co-operative approaches to peacemaking between representatives of opposed communities. Zoughbi's Palestinian-Israeli working group looked at the unresolved issue of the hundreds of unrecognized Arab villages demolished (whose inhabitants were exiled or often murdered) to clear land for the establishment and expansion of the State of Israel in 1948 and 1967. They will continue to meet and develop a special project, to be announced publicly this autumn.

Opinion and Information:

(The views given in this section do not necessarily reflect the views of the Wi'am Center or its staff.)

Scenes from Palestine: By Edward Said

I have just returned from two separate trips to Jerusalem and the West Bank where I have been making a film for the BBC to be shown in England on May 3, and then later in the month on the World Service. The occasion for my film is Israel's 50th anniversary which I am examining from a personal and obviously Palestinian point of view.

But so powerful for me was the experience of going around Palestine and recording what I saw that it seemed to me worthwhile here to reflect a little on the experience itself. Two completely contradictory impressions override all the others. First, that Palestine and Palestinians remain, despite Israel's concerted efforts from the beginning either to get rid of them or to circumscribe them so much as to make them ineffective.

In this, I am confident in saying, we have proved the utter folly of Israel's policy: there is no getting away from the fact that as an idea, a memory, and as an often buried or invisible reality, Palestine and its people have simply not disappeared. The more Israel wraps itself in exclusivity and xenophobia towards the Arabs, the more it assists them in staying on, in fighting its injustices and cruel measures.

This is specially true in the case of Israeli Palestinians, whose main representative in the Knesset is the remarkable Azmi Bishara: I interviewed him at length for the film and was impressed with the courage and intelligence of his stand, which is invigorating a new generation of young Palestinians, whom I also interviewed. For them, as for an increasing number of Israelis (Professor Israel Shahak in the forefront) the real battle is for equality and rights of citizenship.

Contrary to its expressed and implemented intention, therefore, Israel has strengthened the Palestinian presence, even among Israeli Jewish citizens who have simply lost patience with the unendingly shortsighted policy of trying to beat down and exclude Palestinians. No matter where you turn, we are there, often only as humble, silent workers and compliant restaurant waiters, cooks, and the like, but often also as large numbers of people - in Hebron, for example - who continuously resist Israeli encroachments on their lives. The second overriding impression is that minute by minute, hour by hour, day after day, we are losing more and more Palestinian land to the Israelis. There wasn't a road, or a bypassing highway, or a small village that we passed in our travel for three weeks that wasn't witness to the daily tragedy of land expropriated, fields bulldozed, trees, plants, and crops uprooted, houses destroyed, while the Palestinian owners stood by, helpless to do much to stop the onslaught, unassisted by Mr Arafat's Authority, uncared for by more fortunate Palestinians.

It is important not to underestimate the damage that is being done, the violence to our lives that will ensue, the distortions and misery that result. There is nothing quite like the feeling of sorrowful helplessness that one feels listening to a young man who has spent fifteen years working as an illegal day labourer in Israel in order to save up money to build a little house for his family, only to discover one day upon returning from work that the house has been reduced to a pile of rubble, flattened by an Israeli bulldozer with everything still inside the house.

When you ask why this was done - the land, after all, was his - you are told that there was no warning, only a paper given to him the next day by an Israeli soldier stating that he had built the structure without a licence. Where in the world, except under Israeli authority, are people required to have a licence (which is always denied them) before they can build on their own property? Jews can build, but never Palestinians. This is racist apartheid in its purest form.

I once stopped on the main road from Jerusalem to Hebron to record on film an Israeli bulldozer, surrounded and protected by soldiers, ploughing through some fertile land just alongside the road. About a hundred meters away stood four Palestinian men, looking both miserable and angry. It was their land, I was told, which they had worked for generations, now being destroyed on the pretext that it was needed to widen an already wide road built for the settlements. "Why do they need a road that will be 120 meters wide; why can't they let me go on farming my land?" asked one of them plaintively. "How am I going to feed my children?"

I asked the men whether they received any warning that this was going to be done. No, they said, we just heard today and when we got here it

was too late. What about the Authority? I asked, has it helped? No of course not, was the answer. They're never here when we need them. I went over to the Israeli soldiers who at first refused to talk to me in the presence of cameras and microphones.

But I kept insisting, and was lucky to find one who clearly seemed troubled by the whole business, even though he said he was merely following orders. "But don't you see how unjust it is to take land from farmers who have no defence against you,?" I said, to which he replied, "it's not their land really. It belongs to the state of Israel." I recall saying to him that sixty years ago the same arguments were made against Jews in Germany, and now here were Jews using it against their victims, the Palestinians. He moved away, unwilling to respond.

And so it is throughout the territories and Jerusalem, with Palestinians powerless to help each other. I gave a lecture at the University of Bethelehem in which I spoke about the continuous dispossession that was taking place, and wondered why those 50,000 security people employed by the Authority, plus the thousands more who sit behind desks, pushing paper from one side of their desks to the other, cashing handsome cheques at the end of each month, why they were not out there on the land helping to prevent the expropriations, helping the people whose livelihood was being taken from them before their eyes?

One night I came back from filming all day and discovered that the hotel restaurant was sponsoring a Valentine's Day dinner at \$38 (yes, \$38) per person. I was told that since I didn't have a reservation I couldn't be served, but I insisted that as a guest in the hotel I was at least entitled to a sandwich or something equally simple. I was shown a table in the corner and duly served a plate of rice and vegetables.

A moment or two later I saw a Palestinian minister enter the room with seven guests, and sit at a prominent table weighted down with the seven-course Valentine's Day menu, plus wine, and drinks for all.

I was so sickened by the sight of this large, fat, smiling man who spends so much time "negotiating" with donor countries and with the Israelis, eating away happily while his people were losing their livelihood a few meters away, that I left the room in disgust and shame. He had arrived in a gigantic Mercedes; his bodyguards and driver - three of them - were sitting in the hotel lobby eating bananas, while their great leader stuffed himself inside. This is one reason why wherever I went, whoever I talked to, whatever the question, there was never a good word for the Authority or its officers.

It is perceived basically as guaranteeing security for Israel and its settlers, furnishing them with protection, not at all as a legitimate, or concerned, or helpful governmental body vis-a- vis its own people. That at the same time so many of these leaders should think it appropriate to build gigantically ostentatious villas during a period of such widespread penury and misery fairly boggles the mind. If it is to be anything today, leadership for the Palestinian people must demonstrate service and sacrifice, precisely those two things so lacking in the Authority.

What I found staggering is the absence of care, that is, the sense that each Palestinian is alone in his or her misery, with no one so much as concerned to offer food, blankets, or a kind word. Truly one feels that Palestinians are an orphaned people. Jerusalem is overwhelming in its continuing, unrelenting Judaization. The small, compact city in which I grew up over fifty years ago, has become an enormously spread-out metropolis, surrounded on the north, south, east and west by immense building projects that testify to Israeli power and its ability, unchecked, to change the character of Jerusalem. Here too there is a manifest sense of Palestinian powerlessness, as if the battle is over and the future settled.

Most people I spoke to said that after the tunnel episode of last September they no longer felt the need to demonstrate against Israeli practices, nor to expose themselves to more sacrifice. "After all," one of them told me, "sixty of us were killed, and yet the tunnel remained open, and Arafat went to Washington, despite having said that he would not meet with Netanyahu unless the tunnel was closed. What is the point of struggling now?" It is not only the Palestinian leadership that has failed in Jerusalem: it is also the Arabs, the Islamic states, and Christianity itself, which bows before Israeli aggression. Few Palestinians from Gaza or the West Bank (i.e. from cities like Ramallah, Hebron, Bethlehem, Jenine and Nablus) can enter Jerusalem, which is cordoned off by Israeli soldiers. Apartheid once again.

On the Israeli side the situation is not as bleak as one would have expected. I conducted a long interview with Professor Ilan Pappé of Haifa University. He is one of the new Israeli historians whose work on 1948 has challenged Zionist orthodoxy on the refugee problem, and on Ben Gurion's role in making the Palestinians leave. In this, of course, the new historians have confirmed what Palestinian historians and witnesses have said all along - that there was a deliberate military campaign to rid the country of as many Arabs as possible.

But what Pappé also said is that he is very much in demand for lectures in high schools all over Israel, even though the latest textbook for classes on Israel's history simply make no mention of the Palestinians at all. This blindness coexisting with a new openness regarding the past, characterizes the present mood, but deserves our attention as a contradiction to be deepened and analysed further. I spent a day filming in Hebron, which strikes me as embodying all the worst aspects of Oslo. A small handful of settlers, numbering no more than about 200 people, virtually control the heart of an Arab city whose population of over 100,000 is left on the margins, unable to visit the city centre, constantly under threat from militants and soldiers alike. I visited the house of a Palestinian in the old Ottoman quarter. He is now surrounded by settler bastions, including three new buildings that have gone up around him, plus three enormous water tanks that steal most of the city's water for the settlers, plus several rooftop nests of soldiers. He was very bitter about the Palestinian leadership's willingness to accept the town's partition on the entirely specious grounds that it had once contained 14 Jewish buildings dating back to Old Testament times but no longer in evidence. "How did these Palestinian negotiators accept such a grotesque distortion of the reality," he asked me angrily, "especially in

that at the time of the negotiations not one of them had ever set foot in Hebron when they negotiated the deal?"

Perhaps the most unexpected highpoint of experiences with Israelis was an interview I held with Daniel Barenboim, the brilliant conductor and pianist who was in Jerusalem for a recital at the same time I was there for the film. Born and raised in Argentina, Barenboim came to Israel in 1950 at the age of nine, lived there for about eight years, and has been conducting the Berlin State Opera and the Chicago Symphony Orchestra - two of the world's greatest musical institutions- for the last ten years. I should also say that over the past few years he and I have become close personal friends. He was very open in our interview and regretted that 50 years of Israel should also be the occasion of 50 years of suffering for the Palestinian people; during our discussion he openly advocated a Palestinian state, and after his Jerusalem recital to a packed audience, he dedicated his first encore to the Palestinian woman - present at the recital - who had invited him to dinner the night before. I was surprised that the entire audience of Israeli Jews (she and I were the only Palestinians present) received his views and the noble dedication with enthusiastic applause. Clearly a new constituency of conscience is beginning to emerge, partly as a result of Netanyahu's excesses, partly as a result of Palestinian resistance. What I found extremely heartening is that Barenboim, one of the world's greatest musicians, has offered his services as a pianist to Palestinian audiences, a gesture of reconciliation that is truly worth more than dozens of Oslo accords.

So I conclude these brief scenes from Palestinian life today. I regret not having spent time among refugees in Lebanon and Syria, and I also regret not having many hours of film at my disposal. But at this moment it seems important that we testify to the resilience and continued potency of the Palestinian cause, which clearly has influenced more people in Israel and elsewhere than we have hitherto supposed. Despite the gloom of the present moment, there are rays of hope indicating that the future may not be as bad as many of us have supposed. - Copyright Edward Said, 1998

=====
Wi'am Center
P.O. Box 326
Bethlehem, West Bank
Email: alastah@planet.edu
Web: www.planet.edu/~alastah

----- End of message from list: pov-1 ---->

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Tue, 5 May 1998 11:39:53 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: Berger on CTBT & START/ABM

May 5, 1998

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball, Exec. Director

RE: Berger renews call for Senate action on CTBT this year; support for START/ABM protocols

At an address this morning to the Business Executives for National Security Meeting at Georgetown University, the President's National Security Advisor Sandy Berger delivered an address exclusively devoted to nuclear arms control and nuclear risk reduction priorities of the nation -- the first by a senior Clinton administration official since January 1995.

To briefly summarize, he described the important arms control agreements that have been reached in recent years (START I, START II, START III framework, START II/ABM protocols, NPT extension, CTBT, etc.) and noted that, as in the past under other administrations, the future course of events depend very much on action by the respective legislatures of the U.S. and Russia. Noted that the direction of arms control "could be decided in the next few months" as five agreements (CTBT and the four START II/ABM protocols) are debated by the legislatures. He said: "the future is now for arms control."

On the CTBT, he said that the Senate needs to do what the President has asked -- to provide its advice and consent on the Treaty this year. He argued that the package of START II/ABM protocols agreed to in 1997 are in the U.S. national security interest. He said that the ABM demarcation protocol would provide clarity about what TMD systems are permitted under the ABM Treaty. He said U.S. and Russian implementation of the START process will not be possible unless we adhere to the ABM Treaty.

A verbatim copy of the address will be sent later today by e-mail and will be posted on the Coalition's web site.

DK

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: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Tue, 5 May 1998 16:58:01 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: news on Berger speech; text avail.

May 5, 1998

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball, Executive Director

The following Reuters article is based on this morning's address by the President's National Security Advisor Sandy Berger to the Business Executives for National Security Meeting at Georgetown University. The address was exclusively devoted to nuclear arms control and nuclear risk reduction priorities of the nation -- the first such speech by a senior Clinton administration official since January 1995. The story focuses on the ABM aspects of the speech.

Also attached is the Coalition's news release concerning Berger's call for Senate action on the CTBT this year.

A full copy of Berger's speech is available on the Coalition's CTBT site at <<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

DK

Reuters 05/05 1502

Berger says no Russian nuke cuts without ABM pact

By Patrick Worsnip

WASHINGTON- National Security Adviser Sandy Berger Tuesday warned congressional foes of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty that Russia would not carry out strategic arms cuts unless the treaty was observed.

In a speech to defense industry executives, Berger also renewed the administration's push for Senate ratification this year of a global nuclear test ban treaty.

Berger's speech at Georgetown University came amid fresh efforts in the Senate to craft a bill that would make it U.S. policy to deploy a nationwide missile defense system that Moscow fears would spell doom for the ABM Treaty.

The 1972 treaty between the United States and the former Soviet Union, which limits the ability of each side to deploy anti-missile defenses, has been seen by successive governments in Washington and Moscow as the basis of nuclear deterrence.

But some in Congress believe it is outdated and curbs U.S. ability to defend itself from attack by "rogue states."

Berger warned that continued observation of the treaty was vital if there were to be further Russian missile cuts under strategic arms agreements known as START, of which two have been signed and a third is under consideration.

"Further progress on START ... won't happen unless we adhere to the ABM Treaty," he said.

"There is no reason to believe that Russian political and military leaders will agree to sharply reduce strategic nuclear missiles in the absence of the ABM Treaty's constraints on defenses against those missiles," he said.

After years of delay, the Russian Duma (parliament) is now showing signs that it may vote in the next two months on ratification of the START-2 treaty, which cuts U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear warheads to 3,000-3,500 apiece.

President Clinton and Russian President Boris Yeltsin have also sketched out a START-3 treaty that would further reduce the warheads to 2,000-2,500 each. Berger said Clinton wanted this in place before his term ends in 2001.

An American Missile Protection Act currently pending in the Senate would make it U.S. policy to deploy a national missile defense system "as soon as is technologically possible."

The administration has said only it is working on such a system and will decide in 2000 whether there is a missile threat to the United States that would warrant its deployment three years later.

Meanwhile, the Pentagon is working on a much more limited theater missile defense program to protect its troops and bases around the world from attack by short-range missiles.

Two agreements signed with Russia last September define which theater missile defense systems are allowed under the ABM treaty and Clinton has said he will submit these to the Senate for ratification once the Duma ratifies START-2.

Arms control experts say some senators would like to vote down these agreements in hopes of undermining the ABM Treaty, which Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms, a North Carolina Republican, has said needs a "thorough review" this year.

But Berger, who flies to Moscow Wednesday for talks to prepare a Clinton-Yeltsin meeting at next week's Group of Seven summit in England, described these and related agreements that will also be put to the Senate as essential.

He also called on the Senate to ratify this year the 1996 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty that has so far been signed by 149 nations.

Helms, in a letter to Clinton in January, said the treaty was "very low on the (Foreign Relations) committee's list of priorities" because, he said, it had no chance of entering into force for at least a decade.

But Berger said Senate failure to act on the treaty "would open the door further to regional nuclear arms races and a much more dangerous world".

The timing of Berger's remarks appeared dictated by the fact that the Senate last week cleared its main piece of security legislation by approving the expansion of NATO.

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS NEWS RELEASE

"Nuclear Experts Support Action on Test Ban Treaty:
Endorse National Security Advisor's Renewed Call for Senate Vote in 1998"

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: May 5, 1998
CONTACT: Daryl Kimball, (202) 546-0795, extension 136

(May 5, 1998, WASHINGTON, DC) Today, a broad coalition of nuclear security and arms control organizations praised National Security Advisor Samuel Berger's renewed call for Senate approval of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in 1998. Berger made the comments in a speech delivered today.

"Mr. Berger's call for Senate action on the CTBT marks the beginning of a dialogue with the Senate leadership that we hope will lead to the Senate's approval of this longest-sought, hardest-fought nuclear threat reduction Treaty," said John Isaacs, President of Council for a Livable World. "For decades, the American public has consistently supported a nuclear test ban treaty. It would be very difficult for the Senate to ignore that support," added Isaacs. The most recent national public opinion survey indicates that 70% of the American public supports approval of the nuclear test ban. (The Mellman Group, September 1997).

Earlier this year, the President called on the Senate to approve the CTBT in 1998. However, Senator Jesse Helms, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, so far has refused to hold hearings on the Treaty. He suggests that the U.S. should resume nuclear testing. In January, a Helms spokesperson said "Chairman Helms has been supportive of the need for nuclear testing"

The Treaty, which bans all "nuclear weapon test explosions and all other nuclear explosions," has been signed by 149 countries, including the five declared nuclear weapon states. The Treaty would make it much harder for countries with advanced nuclear weapons, including Russia and China, to produce new and more threatening types of nuclear weapons. The Treaty would also help prevent nuclear proliferation because it would prevent nations seeking nuclear arms — like Iran and Iraq — from making smaller nuclear warheads, which are more easily deliverable by ballistic missiles.

A key issue in Senate hearings will concern how to maintain the U.S. nuclear arsenal without nuclear testing. "Current nuclear weapons are safe, secure

and reliable. Numerous independent reports and weapons data indicate that further underground explosive nuclear testing is not needed to maintain the arsenal," said Tom Cochran, a senior scientist at the Natural Resources Defense Council.

"Failure to act on the Test Ban Treaty this year would severely undermine U.S. leadership efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons worldwide," noted Tom Z. Collina, Director of Arms Control and International Security Programs at the Union of Concerned Scientists. "U.S. ratification of the Test Ban Treaty is essential to help persuade nations like India and Pakistan from conducting nuclear tests and building-up advanced nuclear arsenals," Collina added.

"The United States Senate -- and the Republican Party in particular -- is faced with an important decision," observed Daryl Kimball, Executive Director of the Coalition. "They must decide whether they are on the side of resuming nuclear bomb blasts and greater nuclear dangers, or securing the test ban and stopping the proliferation of nuclear weapons," said Kimball.

###

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: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>
Date: Wed, 06 May 1998 14:22:25 +0200
From: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Cc: impress@slt.lk
Subject: pov-1: Bulletin from the Colombo, Sri Lanka Peace to the City
Campaign
Sender: owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Reply-To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org

----- Start of message from list: pov-1 ---->

Colombo Peace to the City Campaign
April 1998 Bulletin

A new initiative undertaken by the National Peace Council (NPC) and FES was to take local elected Sinhalese Politicians from the Matara District in the extreme South of the country, to the Tamil-majority Batticaloa district in the east. This three day visit received a great deal of publicity in the Tamil press. The two largest circulation Tamil newspapers, the Virakesari and the Thinakural carried front page headlines and an editorial on the visit. The Sinhalese Politicians met with locally elected Tamil Politicians in the Eastern Batticaloa district.

The local level Sinhalese politicians who went to Batticaloa belonged to both the ruling People's Alliance and the main opposition party, the United National Party. This was in accordance with the NPC policy of conducting its work with politicians on a strictly bipartisan basis. They had earlier undergone several sensitisation workshops on the ethnic conflict with the NPC and had participated in the 1700 strong National Peace Delegates Convention held in January 1998 which passed a resolution calling for an immediate end to the war and for negotiations between the government and LTTE.

The Sinhalese politicians had a "baptism of fire" in regard to the thinking in Tamil-Majority areas which are in the war zone, when a careless remark by one of them at an introductory meeting sparked off an angry response. An appeal from a Sinhala politicians that "we should live in peace" was angrily rebutted by a young Tamil women who retorted with the demand "first give us our rights, and then we will talk about peace". This led the Sinhalese delegation to the conclusion that their main role was not to talk, but to listen. If they listened, and felt they understood, then only would they make their own observations.

The interaction between the Tamil and Sinhalese politicians proceeded smoothly after this early change of heart among the latter, who were also humbled by the difficulties of life, retarded development and military presence they saw in the Eastern area due to the war. The relationship building process also took off due to the skillful facilitation role by the NPC staff.

A workshop which was one of the activities in the programme began with a stark reminder of the separateness of the participants where conversations had to be translated back and forth, between Sinhala and Tamil leading to a comment that "this looks and feels as if delegations from two different countries are meeting".

The workshop while also acting as a forum for the sharing of difficulties faced by the local level elected politicians in exercising powers that are supposed to be vested in them by the central govt, mainly dealt with ways in which local communities can work towards realising the goal of a negotiated peace. Frustrations that emerged about 'endless talk at the top' led to identifying the need to built understanding and consensus at a community level while reinforcing the need for political leadership. As one Tamil politician summed it up "the PA and UNP should sit together under the Gandhi statue in Batticaloa, say we are willing to talk this thing through and invite the LTTE to join. If national leaders cannot do this, can local level representatives animate this as a beginning?" A Sinhala politician drew strength from his own experience of conflict resolution training by the NPC and said that "we who constitute this delegation - PA and UNP - were like snake and mongoose a few months ago. Today we have traveled to the war zone together and are in dialogue with you. It is a process that can easily be extended to the LTTE as well".

One of the highlights of the visit was a simulated "negotiation" carried out by the two sides with respect to a political solution to the conflict. The Tamil politicians presented their view of the powers that should be vested in the North-East region which would be Tamil dominated and in claimed as the "Tamil Homeland". After scrutinising the list presented, the Sinhala politicians objected, and said that according to this list, virtually nothing had been left for the central government. The Tamil politicians accepted this as a legitimate objection, and began to revise their list. The process could not be completed because the workshop had to come to an end, but the point was made, that a combination of sincerity, political will and dialogue can bring about a mutually acceptable compromise.

On the way back to Matara, the Sinhalese politicians discussed the three days they had spent in the east. They agreed that what the NPC had put across at the earlier sensitisation workshops had turned out to be the reality. They also felt encouraged that through dialogue a mutual change in positions had been possible. They hoped that what they had shown was possible at the "Micro-level" might also be possible at the "Macro-level" between the government and LTTE.

Return visits by persons from the east, who will spend a week each in the south have been planned and a working committee comprising politicians from the two districts was established with the objective of extending this process to local government bodies throughout the country.

National Peace Council
291/50 Havelock Gardens
Colombo 6
Phone/Fax: +94-1-594378, 502522
Email: peace2@sri.lanka.net

<http://peace-srilanka.org/city.htm>

Colombo Peace to the City Campaign Local Coordinator:
Priyanka Mendis
impress@slt.lk

----- End of message from list: pov-1 ---->

Return-Path: <wagingpeace@napf.org>
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com
Date: Wed, 06 May 1998 13:50:22 -0700
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
Subject: Subscribe Religious WG

Dear Howard Hallman,

Would you please subscribe a2000@silcom.com to the listserv for the A2000 Religious Working Group.

Thank you very much.

Christoph Hanterman

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-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>
Date: Thu, 07 May 1998 11:36:05 +0200
From: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Cc: impress@slt.lk
Subject: pov-1: Bulletin from the Suva, Fiji, Peace to the City Campaign
Sender: owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Reply-To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org

----- Start of message from list: pov-1 ---->

Suva Peace to the City Campaign
LALI NEWSLETTER -April 1998
(Lali is a Fijian word for hollowed tree trunk. This is used in traditional Fijian life to summon meetings including church services.)

Contents:

1. Interfaith Search- working for peace between different faiths and denominations
2. Citizens Constitutional Forum launches 'Popular Guide' to the Constitution.
3. Interfaith Search Outreach.. Peace to the cities, town ships, settlements

1. Interfaith Search- working for peace between different faiths and denominations

A handbook of learning exercises for use in multi-cultural Fiji is one of the main achievements of the People for Intercultural Awareness (PIA). The handbook was launched by the Permanent Secretary for Education in July, 1996 and has been described as his ministry as a "very useful tool for helping pupils develop social and intercultural skills".

The handbook includes exercises which allow students to explore why people of different cultures do things differently, and how this can enhance cooperation, rather than divide Fiji's peoples. Each exercise takes about 40 minutes, and progresses from encouraging students to be positive about their own and others' cultures, to understanding discrimination by experiencing it. It also includes rules of good behaviour in different cultures.

PIA says it tries to encourage us to take responsibility for improving situations rather than blaming others for what is wrong. It also aims to counteract prejudicial attitudes which communities give their children while they are still open and idealistic.

The author is Father Frank Hoare, a Columban priest from Ireland who came to Fiji in 1973. Father Hoare has visited schools around the country, including Sigatoka, Ba, Nadi, Vatukoula and Tavua promoting the handbook to secondary school teachers. It has been promoted and sold by other PIA members in Vanua Levu, Suva, Lautoka and Navua.

PIA is an independent voluntary organisation dedicated to improving community relations in Fiji. It believes the promotion of tolerance and mutual understanding within the national community as essential for peace and prosperity in the future.

PIA also began work with other community organisations under the umbrella of the Peace Network. A joint training weekend with a convener in conflict reconciliation from Northern Ireland was held last year, but not much has been done since then.

PIA has also discussed its work with delegates to a Fiji Council of Social Services convention, a workshop for Catechists and with primary school teachers.

2. Citizens Constitutional Forum launches 'Popular Guide' to the Constitution.

Who knows or even cares about the Constitution of one's country in the normal course of events? Most people never give it a thought. Even concerned, civic-minded people who follow parliamentary proceedings diligently and discuss politicians' words and actions, rarely have the need to refer to the country's Constitution. However Fiji's experience of three years without a Constitution, being governed by military and interim government decrees, made us aware of the value of a constitutional framework.

The events of 1987 made us realise there was almost total ignorance of the 1970 Constitution, particularly in regard to the provisions it contained for protection of indigenous Fijian interests. The CCF has taken steps to ensure that such ignorance will not contribute political upheavals such as those of 1987, by publishing a user-friendly version of the new 1997 Constitution.

The most important information about the Fiji Constitution is available in a small, readable book, brightened with lively illustrations.

'Your Constitution Your Rights' explains that the Constitution is the highest law of Fiji, which the Government and all the people of Fiji must follow. It promotes what is especially significant from the values people find most important, and acts as a basis for the Government.

As the book says, the Constitution can only go so far towards protecting your rights. It is up to each of us how we exercise these rights and responsibilities. An informed public is the best guardian of civil liberties and the best way to fight against false propaganda.

The section called 'The Constitution at a glance' is amongst the most useful. It gives a brief outline of what topics are in each chapter of the Constitution. The text, while clear, avoids being simplistic. It is backed with illustrations which make the points in more colloquial local language.

The final section includes some useful addresses of non-government

organisations and public officers such as the Public Legal Advisor, which many people do not even know exist.

The text was written by Kushma Ram and the drawings done by Steven Ratuva, two of Fiji's committed citizens now studying abroad for higher degrees.

The booklet was launched by Prime Minister Sitiveni Rabuka on February 21st this year. It is now being translated into Fijian and Hindi and it is hoped it will be distributed in schools throughout the country. It was inspired by the publication titled 'You and the Constitution' produced by the South African Constitutional Assembly and funded with some assistance from outside agencies.

3. Interfaith Search Outreach... Peace to the cities, townships, settlements By Sister Bertha Hurley

As coordinator of Interfaith Search Fiji, one of my aims for 1998 is to extend our outreach beyond Suva city. A visit to Labasa, the main town on the second largest island of Fiji for a religious ceremony, offered me the opportunity to do just this.

The Catholic ceremony was held in Sister Shankuntla's home village, Naleba, which for me is an interfaith village. Her taking of the vows ceremony was an intercultural service. It was in Hindi, incorporating aspects of the Indian culture, presided over by a Fijian priest whose command of Hindi surprised many, and involved both Indians and Fijians. Hindu and Muslim neighbours had helped with the preparations and on the day itself, some participated at the service while others were behind the scenes, preparing the food to be served at the gathering. It was a very special day for all those present.

I extended my stay in Labasa to allow for some outreach activities. I spoke to Form Five and Six students at a secondary school, about half were Indians representing the major religions here in Fiji, while the other half were Fijians and other races, mainly Christians of various denominations. The principal who was present at my talk was impressed by our aims and work and saw the value of sharing these with staff and all the students. So the next day I returned to address the school assembly. The interest of students was obvious and several of the staff from both Christian and Hindu backgrounds commented on the principles held by Interfaith Search Fiji and what they offered to the wider community.

I later spoke with the staff at a primary school, also interracial and interreligious in composition. Again there was great interest and afterwards a young Indian woman who herself is in an interreligious marriage, approached me. She was keen to have an active branch of Interfaith Search set up in Labasa and was willing to act as the coordinator, organising and contacting people. We have had interfaith prayer gatherings in Labasa on occasions, but there is no organised group at present. Now that we have a volunteer to coordinate this work,

I hope things will begin to move in the north.

Before leaving Vanua Levu I returned to Naleba to speak to interested people there.

I returned to Suva with a sense of hope.

Local Coordinator for the Suva Peace to the City Campaign:

Amelia Rokotuivuna

Pacific Regional YWCA

24 Disraeli Road

P.O. Box 3940

Samabula, Fiji

Phone: +679-301-352, 304-961

FAX: +679-301-222

Email: pac-ywca@sopacsun.sopac.org.fj

<http://www.sopac.org.fj/others/pac-ywca/suva-peace.htm>

----- End of message from list: pov-1 ---->

Return-Path: <owner-sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com>
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com
Date: Fri, 08 May 1998 16:36:48 -0700
To: sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
Subject: (sunflower-napf) The Sunflower, No. 12, May 1998
Sender: owner-sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com

=====
THE SUNFLOWER
=====

ISSUE NO. 12, MAY 1998
NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION
=====

The Sunflower is a free monthly electronic newsletter providing educational information on nuclear weapons abolition and other issues relating to peace in the Nuclear Age.

=====
IN THIS ISSUE
=====

NEWS

*NUCLEAR WEAPONS ABOLITION

NPT Preparatory Committee
World Conference of Mayors Joins Abolition 2000

*CTBT AND NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROLIFERATION

Washington is Ambiguous About CTBT
U.S. Tritium Production
U.S. Government Lied About NIF Hazards
Asian Financial Crisis May Add to Proliferation Risks

*FUELING THE ARMS RACE

Arms Race on the Indian Sub-Continent
China Considers MIRVing Its Missiles

*RADIATION EFFECTS

Chernobyl Anniversary
Radiation Victims in Kazakhstan

*NATO NEWS

Senate Approves NATO Expansion

*PRISON NEWS

ACTIONS YOU CAN TAKE

DATES TO REMEMBER

EVENTS

RESOURCES & DOCUMENTS
=====

"The time, place, and circumstances of a specific accident are no more predictable for nuclear weapons than for other accidents. Nonetheless, as long as there is a finite, nonzero, annual probability that an accidental launch will occur, then given sufficient time, the probability of such a launch approaches certainty."

-- Lachlan Forrow, M.D. et al,
"Accidental Nuclear War - A Post-Cold War Assessment,"
New England Journal of Medicine 338, no. 18 (April 30, 1998)

=====
NUCLEAR WEAPONS ABOLITION
=====

NPT Preparatory Committee

Member states of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty met recently in Geneva for their second Preparatory Committee (NPT PrepCom). Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and citizen movements that are part of the Abolition 2000 Global Network have presented their positions to NPT PrepCom delegates. Abolition 2000 distributed an information packet for NPT delegates calling for progress on nuclear disarmament. Press briefings, documents, speeches, etc. are accessible on the following web-sites:

<http://www.basicint.org/PrepCom98.htm>

<http://www.gn.apc.org/acronym/nptdesc.htm>

<http://www3.itu.int/ipb/prepcom.htm>

<http://www.wagingpeace.org/npt98/>

World Conference of Mayors Joins Abolition 2000

In a letter to Ablition 2000 on April 23, Takashi Hiraoka, Mayor of Hiroshima and President of the World Confrence, wrote: "I am pleased to inform you that the World Conference of Mayors for Peace through Inter-city Solidarity hereby express our official support for Abolition 2000." The World Conference represents 427 municipalities in 99 countries and joins with about 1,064 other organizations and 191 municipalities in committing to the goals of Abolition 2000.

|- For municipality resolutions see: <http://www.wagingpeace.org/ab2000city.html>

Abolition 2000 is a global network of over 1,000 NGOs working toward the goal of nuclear weapons abolition.

|- To learn more about Abolition 2000, go to <http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/>

|- To add your voice or to start your own signature campaign, please down-load a petition from <http://www.wagingpeace.org/hardcopypetition.html>.

CTBT AND NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROLIFERATION

Washington is Ambiguous About CTBT

While Britain and France became the first nuclear powers to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) on April 6, Jesse Helms (R-NC), the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is single-handedly blocking consideration of the CTBT by the U.S. Senate. The Clinton administration supports ratification but maintains that continuing "sub-critical" nuclear tests and establishing a "virtual" nuclear testing capability are prerequisites for the U.S. to do so. (AP 980406/07)

U.S. Tritium Production

Members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, citing concerns over international nuclear weapons proliferation, expressed reservations about the U.S. using a commercial nuclear reactor to produce tritium for atomic weapons. Tritium is needed to increase the yield of nuclear weapons. The U.S. interest in continued tritium production may indicate an interest in holding on to nuclear weapons for a long time. Under questioning from Senator Strom Thurmond (R-SC), former Energy Secretary Frederico Pena told the committee his staff is conducting an interdepartmental study with the Departments of Defense and State. Pena said some analysts believe tritium should not be classified as a nuclear material and the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) reactors might not be, in the strictest sense, commercial reactors. (TCH 980327)

U.S. Government Lied About NIF Hazards

Citizen's Watch reported in March that the U.S. government deliberately kept the public in the dark regarding the dangers and costs of operating the National Ignition Facility (NIF) at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in Northern California. Newly-declassified, official reports detail long-standing plans by high-ranking scientists at Livermore Lab, the Dept. of Energy (DOE) and the Dept. of Defense (DOD), among others, to use plutonium, uranium

and lithium hydride in experiments at the NIF, once it's completed in 2003. A stack of reports, dating from 1991 to 1997, was declassified due to the lawsuit by a coalition of 39 plaintiff organizations to force DOE to provide a legally-adequate review regarding the risks of, and alternatives to, NIF and the rest of the "Stockpile Stewardship" program. According to the documents, these experiments could involve substantial changes to NIF's design, its price tag, its hazard rating and its waste streams. A report on nuclear weapons effects testing with NIF shows an increase of \$300 million for just one of the proposed additions. (CW 9803)

|- For excellent up-to-date information on NIF and Stockpile Stewardship see:

|- <http://sfnewmexican.symtezzi.com/> or <http://www.sfnewmexican.com/>

Asian Financial Crisis May Add to Proliferation Risks

In 1994 North Korea agreed to place under international safeguards some material that could be used to produce nuclear bombs. Part of the deal was that North Korea would get two new nuclear reactors to replace a Soviet reactor that produced weapons-grade plutonium. The new reactors, estimated to cost \$5.1 billion over 10 years, are financed by an international consortium headed by the United States, Japan and South Korea. Due to the financial crisis in Asia, both Seoul and Tokyo are facing problems receiving parliamentary approval for their shares of the costs (70% for South Korea and 20% for Japan). The Clinton administration may ask the U.S. Congress for an appropriation for the North Korea project unless it wants to scuttle the agreement as some Republican critics are calling for. (LAT 980410)

=====

FUELING THE ARMS RACE

=====

Arms Race on the Indian Sub-Continent

Pakistan announced that it has successfully test-fired a medium-range 1,000-mile surface-to-surface missile that is believed to be capable of carrying a nuclear warhead. India responded by announcing its "Prithvi" medium-range missile could reach anywhere in Pakistan and was ready to meet any threat to its security. India's missile was tested in 1996 and has been deployed along the border with Pakistan. Pakistan named its medium-range missile after Ghauri, a 12th century Afghan emperor who attacked India and defeated a Hindu prince named Prithvi. Pakistan's medium-range missile appears to be based on smuggled North Korean technology. (Reuters 980407, NYT 980503)

China Considers MIRVing Its Missiles

According to Air Force Gen. Eugene Habiger, commander of the U.S. Strategic Command, China's new Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs) are capable of hitting all parts of the U.S. except southern Florida. China is also "looking at putting in a new system with multiple independent re-entry vehicles" or MIRVs, he said. MIRVing ICBMs could rekindle the nuclear arms race and destabilize arms control and disarmament efforts, in light of U.S.-Russian arms agreements that call for scrapping all land-based missiles with multiple warheads. Habiger's remarks come amid the disclosure of a secret proposal by the Clinton administration to offer China increased space-launch cooperation, including access to advanced missile technology. (WT 980401)

=====

RADIATION EFFECTS

=====

Chernobyl Anniversary

Chernobyl's reactor no. 4 exploded during a test on April 26, 1986. The nuclear disaster released 300 times the amount of radiation of the Hiroshima bomb and spread radioactive material all across Europe. So far 3,600 Ukrainians and 10,000 Russians have officially been reported as Chernobyl victims. The 12th anniversary of this tragedy came with mixed news. 7,000 people reportedly demonstrated in Belarus. The chief of the Chernobyl power station announced the restarting of Reactor No. 3 just days earlier. It had been shut down last year after cracks were discovered in the cooling system's pipes. While Ukrainian President Leonid D. Kuchma reiterated his promise to shut down the Chernobyl plant in two years, it appears that Ukraine will not shut down Chernobyl until Western donors come up with some \$2 billion. Ukraine wants the money to clean up reactor no. 4 and finish two new nuclear stations in the western part of the nation.

(AP, Reuters 980424/27)

Radiation Victims in Kazakhstan

The Cold War arms race still claims victims in the population of 16 million people in Kazakhstan. From 1949 to 1962 the Soviet Union held 124 above-ground nuclear explosions. Another 372 underground explosions were held from 1962 to 1989. Aitkhazha Bigaliyev, director of the Kazakh Institute of Ecological Problems, told an international conference that "it would take 300 to 350 years to get rid of genetic mutations caused by decades of nuclear tests. Scientists said that around 1.5 million people have been exposed to radiation and that the number of crippled children would rise every year because the genetic effects of nuclear tests are usually felt only in the second or third generation. (Reuters 980410)

N A T O N E W S

U.S. Senate Approves NATO Expansion

On April 30, the U.S. Senate approved Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to join NATO, voting 80 to 19. Breaking a promise made to Russia by the U.S. not to expand NATO, the decision antagonizes Russia, rekindles Cold War animosities, and threatens the process of nuclear disarmament. While many Senators were troubled by the consequences of the decision, few were willing to vote "no."

| - See also: http://www.wagingpeace.org/aa_9804_nato_expansion.html

| - For a letter by David Krieger to all Senators see:

| - http://www.wagingpeace.org/aa_9804_nato_letter.html

P R I S O N N E W S

Citizen Protest Helped Reduce Vindictive Punishment

Philip Berrigan, a former Catholic priest, long-time peace activist and brother of Daniel Berrigan, is being denied visitation rights in prison, including those with his family, because of an act of conscience committed by Nobel Peace Laureate Mairead Corrigan Maguire. Berrigan is serving a two-year sentence for damaging a Navy destroyer as a protest against nuclear weapons. In February 1998, Berrigan was visited by the distinguished Irish Nobel Peace Laureate, Mairead Corrigan Maguire, who had nominated Berrigan to receive the Nobel Peace Prize a month earlier for a lifetime of dedication to the cause of promoting peace, justice and human rights around the world, and especially in the U.S. After the meeting, Ms. Maguire staged a protest for peace by refusing to leave the prison. Berrigan was accused of "disruptive conduct," and his visitation rights were taken away for a year. In response to citizen action the denial of Berrigan's visitation rights was reduced from one year to 90 days! Thanks to everyone who got engaged!

| - For more information see: http://www.wagingpeace.org/aa_9805_berrigan.html

A C T I O N S Y O U C A N T A K E

1) ==> ASK YOUR SENATORS TO VOTE "NO" ON THE MOBILE CHERNOBYL BILL ISSUE:

The Mobile Chernobyl bill will provide for the transport of nuclear waste from utilities across the country to an interim storage site near Yucca Mountain, Nevada. Sen. Lott (R-MS) has indicated he would bring the bill to the floor as early as possible if the 67 votes exist to override the President's threatened veto.

For more information see: http://www.wagingpeace.org/aa_9805_mobile_chernobyl.html

==> contact your SENATORS at: <http://www.senate.gov/senator/>

A complete list of all Congressional phone and fax numbers and e-mail addresses can be found at:

Senate: <http://www.lib.umich.edu/libhome/Documents.center/congress/sen97.txt>

House: <http://www.lib.umich.edu/libhome/Documents.center/congress/hou97.txt>

2) ==> WRITE AN ENCOURAGING NOTE TO PHIL BERRIGAN ADDRESS:
Philip Berrigan, FCI Petersburg, PO Box 1000, Petersburg, VA 23804-1000, Fax: 804/863-1510
For more information see: http://www.wagingpeace.org/aa_9805_berrigan.html

3) ==> JOIN OUR ACTION ALERT NETWORK: ACT NOW!
To subscribe to "ACT NOW!" send a message leaving the Subject line empty
To:majordomo@lists.xmission.com
Subject:
subscribe act-now-napf your-email@here

4) SIGN THE ABOLITION 2000 INTERNATIONAL PETITION
<http://www.wagingpeace.org/intlpetition.html>

5) ==> FORWARD THIS NEWSLETTER TO A FRIEND

=====
D A T E S T O R E M E M B E R
=====

May 8, 1863 International Red Cross founded.
May 8, 1945 V-E Day-World War II ends in Europe.
May 10, 1998 Nelson Mandela is inaugurated as the first black president of South Africa.
May 13, 1968 U.S. and North Vietnam begin peace talks in Paris.
May 18, 1974 India explodes its first nuclear device in an underground test at Pokharan in the Rajasthan desert.
May 24, 1972 Salt I Accord signed by U.S. and USSR.
May 26, 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty signed by U.S. and USSR.

=====
E V E N T S
=====

July 23-24
International Network of Engineers and Scientists for Global Responsibility (INES) workshop on "New Security Concerns and Approaches" in Boston, MA.
For information contact Reiner Braun at: R.Braun@lilly.ping.de

July 24-26
INES Executive Council meeting, Boston, MA.
For information contact Reiner Braun at: R.Braun@lilly.ping.de

July 27-28
INES Seminar on Sustainability, Boston, MA.
For information contact Reiner Braun at: R.Braun@lilly.ping.de

For a current list of more events, please visit our web at: http://www.wagingpeace.org/events_current.html

=====
R E S O U R C E S & D O C U M E N T S
=====

AUDIO TAPES (\$8.00 each plus \$3.00 s&h)
- "The Social Responsibility of Scientists" by Joseph Rotblat
- "A World Without War" by Joseph Rotblat
- "Musicians Don't Make War" by Lord Yehudi Menuhin

FREE OF CHARGE

*** "The Determined Pursuit of Systematic and Progressive Efforts to Impede Nuclear Disarmament," Statement to the Delegates to the NPT PrepCom by David Krieger.

Can also be found at: http://www.wagingpeace.org/npt98/npt_98_dk.html

*** "Security and Sustainability in a Nuclear Weapons Free World." By David Krieger.

Can also be found at: http://www.wagingpeace.org/sec_sust.html

*** "Act Now For Nuclear Abolition." A Statement by Godfried Cardinal Danneels and Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser.

Can also be found at: http://www.wagingpeace.org/npt_98_religious_leaders.html

*** A Statement by more than 100 Civilian Leaders in favor of nuclear abolition.

Can also be found at: http://www.wagingpeace.org/a2_statement_100leaders.html

*** A speech delivered by General Lee Butler at the National Press Club in Washington on February 2, 1998.

Can also be found at: http://www.wagingpeace.org/butler_speech_9802.html

*** "Nuclear warfare. The public has a right to know." Op-ed on Presidential Decision Directive (PDD) 60 by David Krieger.

Can also also be found at: <http://www.wagingpeace.org/pdd60.html>

=====
F E E D B A C K
=====

"Congratulations on The Sunflower Newsletter. I am very happy to be a subscriber."

-- Richard Falk, Prof. of International Relations, Albert G. Milbank Prof. of International Law and Practice, Princeton University

"I'm a high school senior in Lodi, California, and may I say congratulations for beating me to the punch. My Senior Project is fomenting a Net campaign to get the UN debt paid, and now I have less frontier to cover. Well done. I hope that NAPF members took your March 19 Action Alert seriously. It is a problem that affects us profoundly. Thank you."

-- Sumana Harihareswara

-->PLEASE SEND US YOUR QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS

--><mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org>

=====
E D I T O R S
=====

David Krieger, J.D., Ph.D., Christoph Hanterman, Ph.D.

=====
S P O N S O R
=====

List service is being sponsored by XMission, 51 East 400 South Suite 200, Salt Lake City, UT 84111
voice: 801/539-0852 fax:801/539-0853 URL: <http://www.xmission.com>

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION
International contact for Abolition 2000
a Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

1187 Coast Village Road, Box 123
Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794
Phone (805) 965-3443 * Fax (805) 568-0466
e- mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org
URL <http://www.wagingpeace.org>
URL <http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/>

- To unsubscribe to sunflower-napf, send an email to "majordomo@xmission.com" with "unsubscribe sunflower-napf" in the body of the message. For information on digests or retrieving files and old messages send "help" to the same address. Do not use quotes in your message.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: fme@motherearth.org
Date: Mon, 11 May 1998 01:41:24 +0200 (CEST)
From: "Pol D'Huyvetter" <pol@motherearth.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: actions NWAD 98
To: a-days@motherearth.org, abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Sender: pold@pop.xs4all.be

REPLY TO katri@motherearth.org

Dear friends,

here follows a short article about the Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days 1998 to be used to inform activists and others in your newsletters, mailings... Photographs of the actions last year (NATO Summit, Madrid; Citizens' Inspections at NATO HQ and in Kleine Brogel, Belgium) are available on request from <katri@motherearth.org>.

Love,

Katri Silvonen
For Mother Earth International

Towards a nuclear weapon-free world

The five declared nuclear powers - the United States, Russia, Britain, France and China - still possess some 36 000 nuclear warheads among them, according to a recent report by the Natural Resources Defense Council. The report doesn't tell the amount of nuclear warheads of potential nuclear weapon states India, Pakistan, Israel, Iraq and North Korea, but mentioned warheads are already enough to destroy the whole planet multiply times.

On 8 July last year an international delegation of nuclear disarmament campaigners representing international network 'Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days' (NWAD) presented notarized Citizens' Summonses to all sixteen NATO Heads of Government meeting in Madrid. Their presentation coincided with the first anniversary of the International Court of Justice's

Advisory Opinion declaring 'the threat or use of nuclear weapons to be generally contrary to the rules of international humanitarian law'. The Court had also amplified the Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) by stating that there exists a legal obligation to achieve an international convention banning all nuclear weapons.

In the Citizens' Summons activists pledged to start a legal campaign of Non-Violent Direct Actions (NVDA) to uphold international law on nuclear weapons if the nuclear powers and their allies failed to start the negotiations leading to complete nuclear disarmament. "As NATO, after one year, has given no indication of complying with the ICJ Advisory Opinion", the Summons said, "such action will commence after the meeting of the NATO Heads of State in Madrid." So far more than eighty international and national peacegroups around the world and several Members of Parliament have signed the Summons.

A first series of NVDA followed on the 52nd anniversaries of atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki on August 6th and 9th. 'Citizens' War Crimes Inspection Teams' encroached simultaneously on 13 nuclear weapon-related 'sites of crime' in Europe and the USA. A new model of action was born.

The recent crisis around the UNSCOM-weapons inspectors in Iraq inspired a new wave of 'Citizens' War Crimes Inspection Teams'. A remarkable feature was the presence of Canadian and Belgian members of parliament in the citizens' teams attempting to inspect nuclear weapons sites in the USA and Belgium. Since August last year there have been inspections in Belgium, England, France, Germany, Israel, the Netherlands, Scotland and the USA.

The NWAD network calls peacegroups to plan new 'Citizens' War Crimes Inspections' with the participation of VIP's (i.e. MPs, artists, lawyers, physicians, ..) on 1 October 1998 at nuclear 'sites of crime'. The non-violent direct action(s) could be linked with the anniversary of the end of the Nuremberg Tribunal or with the global action day, 30 September, to demand freedom for the Israeli nuclear prisoner of conscience and whistleblower Mordechai Vanunu. In 1986 Vanunu disclosed Israel's top secret nuclear weapon-program and got kidnapped by the Secret Service of Israel. He is still in jail today.

NATO's attachment to nuclear weapons was illustrated again during the latest vote of UN resolution which called to start multilateral negotiations for nuclear disarmament in 1998. The resolution was adopted by a large majority of 116 states. Nevertheless 26 states, including most NATO states and their allies voted against the resolution to start negotiations. NATO rebels Iceland, Norway and Denmark showed some courage and abstained among 21 other countries.

NWAD-network invites you to join the non-violent protests at NATO Headquarters in Brussels during scheduled meeting of NATO Ministers of Defence on 11-12 June. Activists plan to confront NATO Ministers with their lack of commitment in respect to nuclear disarmament. The meeting coincides

with the anniversary of the adoption of NPT, in which the Nuclear Weapon States pledged to start the negotiations to ban nuclear weapons, by the UN in 1968. Thirty years of broken promises is enough!

Activists are invited to join an International Peace Camp near NATO HQ in Brussels, Belgium on 2-11 July. On 8 July non-violent direct action is planned to mark the second anniversary of the ICJ ruling on the illegality of nuclear weapons. The action will be prepared during the camp by consensus. There will be workshops about non-violence, direct action ect. on the camp.

For Mother Earth (FME) is planning to link the Peace Camp of NWAD in Brussels with the actioncamp of Trident Ploughshares 2000 in Faslane, Scotland (9-25 August) by organizing a peacewalk from Belgium to Scotland. The 'Walk for Nuclear Disarmament' will leave from the Peace Camp on 12 July, and arrive in the Ploughshare Camp at the British Trident nuclear submarine base of Faslane, Scotland on 9 August 1998.

FME finds walking an effective way to campaign and raise awareness on nuclear issues, and inspire new people to get involved in anti-nuclear movement. In the past FME has organized cross-continental peacewalks in the USA (1992) and Europe (1995), and a walk in the area of Chernobyl (1996). In the UK the walk is organized in co-operation with London region CND, Scottish CND and Greater Manchester CND. Everybody is welcomed to join and get closer to a nuclear weapon-free world by every step during this four weeks long stretch of road.

Financial donations are necessary and welcomed on international postal account # 000-1618561-19 of For Mother Earth. The organisers also look for practical help for: campsites, scouting routes, support vans for kitchen and luggage, kitchen equipment, banners, organic food donations, etc. ...and volunteers. If you can help, please contact For Mother Earth in Belgium, or your regional contact in the UK.

Participants in need of a visa are requested to apply as soon as possible with <merwin@motherearth.org>, fax: +32-9-233 7302. Please send all necessary data (name, passport number, date and place issued, birthdate & place, address, etc ...).

Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days
For Mother Earth International office
Lange Steenstraat 16/d, 9000 Gent, Belgium
Phone/fax: +32-9-233 84 39
Fax: +32-9-233 73 02
E-mail: pol@motherearth.org
international postal account # 000-1618561-19
www.motherearth.org

end

```
*****
*      For Mother Earth International office      *
*****
*      Lange Steenstraat 16/D, 9000 Gent, Belgium      *
*      Phone/fax +32-9-233 84 39      *
*      Fax +32-9-233 73 02      *
*      E-mail: pol@motherearth.org      *
*****
*      WWW:http://www.motherearth.org      *
*****
*      Postal account : 000-1618561-19      *
*****
* For Mother Earth is member of Abolition 2000 - a global *
*network to eliminate nuclear weapons, the International Peace*
* Bureau (IPB) and World Information Service on Energy (WISE) *
*****
* For Mother Earth has offices in Belgium, Slovakia, Romania, *
* Sri Lanka and USA, aswell as active members/groups in *
* Belarus, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, France, Finland, *
* Germany, Netherlands, United Kingdom and Ukraine *
*****
```

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 15:43:46 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: advice on message on Indian n-testing

May 12, 1998

TO: Coalition colleagues
FR: Daryl Kimball, Executive Director

RE: Message and strategy on Indian nuclear testing -- "Think CTBT"

As we respond and react to the shocking news of the Indian nuclear tests, I would like to suggest that we articulate a three-pronged message wherever possible:

* First, we of course should condemn the Indian tests and stress that such actions undermine regional and international security. We should urge that Pakistan and others (China) exercise restraint -- though Pakistan is very likely going to test.

* Second, we must emphasize the importance of stressing the importance of global implementation of the CTBT -- by India and Pakistan AND by the United States, as the Coalition media advisory stresses, the Indian tests underscore the importance of the CTBT.

U.S. nuclear testing opponents have and will continue to cite the Indian tests as evidence that the CTBT won't work and that the Senate should continue to delay action on the Treaty. Some, like the unnamed Senate aide quoted in this morning's Washington Times will even say that the Indian tests "... mean that the United States is free to engage in nuclear testing It debunks the administration's claim that the test ban is OK because we are no longer in the testing business. We're back in it."

Our community, along with the Administration, and CTBT supporters in the Senate, must be aggressively rebut such arguments and use this opportunity to demonstrate that the Senate must approve the CTBT.

In addition, U.S. Senate approval of the CTBT will strengthen the credibility of any U.S. bilateral effort to defuse nuclear tensions in South Asia, especially given the imminent imposition of sanctions under the 1994 Glenn legislation.

* Third, we should support the implementation of the existing U.S. law, passed in 1994. In fact, we have little choice on the matter, given the fact that law's provisions are virtually automatic and that President Clinton said this morning that "I intend to implement them fully."

While some have recommended that the President delay sanctions for the 30 days Congressional working days allowed under the law to consider declaring a test moratorium, such an approach seems to have little support on the Hill

and might signal a further weakening of U.S. resolve to address proliferation in South Asia.

###

I encourage each of you to forward your thoughts and suggestions about our collective approach and to attend the CTBT Working Group session on Friday, May 15 at 245 2nd St. NE, which will begin at 3pm. It will follow our informal discussion with Ambassador Stephen Ledogar, which begins at 2:00 pm.

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: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: "Abolition@Watserv1. Uwaterloo. Ca (E-mail)" <abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 20:49:45 -0400
From: "Ross Wilcock" <rwilcock@execulink.com>
Importance: Normal
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: FW: Peace Bureau calls India a rogue state
To: "Abolition-Caucus@Igc. Org (E-mail)" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

Non-member submission from [International Peace Bureau <mailbox@ipb.org>]

From: International Peace Bureau <mailbox@ipb.org>
To: "'ABOLITION-CAUCUS'" <ABOLITION-CAUCUS@IGC.APC.ORG>
Subject: FW: Peace Bureau calls India a rogue state
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 18:27:25 +-200

Press Communique - please forward to interested individuals
Geneva, May 12, 1998

India's nuclear tests have turned it into a rogue state, according to the International Peace Bureau, the world's oldest international peace federation. "We are bitterly disappointed by India's provocative action", said IPB president Mrs Maj-Britt Theorin, "and we demand an immediate moratorium on any further tests. India has ruined its reputation as a leader in the Non-Aligned Movement and as a credible voice for disarmament. It has now joined the tiny group of states who threaten weapons of mass destruction and who refuse to open negotiations with the vast majority of countries who abide by international law. These are rogue states."

The International Peace Bureau, along with other members of the 1000-strong global network of anti-nuclear NGOs known as Abolition 2000, has consistently condemned nuclear testing by any state. It argues that if the US, along with the other nuclear weapons states, does not ratify the 1996 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and fails to cancel its 'sub-critical' testing and 'stockpile stewardship' programmes, then the threshold states will draw the conclusion that the US is indeed not serious about disarmament. This conclusion was confirmed by attitudes displayed at the NPT PrepComm which concluded in Geneva on Friday, and India's disastrous decision to test is a predictable consequence of the intransigence of the NWS.

The IPB is extremely anxious about the likely reactions from Pakistan and China, and the overall destabilising effects on the international security environment. The tests bring suddenly closer the nightmare of a regional arms race that could engage all three states in a spiralling programme of nuclear procurement. Moreover, the tests will poison the atmosphere in all disarmament fora and risk unravelling years of work towards nuclear elimination.

"We call on all our member organisations, other NGOs and friends of India and Pakistan, to organise vigorous protests against the tests and to urge immediate bilateral talks to de-escalate the tension" said IPB Secretary-General Colin Archer. "At the same time increased pressure must be exerted on decision-makers in the 'official' nuclear states to open negotiations on steps to abolition."

From: (Mr) Colin Archer, Secretary-General
International Peace Bureau
41 rue de Zurich, 1201 Geneva, Switzerland.
Tel: +41-22-731-6429, Fax: 738-9419
Email: mailbox@ipb.org
Web: <http://www.itu.ch/ipb/>

IPB is the oldest and the most comprehensive of the international peace federations - covering issues ranging from nuclear weapons and landmines to conflict resolution and peace education. Our current main programme is the Hague Appeal for Peace 1999, which features all these themes. Write for details of membership, projects and publications - or consult Website.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 21:15:55 -0400
From: "Ross Wilcock" <rwilcock@execulink.com>
Importance: Normal
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: FW: India: final nail in nuclear weapons coffin
To: "Abolition-Caucus@Igc. Org (E-mail)" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

Non-member submission from [sstaples@canadians.org (Steven Staples)]
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 10:17:32 -0700
From: sstaples@canadians.org (Steven Staples)
To: "abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>
Subject: India: final nail in nuclear weapons coffin

Pull up a chair for the newest member of the nuclear club.
For the first time in nearly 30 years, the membership of declared nuclear states has grown. And the newest member is not North Korea, Iran, or even Iraq.

It is no surprise at all that India has tested a nuclear device. They have been sending signals very clearly for years. India's protests during the NPT extension negotiations fell on deaf ears, while many of us in the peace movement warned a permanent extension which ignored the absolute failure of compliance on Article VI calling for disarmament would result in greater proliferation.

In India, the arrogance of the nuclear states weakened the hand of the Doves, and strengthened the Hawks.

The peace movement needs to turn this terrible turn of events into the final nail in the coffin of nuclear weapons.

For Canada, we have a special obligation:

1. This country is directly responsible for providing India the technology. As one U.S. analysts said on CBC last night, without Canadian nuclear technology there would be no Indian nuclear program.
2. The Canadian government played a key role in the permanent extension of the NPT - a direct factor in India's decision to go nuclear.

We need to lay this calamity directly on the doorstep of the Canadian government, NATO, and the nuclear weapons states.

Like France's nuclear testing, this is also an opportunity to educate the public the threat of nuclear war is greater today than it was a decade ago. We will also have another opportunity within the next few weeks ... when Pakistan conducts its first nuclear test.

Steve Staples

Return-Path: <owner-pov-l@wccx.wcc-coe.org>
Date: Wed, 13 May 1998 10:50:30 +0200
From: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>
To: pov-l@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Cc: impress@slt.lk
Subject: pov-l: May Bulletin from Colombo, Sri Lanka
Sender: owner-pov-l@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Reply-To: pov-l@wccx.wcc-coe.org

----- Start of message from list: pov-l ---->

Colombo Peace to the City Campaign
May 1998 Bulletin

THE NATIONAL PEACE COUNCIL OF SRI LANKA CALLS FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF A BIPARTISAN PEACE COMMISSION

Various calls, both local and international, have been made for negotiations between the government and LTTE with third party mediation. It is generally recognised that a bipartisan consensus between the major political parties is a necessary pre-condition for such peace talks to succeed.

Unfortunately, for the past several months, the two major parties appear to be at loggerheads. The government has declared its intention to wind up the Parliamentary Select Committee on Constitutional Reforms. On the other hand, the UNP has been insisting on the reconvening of the Select Committee to further modify the devolution proposals.

As a means of securing a bipartisan consensus on the necessary constitutional reforms, but without the delays inherent in the Parliamentary Select Committee procedure, the NPC calls for the appointment of a specially mandated Peace Commission drawn from the PA and UNP, and with suitable Tamil and Muslim political representation.

As in the case of the three member National Unification Commission in the Philippines, the Peace Commission should be provided with Cabinet status and specifically empowered with the task of formulating consensual principles on which a political solution may be found. It should also be empowered to negotiate with the LTTE after its proposed framework for power sharing and devolution has been approved by all political parties.

The NPC believes that the mechanism of a bipartisan Peace Commission could provide an institutional framework outside of the petty party political rivalries that continue to stand in the way of a solution to the conflict in the country, and could be a mechanism for achieving a just and sustainable peace.

THE NATIONAL PEACE COUNCIL RECOGNIZES THE NEED FOR

FACILITATION PRIOR TO THIRD PARTY MEDIATION

The visits by the US Permanent Representative to the UN, the US Assistant Secretary of State for South Asian Affairs and the Commonwealth Secretary-General have been concluded, and the usual diplomatic statements have been made, but we are back to where we were, and the tortuous journey along the A9 highway has begun again.

Operation Jayasikuru is in its twelfth month and has created over 80,000 newly displaced persons, adding to the 300,000 internally displaced persons (IDPs) who were already in the Vanni. An acknowledged military death toll of some 1100 soldiers plus over 3000 wounded (with at least an equal number for the LTTE) would constitute the minimum cost, and provides a stark reminder of the human cost of the ongoing war.

The humanitarian situation remains precarious in the Vanni. Indications of severe malnutrition are present among the IDPs. Restrictions also continue for access to surgical drugs and related items.

At the political level the much debated devolution proposals have received both condemnation and praise by parties concerned, and at the implementation level the whole process is bogged down with no sign of any bipartisan consensus which is crucially necessary for a political solution.

The idea of foreign mediation has so far not been seen as an acceptable means of conflict resolution by the Sri Lankan government. But early in the month a statement made by the Catholic Bishop of Jaffna, Thomas Savundranayagam, was given publicity in which he declared that the LTTE was prepared to accept third party mediation.

In view of the incalculable human suffering, and the immense economic costs of prolonging this war, a process of facilitation that would lead to a negotiated settlement with mediation acceptable to both parties, and bipartisan support, needs to be put in place forthwith. Singing the laurels of the government on the one hand, and ostracising the LTTE on the other, will only take the country down the road to destruction sooner than what is witnessed along Route A9.

WE MUST BUILD ON HUMANITARIAN IMPULSES

The visit of the United Nations special representative on children and armed conflict to Sri Lanka is another indication of international concern over the tragic situation the country has fallen into. The pathos of this war is brought out by the mobilisation of children by the LTTE and the recent announcement by the government that it would be conducting recruitment campaigns in schools for the armed forces. The conduct of the protagonists reveals the desperation for life and security brought about by a cruel war that spares no one, not even children, in the scope of its mutual destruction.

The National Peace Council notes that the unilateral two day ceasefire declared by the LTTE during the visit of Mr Olaru Otunnu to the Vanni has evoked a response from the military spokesman that "If they don't

fight, we don't." This exchange parallels the unofficial humanitarian ceasefires between the two sides that have taken place on two successive years during the polio immunisation campaigns carried out by UNICEF. The National Peace Council believes that these are the humanitarian facets of an increasingly desperate war that can be built upon to achieve a peaceful settlement.

The shortage of voluntary adult participation in the war is convincing evidence that fighting the war is not popular with the vast majority of people who are unwilling to be dragooned into it. Conscripting adults between the ages of 18 and 30 into the armed forces, as threatened by the government, is not the answer to the lack of progress on the military battlefield. Building on humanitarian impulses that facilitate dialogue and reduce violence is the only way forward, and must be done immediately in the name of humanity.

National Peace Council
291/50 Havelock Gardens
Colombo 6 Phone/Fax: +94-1-594378, 502522
Email: peace2@sri.lanka.net
<http://peace-srilanka.org/city.htm>

Colombo Peace to the City Campaign Local Coordinator:
Priyanka Mendis
impress@slt.lk

----- End of message from list: pov-1 ---->

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 21:20:42 -0700
From: "Peter Coombes" <pcoombes@web.net>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: Products from India
To: "Bob Tiller" <btiller@psr.org>, <abolition-caucus@igc.org>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

I for one will NOT boycott India.

We have to deal with the real issue. As long as the elite club of five nuclear weapon states persist with their arrogance, that only they should have nuclear weapons then proliferation will always be a problem. India has had the bomb for many years -- it is merely coming out of the closet for political and military reasons.

If you want a boycott then boycott all nuclear weapon states. Not a very practical matter, is it?

This tragedy is an opportunity for the peace movement world wide to say "We told you so, NO MORE NUKES."

Peter Coombes

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

From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org <abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: May 12, 1998 2:18 PM
Subject: Products from India

>Is anyone compiling a list of products from India, which might be used
>by those who want to stop purchasing and using them?

>

>Shalom,

>Bob Tiller

>Physicians for Social Responsibility

>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: inesap@fy.chalmers.se, pen@envirolink.org, dkrieger@napf.org
Date: Wed, 13 May 1998 11:14:06 +0200 (CET)
From: Martin Kalinowski <dh3m@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: cut-off at the NPT PrepCOM
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igcb.igc.org id DAA08509
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id DAB08596

Dear friends,

Are you interested to contribute with lobby work in your capital to support progress towards a "disarmament cut-off treaty"? I have some suggestions below.

At the NPT PrepCom in Geneva the delegates spent extra time to discuss the cut-off for production of fissile materials. The result is not really new but it is very interesting to note that the motivation of most western states is still very high. Even India in its official press release on the underground weapons explosions states that "we shall also be happy to participate in the negotiations for the conclusion of a fissile material cut-off treaty in the Geneva based Conference on Disarmament".

The problem is that the western states tend to stick to the Shannon mandate which is discriminatory against the nuclear threshold states (or how shall we call India now?) Also these states tend to start negotiations without these states or without listening to their ideas just like at the CTBT negotiations.

For me it is crystal clear that a cut-off treaty needs to be a disarmament treaty by integrating disarming effects into it. For example a ban on tritium production should be included. I have more ideas written down in the INESAP Briefing Paper No. 3 that was presented during the NPT PrepCom in Geneva.

What I suggest now:

- Please give me your snail mail address and I send you the INESAP Briefing Paper No. 3.
- Let's exchange information about the position of your country. We should agree on the main message that we should send to the government of your country.
- You contact the responsible persons in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in your country as well as delegates of your country to the CD.
- You report back about your conversations.

I offer this work as convenor of the working group of Abolition 2000 on weapons-usable radioactive materials.

I hope we can promote together the idea of a cut-off treaty as a disarmament treaty in a number of key countries.

Best wishes,
Martin

=====
=====
Dr. Martin B. Kalinowski, IANUS
Hochschulstr. 10, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany
Tel.: +49-6151-163016 FAX: +49-6151-166039
Internet, private: KALINOWSKI@HRZPUB.TU-DARMSTADT.DE
Internet, group: IANUS@HRZPUB.TU-DARMSTADT.DE
<http://www.tu-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/welcome.htm> and [.../inesap.htm](http://www.tu-darmstadt.de/ze/ianus/inesap.htm)
=====

Please mind the change in our postal address!

Please mind the slight change in the internet address: tu instead of th !

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 12 May 1998 21:18:57 -0400
From: "Ross Wilcock" <rwilcock@execulink.com>
Importance: Normal
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: FW: Nuclear testing in India - A Draft comment for discussion
To: "Abolition-Caucus@Igc. Org (E-mail)" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>,
"Abolition@Watserv1. Uwaterloo. Ca (E-mail)" <abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

Ross Wilcock
rwilcock@web.net
<http://www.pgs.ca/>

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

From: Rosalie Bertell [mailto:IICPH@compuserve.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 1998 3:29 PM
To: Ross Wilcock
Subject: Re: Nuclear testing in India

-----Forwarded Message-----

From: Joan Russow, INTERNET:jrussow@COASTNET.COM
To: [unknown], INTERNET:WOC-L@PGS.CA
Date: 11/05/98 4:54 PM
RE: Re: Nuclear testing in India

Date: Mon, 11 May 1998 13:54:06 -0700
Reply-To: Joan Russow <jrussow@COASTNET.COM>
Sender: World Order Conference List <WOC-L@PGS.CA>
From: Joan Russow <jrussow@COASTNET.COM>
Subject: Re: Nuclear testing in India
To: WOC-L@PGS.CA

A Draft comment for discussion

CALL FOR UNIVERSAL AND COMPLETE BANNING OF ALL TESTING OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

India's position that the nuclear weapons states should not be given special privileges in the Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT) vis a vis testing etc was previously deemed by many to be credible.

Despite the fact that India was right in its opposition to the NPT and the CPT treaties as yet further nuclear scams by the US that has found other means of testing. India would not sign the Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) unless the US undertook to abandon all its other "technical means" to further test and design nuclear weapons. The US and other nuclear weapons states refused.

It is unproductive of India to have resumed testing which can only lead to intensification of conflict in that region. It is incumbent upon India and Pakistan to have an agreement not to make any further test of nuclear weapons, and to achieve a stable peace in that region.

Indian's actions stresses the need for the position that there should be a truly universal and comprehensive test ban with the abandonment of all those other "technical means" to bypass the current treaty.

Fred Knelman Ph.D
Joan Russow Ph.D
1- 250-598-0071

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Date: Wed, 13 May 1998 10:22:22 +0200
From: wilpf@iprolink.ch (WILPF)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: WILPF STATEMENT on INDIA'S TEST
To: wilpf-news@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: wilpf@pop.iprolink.ch (Unverified)

India 's Betrayal of Gandhi

The underground nuclear tests carried out by India on 11 May in Pokhraw in the desert of Rajasthan, near the Pakistan border, has given a severe blow to the international nuclear non-proliferation regime. The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom condemns India's nuclear tests as it condemns all such tests, conducted in violation of internationally agreed principles and in complete disregard to the wish of the world's people.

India announced its nuclear weapon capability in 1974 when it exploded a nuclear device, but declared that it would not develop nuclear weapons for deterrence. Since then, it has repeatedly demanded that the nuclear weapons states honour obligations under the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), in particular Article VI calling for "negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament".

The failure of the five declared nuclear weapons states to begin genuine negotiations under Article VI of the NPT has given political reason to states, such as India, to maintain their nuclear option in order to join the nuclear club.

The second session of the Preparatory Committee for the NPT Review Conference in 2000 finished a few days ago in deadlock. The nuclear powers refused to set aside time to discuss nuclear disarmament, which can only signal their continued refusal to negotiate nuclear disarmament in good faith.

India has for years made proposals in the Conference on Disarmament, the world's sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, for nuclear disarmament in a time-bound framework. WILPF regrets its plans to follow the USA, France and Russia down the path of laboratory experiments, hydro-dynamic explosions and computer simulations for the development and possession of the most violent of weapons - nuclear weapons. In doing so, it is turning its back on Gandhi's most honoured principle, that of non-violence.

The response to this highly dangerous new development is not to apply sanctions against India, but to put an end to the erroneous doctrine of nuclear deterrence. We call on all nuclear weapons states to move without delay toward the abolition of nuclear weapons. A Nuclear Weapons Convention has already been drafted by experts and is now an official UN document submitted by Costa Rica. WILPF calls on all nuclear weapons

states to use this excellent resource as a basis to bring about a nuclear free world.

For further information: Edith Ballantyne, International President in Geneva + 41 22 733 6175
Local Contact:

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
International Secretariat
1, rue de Varembe
C.P. 28
1211 Geneva 20
Tel: +41 22 733 61 75
Fax: +41 22 740 10 63

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 13 May 1998 12:21:29 +0100 (BST)
From: Janet Bloomfield <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: Abolition Using India Like They Used Us!
To: WILPF <wilpf@iprolink.ch>
cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Dear all,
this is a good basis, with Rob's amendments for a draft statment
that A2000 groups can use. I have just one specific point...the
description of the network as groups including lawyers, physicians,
women etc omits mention of peace and anti-nuclear groups. Why?
In all honesty these are the groups that provide the action and
energy so why deny them. Hope it's just a mistake...
Love,
Janet.

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

Cc: "Abolition-Caucus@Igc. Org (E-mail)" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>,
"Abolition@Watserv1. Uwaterloo. Ca (E-mail)" <abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>

Date: Wed, 13 May 1998 09:19:39 -0700

From: Vijai K Nair <magoo@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in>

Organization: Forum For Strategic & Security Studies

References: <001501bd7e0b\$4a2af070\$0b00a8c0@arw.execulink.com>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Re: FW: Peace Bureau calls India a rogue state

To: Ross Wilcock <rwilcock@execulink.com>

Vijai Nair wrote:

THE ABOLITION CAUCUS SHOULD REFRAIN FROM CALLING STATES NAMES

Questions for Mr. Colin Archer's International Peace Bureau's and Mrs Maj-Britt Theorin on their definition of India.

If the nom de plume ROGUE is applicable to India because it: "refuses to open negotiations with the vast majority of countries ... abide by international law refused to get on board the discriminatory NPT and CTBT treaties"; by testing it has taken "Provocative action"; and, "now joined the tiny group of states who threaten weapons of mass destruction."

Are we to understand that the IPB has issued a similar statement declaring the following states, who have preceeded India in all these actions, as "rogue states?":

- (a) The USA, UK, Russia and France who rely on nuclear weapons to underwrite their national security in the face of global objection?
- (b) France and China for rewarding the NNWS for extending the NPT indefinitely by commencing nuclear weapon tests before the ink had dried on the document?
- (c) Germany, Belgium, The Netherlands, Italy, Greece and Turkey for holding nuclear weapons on their soil for use by their military as an adjunct of the NATO strategy [that is their defence] of First Use of nuclear weapons?
- (d) Switzerland for having secretly continued their nuclear weapons development programme until 1 November 1988 - even after having acceded to the NPT?
- (e) Israel and Pakistan for having created and stockpiled nuclear weapons?

If not, the the IPB, that professes to be "the oldest and the most comprehensive of the international peace federations," loses any credibility it may have.

Most importantly, the time has come for all of us to grow up. Calling each other names is a sure sign of an inability to cope - frustrations that could lead us to destabilise an already turbulent condition. We need to objectively assess the situation around us and try to use all the little bits at our

disposal to correct it within the frame work of our individual and collective beliefs. By all means condemn what you believe is wrong. But there is no mileage in calling 'names.'

In so far as I am concerned please feel free to call who you want what names including my country. But, thereafter do not expect a sympathetic hearing that may help you achieve your ends.

Vijai Nair

Brigadier Vijai K Nair
Executive Director
Forum for Strategic and Security Studies
Safdarjung Airport
New Delhi 110 003
INDIA

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 13 May 1998 20:10:06 +0930
From: "Ron Gray" <r-grayle@email.msn.com>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Hypocrisy
To: "Abolition Caucus" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.71.1712.3
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id DAB16460

So, the new Indian Government has restarted a nuclear weapons program. One can only be amazed at the forbearance of previous Indian governments for not restarting sooner, with China (a Nuclear Weapon State) as a close neighbour.

The warning was there when India refused to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) after the Nuclear Weapon States (NWS) refused to begin negotiations to set a time line for the elimination of nuclear weapons; a step they promised to take when the Treaty was originally negotiated over twenty-five years ago.

Australian governments have consistently supported the NWS' position on this.

The Australian Government can, of course, adopt a 'holier than thou' attitude over the Indian Government's decision, as we have signed the NPT and have not considered developing nuclear weapons.

We don't need to, however, as by hosting the US bases in Australia, we shelter under the US nuclear umbrella and, indeed, are part of the US nuclear war fighting machine.

Hooray for hypocrisy!

Ron Gray.

Ron Gray,
Australian Peace Committee (South Australian Branch) Inc.
11 South Terrace, Adelaide, S A 5000, Australia
Ph: (+61-8) 8212 7138 Fax: (+61-8) 8364 2291
Email: <r-grayle@msn.com>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Wed, 13 May 1998 09:25:13 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: selected testing news: two more tests; sanctions

May 13

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: select news on Indian testing developments/repercussions

Attached please find three articles on:

- * two more Indian tests;
- * sanctions to be imposed;
- * hill reaction on CTBT situation

See the Coalition's CTBT web site and links for more information and original documents and statements.

DK

Wednesday May 13 6:46 AM EDT

US sanctions for India; new tests conducted

By Randall Mikkelsen

BERLIN (Reuters) - U.S. President Bill Clinton on Wednesday formally signed documents imposing sanctions against India for conducting nuclear weapons tests, White House officials said.

The officials said Clinton, who is visiting Berlin, had decided to impose sanctions on Tuesday night and signed them on Wednesday morning before leaving for a meeting with German Chancellor Helmut Kohl.

Meanwhile, India said on Wednesday that it had conducted two more underground nuclear tests at 12.21 p.m. (0651 GMT), completing its planned series of experimental blasts.

The government said in a statement that the "sub-kiloton" tests, as with the three tests on Monday, were carried out in the Pokhran range in the western desert state of Rajasthan.

The swift imposition of punishing U.S. sanctions underscores the seriousness with which the United States views the threat of proliferation posed by the

tests, and sets the stage for a long-term rift between the United States and the world's second most populous country.

White House spokesman Joe Lockhart said Clinton would announce the sanctions at a news conference with German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, scheduled for 3:40 p.m. CET (1:40 p.m. GMT).

The sanctions are being imposed under a 1994 U.S. non-proliferation law that mandates strict penalties for countries not recognized as nuclear powers that receive or detonate a nuclear device.

A New York Times article Wednesday said Clinton had decided to impose the sanctions after a disappointing response by India to the widespread international condemnation to Monday's tests and an apparent unwillingness to consider his plea to pledge to refrain from further nuclear weapons tests or deployment.

The sanctions law forces a cutoff of U.S. military and economic assistance to India, and, of potentially greater economic consequence, requires the United States to oppose loans to the country by international lending agencies. It also bars U.S. bank loans to the Indian government, except for food purchases, and restricts military exports to the country.

Officials said they would leave it to Clinton to outline any conditions under which the sanctions would be lifted.

White House spokesman Mike McCurry said on Tuesday the tests may force Clinton to reconsider a planned trip to India in the fall.

Clinton received on Tuesday a letter from Indian Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee outlining his reasons for the tests. In a copy of the letter published by the New York Times, Vajpayee said, "I have been deeply concerned at the deteriorating security environment, especially the nuclear environment, faced by India.

Referring to China, a nuclear power, Vajpayee said relations had improved over the last decade but "an atmosphere of distrust persists due to a lingering border dispute.

He said the distrust had been exacerbated by China's aid to India's bitter neighbor, Pakistan, saying the aid helped Pakistan become a covert nuclear weapons state.

Vajpayee pledged to work to promote nuclear disarmament and said "the series of tests are limited in number and pose no danger to any country which has no inimical intentions toward India.

U.S. officials said the handling of the U.S. response to the test is extremely sensitive, and potentially could affect U.S.-India relations for the next 10-20 years.

India Deals Blow to Nuke Treaty

By John Diamond
Associated Press Writer
Tuesday, May 12, 1998; 5:57 p.m. EDT

An AP News Analysis

WASHINGTON (AP) -- The impact of the India nuclear tests spread quickly in Washington.

The momentum President Clinton has been trying to build in favor of a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing was halted by India's action, experts on both sides of the arms control debate said Tuesday.

The CIA began an assessment of its failure to see India's action coming.

And the Clinton administration, while trying to place the onus on India, faced accusations that this country had been too gentle with the Indians and relied too much on international pacts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons.

Administration officials seemed stunned by India's announcement that it had conducted three underground nuclear tests at a site about 70 miles from the border of arch-rival Pakistan.

Arms control advocates, appalled by India's decision, did their best to spin the episode into political momentum for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. But they frankly acknowledged that the development was a setback for their cause, and they got quick confirmation of that view when Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott said he would probably halt any action this year on ratification of the treaty.

India's nuclear test ``is a clear repudiation of a failed Clinton administration nuclear non-proliferation policy," said Paul Leventhal, president of the Nuclear Control Institute, a Washington-based arms control advocacy group. The administration, Leventhal said, provided economic assistance

to India without making clear that the key condition for U.S. support was India's restraint on nuclear testing.

On the conservative side, Lott offered some spin of his own, saying India's action pointed to the need for a national missile defense system, a multibillion dollar investment being debated this week in the Senate.

Frank Gaffney of the conservative Coalition to Defend America said the tests by India showed "the absurdity of investing in arms control and international arrangements when you're trying to deal with something that is as increasingly omnipresent as proliferation." Gaffney predicted the test ban treaty would be defeated if it came up for a ratification vote, a view backed by Democratic Sen. John Glenn.

"I think it makes it more difficult to pass when you have a nation like this that we thought was just going to go along," said Glenn, D-Ohio.

At the urging of the United States and the four other previously declared nuclear powers -- China, Russia, France and Britain -- 149 nations have signed the Comprehensive Test Ban. India and Pakistan, however, are conspicuously missing. And because both possess nuclear know-how, their absence threatens to delay implementation of the treaty by a decade. Monday's nuclear tests conducted by India only promise to prolong that delay.

The United States is sure to come under increasing pressure from non-nuclear states who charge that Washington's advocacy of non-proliferation and a ban on testing only serves to seal its nuclear advantage. These countries say the United States is failing to make good on its commitment in the Non-Proliferation Treaty to move toward nuclear disarmament, said Daryl Kimball, executive director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers. In this context, India's tests

only serve to underscore that the world remains divided between nuclear haves and have-nots.

The CIA's failure to predict the Indian test was particularly notable because the United States has monitored the India test site in the past, and because India's governing Hindu nationalist party announced in March, before it took power, that it would re-examine the country's longtime moratorium on testing.

"This was a colossal failure on the part of our intelligence community," Sen. Richard Shelby, R-Ala., chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, said in an interview. It is inexcusable, he said, "when our intelligence gathering agencies do not in a timely manner find out that there is a likelihood of some type of nuclear testing, especially of this magnitude -- three tests -- in an area that we've been watching for a long time and could be a flash point for a nuclear exchange."

In a rare public acknowledgment of an intelligence lapse, CIA Director George Tenet announced Tuesday he had appointed a review team headed by retired Adm. David Jeremiah to examine the episode and, according to a CIA release, "determine what lessons can be learned."

The panel will report its findings in 10 days. But the CIA will have to answer questions sooner than that. Shelby said he was calling a hearing for Thursday to find out why the Indian nuclear tests came without warning.

CIA spokesman Bill Harlow said, "It is apparent that the Indians went to some lengths to conceal their activities and intentions."

RATIFICATION OF WEAPONS TREATY UNLIKELY
IN LIGHT OF INDIA'S TESTS

By Sumana Chatterjee, CQ Staff Writer

India's resumption of nuclear tests yesterday "not only threatens the stability of the region, it directly challenges the firm international consensus to stop nuclear proliferation," President Clinton said today.

Citing the provisions in the 1994 State Department authorization law (PL 103-236) that compel the president to impose economic sanctions on nations that conduct nuclear tests or sell nuclear weapons, Clinton said: "I intend to implement them fully" unless New Delhi changes course and signs the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).

India has not given any indication that it intends to join Russia, China and the other declared nuclear powers in signing the CTBT, which would halt the development of new weapons of mass destruction by imposing a global ban on nuclear detonations. India and Pakistan were absent when President Clinton joined scores of other leaders at the United Nations in 1996 to endorse the treaty. The treaty has been signed by 146 nations and is awaiting ratification in the Senate.

However, with recent news of India's escalation of a South Asian arms race, ratification of the CTBT is unlikely, said Senate Foreign Relations Committee spokesman Marc Thiessen. "We are not going to waste our time," he said.

Policy-makers are wondering why they heard the reports of India's underground nuclear tests in the news -- and not from the intelligence community. Senate Select Intelligence Committee Chairman Sen. Richard C. Shelby, R-Ala., said that the failure of the CIA and other U.S. intelligence organizations to warn of test preparations had deprived policy-makers of an opportunity to use diplomacy to head off the explosions. "We want to know why this happened, how this happened, who was asleep, why they were asleep," he said. "Something's wrong here. This is a colossal failure.

"If we had an inkling that they were going to detonate one or more nuclear weapons, perhaps we could have intervened," Shelby added. "We certainly would have tried and the world community could [have tried]."

Shelby said he will hold oversight hearings on the failure to detect India's intentions to test nuclear warheads.

In December 1995, after U.S. spy satellites detected suspicious activity near an Indian test site, American diplomats successfully persuaded the Indian government to halt plans to conduct nuclear tests.

The CIA has not returned calls for comment.

U.S. Ambassador to India Richard F. Celeste, who was en route to New Delhi, reportedly has been told to return to Washington to consult on the testing.

Russian Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov criticized India today for carrying out the tests, but said Moscow was unlikely to back any

sanctions against New Delhi.

Legislation (HR3694, S2052) to combat the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction was passed by the House and approved by the Senate Select Intelligence committee last week. Both measures authorize more funding for spy satellites, covert actions, personnel and analysis to combat weapons proliferation.

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: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Date: Wed, 13 May 1998 14:32:21 +0200 (CEST)
From: "Pol D'Huyvetter" <pol@motherearth.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: Products from India or USA
To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
X-Sender: pold@pop.xs4all.be

Dear Bob,

Sorry, but I would have less problems with a boycott of US products and services. It is my belief that it is the US military, industrial, and financial complex which is the driving force in the nuclear arms race ... and blocks the road to start multilateral negotiations for a Nuclear Weapons Convention.

No problem to start an international boycott of US products and services to push for a start of negotiations for a nuclear weapons convention.

Cheers,

Pol D'Huyvetter

```
*****  
*           For Mother Earth International office           *  
*****  
*           Lange Steenstraat 16/D, 9000 Gent, Belgium       *  
*           Phone/fax +32-9-233 84 39                       *  
*           Fax +32-9-233 73 02                             *  
*           E-mail: pol@motherearth.org                     *  
*****  
*           WWW:http://www.motherearth.org                  *  
*****  
*           Postal account : 000-1618561-19                 *  
*****  
* For Mother Earth is member of Abolition 2000 - a global *  
*network to eliminate nuclear weapons, the International Peace*  
* Bureau (IPB) and World Information Service on Energy (WISE) *  
*****  
* For Mother Earth has offices in Belgium, Slovakia, Romania, *  
* Sri Lanka and USA, aswell as active members/groups in    *  
* Belarus, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, France, Finland,     *  
* Germany, Netherlands, United Kingdom and Ukraine        *  
*****
```

Return-Path: <owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>
Date: Wed, 13 May 1998 16:09:32 +0200
From: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Cc: impress@slt.lk
Subject: pov-1: WCC Press Release on Indian Nuclear Tests
Sender: owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Reply-To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org

----- Start of message from list: pov-1 ---->

May 13, 1998

WCC CONDEMNS INDIAN NUCLEAR TESTS

India's recent nuclear tests were "ill-considered and unwarranted" and threatened the fragile stability of the region, the World Council of Churches (WCC) has told the Indian government.

This assessment was contained in a 13 May letter to the Indian Prime Minister, H.E. Atal Bihari Vajpayee, from WCC General Secretary, Rev. Dr Konrad Raiser, in which he called upon the Indian government to join other states which have declared a moratorium on further nuclear testing, and also to adopt a no-first-use policy.

Dr Raiser told Prime Minister Vajpayee that news of the recent Indian tests "was a cause of profound concern and sadness".

He added, "The positions taken over the past fifty years by the World Council of Churches calling for the total abolition of atomic, hydrogen and nuclear weapons have often been informed especially by the reasoned arguments of Indians as well as other specialists."

"By providing some of the most revered architects and memorable leaders of the non-aligned movement, India offered enlightened leadership on these same issues to world public opinion."

"Now, with this act, planned and conducted even as the Preparatory Committee for the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty met here in Geneva, India has tarnished its image as a wise and considered voice of reason in international affairs. It has turned a deaf ear to its own best counsel, relying on weapons of mass and indiscriminate destruction to show its power, rather than on the sophisticated art of statecraft to manifest its wisdom. In so doing, it has dealt what appears to be a calculated blow to the political stability and fragile basis of security in Asia."

Dr Raiser concludes his letter by telling the Indian Prime Minister, "It is not too late to give evidence to the world that India has not forgotten or denied its venerable national heritage. That same path of reason and active non-violence can lead India to reclaim the respected place on the world stage it ceded with these ill-considered and unwarranted tests."

Contact: John Newbury WCC Press & Information Officer
(+41.22) 791.61.52 (Office); 369.37.26 (Home)

----- End of message from list: pov-1 ---->

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 13 May 1998 07:24:53 -0400
From: Lachlan Forrow <lforrow@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Sample Op-Ed letter on Indian tests
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Sender: lforrow@pop.igc.org

Below is a letter I've sent to the Boston Globe.
I'm posting it in case it's helpful to Abolition 2000
colleagues who (I hope) are flooding the world's
newspapers with our message. Feel free to take/adapt
anything for local use. Let's use this to get Abolition
2000 the visibility it deserves.

Could we have a statement in the name of Abolition 2000
that includes Indian signatures?

--LF

>
>As dangerous and short-sighted as India's five
>nuclear test explosions are, we Americans will be
>unable to provide effective moral and political leadership
>regarding nuclear weapons as long as we try to maintain
>today's double standard: other nations can't be trusted
>with nuclear arms but we and the other four permanent
>members of the U.N. Security Council (Russia, China,
>France, and the UK) insist on keeping our own.
>
>In calling for the global abolition of all nuclear weapons
>in July 1994, General Charles Horner, who had commanded US
>air forces in the Gulf War and was now responsible for
>defending the US from nuclear attack, said "Think of the moral high
>ground we secure by having none...It's kind of hard for
>us to say..."You are terrible people, you're developing a
>nuclear weapon" when the United States has thousands
>of them...I want to go to zero."
>
>There are only two long-term choices: nuclear proliferation or
>nuclear abolition. The global Abolition 2000 network now
>includes over 1000 co-sponsoring citizens' organizations
>in 75 countries, united in calling for a signed global agreement
>by the year 2000 committing the world to the permanent
>abolition of nuclear weapons within a specified timeframe.
>
>Polls show that nearly 80% of Americans support nuclear
>abolition -- it is time to insist that our elected government
>does, too.
>
>
>
>

Lachlan Forrow, MD

The Albert Schweitzer Fellowship
Dedicated to Reverence for Life in Action
A co-sponsor of ABOLITION 2000

"Nuclear weapons are against international law and they have to be abolished...All negotiations regarding the abolition of atomic weapons remain without success because no international public opinion exists which demands this abolition."

--Dr. Albert Schweitzer

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Wed, 13 May 1998 11:05:33 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: Indian Gov't stmt, 5/13

May 13

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: statement from the Indian Government on the two tests of May 13

"In continuation of the planned programme of nuclear tests begun on the 11th of May, two more sub-kiloton nuclear tests were carried out at Pokhran range at 12.21pm (0651GMT) on the 13th of May 1998. The tests have been carried out to generate additional data for improved computer simulation of designs and for attaining the capability to carry out subcritical experiments, if considered necessary. The tests were fully contained with no release of radioactivity into the atmosphere. This completes the planned series of tests. Government of India reiterates the offer to consider adhering to some of the undertakings in the CTBT in the framework of the proposal in its statement of the 11th of May 1998."

It is also accompanied in the May 11 statement by the following rider:

"We would be prepared to consider being an adherent to some of the undertakings in the CTBT. But this cannot obviously be done in a vacuum. It would necessarily be an evolutionary process from concept to commitment and would depend on a number of reciprocal activities."

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: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 13 May 1998 17:33:27
From: amok@amok.antenna.nl
Reply-To: amok@amok.antenna.nl
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: indian test - comment on approach by activists
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Link: WINDMAIL for LAN and standalone PC (amok.antenna.nl)

Utrecht 13 May 1998

Dear network,

Just a few comments on the Indian nuclear tests and the reactions I have seen so far. It seems to me vitally important, especially now, not to join in the general one-sided India-bashing going on all over the western world.

It seems to me that we should point at the consistent hypocrisy of the nuclear weapons states as far as their own nuclear arsenals are concerned. This should be done in close conjunction, intertwined with the criticism of the Indian nuclear brinkmanship (eg sub-criticals, co-sharing nuclear tasks by NATO member states, obstruction measures suggested by SA, Canada at prepcom).

I would also argue against any measures which will tend to strengthen the nationalist fervour now being whipped up in India. Economic sanctions which hurt the entire population will have a counter productive effect.

For the rest, let's ride the publicity wave in a constructive manner.

Karel Koster

AMOK
Obrechtstraat 43
3572 EC Utrecht
+31 (0) 30 2714376
+31 (0) 30 2714759

Werkgroep Eurobom / Working Group Eurobomb
Part of the international PENN network
Obrechtstraat 43
3572 EC Utrecht
+31 (0) 30 2714376
+31 (0) 30 2714759

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 13 May 1998 16:14:28 +0100 (BST)
From: Janet Bloomfield <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: INDIA/How do we respond?
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, org@gn.apc.org,
abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de
cc: abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca

Dear Abolition Friends,

I have been reading with great interest the flurry of e-mails about the Indian nuclear tests. Like everyone else I am appalled and want to do everything I can to stop this. As with most problems in the world today there are no easy answers but I think there are some key lessons we need to learn as a network if we are to be effective in our response to this crisis.

First - we must act in solidarity with our friends and colleagues from the sub-continent who are resisting the development of the nuclear arms race there. I would ask that we listen with great respect to what they have to say. How many organisations in India and Pakistan have endorsed the Abolition statement? Not many are on e-mail. Please can we have a list of addresses and any fax numbers circulated by our co-ordinating office at NAPF so that we can communicate with our Indian and Pakistani colleagues...During the French testing campaign we acted with our French friends, we should do the same now.

Second, we have to speak from principle and not blame or excuse. All nuclear testing is wrong, all nuclear weapons are wrong. The behaviour of states should be assessed by what they do. India should not test, neither should those who already have nuclear weapons be allowed to be hypocrites and apply double standards. If it is right to apply sanctions and boycott India then we should also call for sanctions and a boycott of the USA, Russia, Britain, France, China, Israel and Pakistan. Concerted action to explain the whole picture regarding nuclear weapons is needed, partiality we can leave to the media and the politicians!

Third, I think it is important to recognise that we are now in a new phase in the struggle for the abolition of nuclear weapons. The choice between a nuclear free world and a nuclear free for all is stark and one that the world is faced with now, at this moment, not in 2000 or 2005 or whenever. I feel a sense of sadness that so many good people spent so much time, effort and resource in the last few weeks trying to have an effect on the NPT Prep Comm when the real game was just about to be played out in the desert of Rajasthan. We need to think hard and quickly about where we go from here.

I offer these thoughts as part of the debate and look forward to your response. Meanwhile all good wishes for success in the action you take.

Yours in peace,
Janet Bloomfield.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.org, abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca
Date: Wed, 13 May 1998 09:51:49 -0700 (PDT)
From: Peace Action - National Office <panukes@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: FW: Peace Bureau calls India a rogue state
To: magoo@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in, rwilcock@execulink.com

Dear friends:

Vijai's comments are good. For me, as a citizen of the United States, the appropriate message to India should be;

We know all about nuclear arms races. They are economic and environmental disasters. Our nuclear arms race kept us, and the rest of the world, perilously close to the nuclear brink for decades.

We lived in

an

almost

constant state of anxiety. We needlessly exposed our population to a rogue's gallery of radioactive isotopes. It will cost us several hundred billion dollars to clean up the mess. Please don't blunder down this same terrible path.

Bruce

>

> Vijai Nair wrote:

>

> THE ABOLITION CAUCUS SHOULD REFRAIN FROM CALLING STATES NAMES

>

> Questions for Mr. Colin Archer's International Peace Bureau's and Mrs

> Maj-Britt Theorin on their definition of India.

>

> If the nom de plume ROGUE is applicable to India because it: "refuses to open
> negotiations with the vast majority of countries ... abide by international
> law refused to get on board the discriminatory NPT and CTBT treaties"; by
> testing it has taken "Provocative action"; and, "now joined the tiny group of
> states who threaten weapons of mass destruction."

>

> Are we to understand that the IPB has issued a similar statement declaring
> the following states, who have preceeded India in all these actions, as
> "rogue states?":

>

> (a) The USA, UK, Russia and France who rely on nuclear weapons to underwrite
> their national security in the face of global objection?

>

> (b) France and China for rewarding the NNWS for extending the NPT
> indefinitely by commencing nuclear weapon tests before the ink had dried on
> the document?

>

> (c) Germany, Belgium, The Netherlands, Italy, Greece and Turkey for holding
> nuclear weapons on their soil for use by their military as an adjunct of the
> NATO strategy [that is their defence] of First Use of nuclear weapons?

>
> (d) Switzerland for having secretly continued their nuclear weapons
> development programme until 1 November 1988 - even after having acceded to
> the NPT?
>
> (e) Israel and Pakistan for having created and stockpiled nuclear weapons?
>
> If not, the the IPB, that professes to be "the oldest and the most
> comprehensive of the international peace federations," loses any credibility
> it may have.
>
> Most importantly, the time has come for all of us to grow up. Calling each
> other names is a sure sign of an inability to cope - frustrations that could
> lead us to destabilise an already turbulent condition. We need to objectively
> assess the situation around us and try to use all the little bits at our
> disposal to correct it within the frame work of our individual and collective
> beliefs. By all means condemn what you believe is wrong. But there is no
> mileage in calling 'names.'
>
> In so far as I am concerned please feel free to call who you want what names
> including my country. But, thereafter do not expect a sympathetic hearing
> that may help you achieve your ends.
>
> **Vijai Nair**
> *****
>
> **Brigadier Vijai K Nair**
> **Executive Director**
> **Forum for Strategic and Security Studies**
> **Safdarjung Airport**
> **New Delhi 110 003**
> **INDIA**

To: Christian CND <ccnd@gn.apc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: RE: information on Christian CND
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 11:14 AM 5/8/98 +0100, you wrote:

>Dear Howard:

>

>I hope that the NPT PrepCom in Geneva went well. Christian CND did not send a representative to attend the conference, but thank you for the invitation to the reception on 27 April. If you could email your mailing address to the office, I can send you information and also a copy of the newsletter we put out.

>

>Peace and Happiness,

>

>Nancy

>Christian CND

Dear Nancy:

Our mailing address is 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036, USA; our phone number is 301 896-0013. Fax is the same.

I look forward to receiving your information and developing a relationship with the Christian CND.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <dce@wcc-coe.org>
Date: Fri, 17 Apr 1998 14:37:29 +0200
From: Dwain EPPS <dce@wcc-coe.org>
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: NPT PrepCom Reception

Dear Howard,

Here is a first draft which I have shared with Konrad of his possible remarks at the reception. I would welcome any comment you might have!

With warm greetings,

Dwain

Attachment Converted: C:\INTERACT\data\download\RAISER.NPT

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 13 May 1998 11:56:24 -0400
From: John Loretz <jloretz@tiac.net>
Organization: Medicine & Global Survival
Reply-To: jloretz@tiac.net
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Misdirected anger?
To: AbolitionCaucus <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>

I can understand why we would all feel anger towards India for taking this step and I would never endorse nuclear testing for any reason or suggest that protests directed toward the Indian government are inappropriate. On the other hand, India's nuclear tests themselves appear on some level to be a form of protest against a situation that has gone on for too long. While risking an overheated nuclear arms race anywhere in the world in order to make a point may not be the smartest course of action any government has ever taken, those of us who live in the nuclear weapons states (or countries under their umbrellas) might consider directing most, if not all, of our justified anger toward our own governments for perpetuating conditions that more and more non-nuclear-weapon states (and formerly non-nuclear-weapon states) are finding intolerable. Lachlan Forrow has it right on this one: the long term choice is between abolition and unlimited proliferation. No one who can envision the ultimate consequences of the latter course would ever advocate it. That means fitting the nuclear gang with some new glasses, since they seem to have some continuing problems with nearsightedness and maybe a touch of astigmatism. Is there an optometrist in the house?

--

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 International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) Web site (<http://www.healthnet.org/IPPNW>) for information about the Abolition 2000 campaign, the campaign to ban landmines, and IPPNW research studies and publications.